

6 New working spaces

Policy perspectives before and after the COVID-19 pandemic

*Carolina Pacchi, Nicola Francesco Dotti,
and Mariachiara Barzotto*

Introduction

Coworking spaces (CSs) emerged in the US in the mid-2000s as part of a broader evolution of (urban) working spaces, moving beyond the traditional idea of large (Fordist) manufacturing plants. This internally diversified phenomenon includes various forms of new, shared working spaces such as incubators, makerspaces, and fabrication laboratories (fab labs). This diversity, which is part of the richness and potential of new working spaces, makes them difficult to define (Akhavan, 2020) and this unclear conceptualization has implications for interventions aimed at supporting or promoting them (Avdikos & Merkel, 2020). However, the potential for creating jobs, supporting start-ups and new forms of work organizations (as explained in the other chapters of this volume) has attracted policy interests to counteract deindustrialization processes in advanced economies. The emergence of the post-Fordist economy in developed countries left many brownfields, both large ones on the urban fringes and smaller ones in the consolidated urban fabric, presenting critical challenges for urban transformations. At the same time, policymakers had to face job losses and growing socioeconomic polarization within cities. In this perspective, the new forms of working spaces combine economic, social, and urban aspects.

This chapter maps the debate of new working spaces (particularly CSs) on the level of European policy making. It explores how new working spaces have been interpreted by the European Commission and how this debate has evolved from its origins up to the recent COVID-19 period. For these purposes, two different ideas of CSs will be presented and discussed: CSs as innovation drivers boosting economic development; and as opportunities for territorial regeneration, such as brownfield redevelopment or local hubs promoting social cohesion. Specific attention is devoted to identifying the evolution of policies supporting these spaces with a focus on place-based and urban planning measures before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. This chapter empirically investigates this debate analyzing EU policy reports and case studies. Finally, remarks and suggestions for policy learning are presented.

The remainder of the chapter is structured as follows. In Section 2, a (short) historical review of the emergence of new working spaces in advanced

economies is presented. Section 3 presents a conceptualization of new working spaces for policy design, with a focus on CSs as drivers of economic development and urban regeneration. Section 4 reflects on the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on CSs. Finally, Section 5 concludes by delineating remarks and suggestions for policy learning.

The evolution of new working spaces in cities undergoing deindustrialization

From a long-term perspective, CSs form part of the continuing evolution in the organization of workspaces, moving beyond the large (Fordist) manufacturing plants to introduce new, flexible forms of (shared) working spaces. This evolution has changed and is still changing the urban landscape and collective imagery of working spaces (Aerts et al., 2007; Caiazza, 2014; Grimaldi & Grandi, 2005; Mian et al., 2016; Smith & Zhang, 2012; Theodorakopoulos et al., 2014). In the Europe-centred policy-oriented perspective chosen for this chapter, three main periods can be identified, from the first ‘incubator’ in the US, to the diffusion of ‘business innovation centres’ in Europe, to the most recent CSs. This concise overview presents a framework to conceptualize policy interventions for CSs.

The starting point can be identified in the well-known case of the Batavia Industrial Center by Joseph Mancuso in New York, USA, which is considered the first known business ‘incubator’. This first example was mainly a profit-oriented real-estate project for newly established companies. Its success spread from Northern America to Europe and was also replicated several times by governments and universities. Mancuso’s fundamental intuition was to provide equipped office space (and eventually production space) to newly established companies. However, this initial real-estate perspective was quickly integrated with the benefits for early-stage entrepreneurs of being located in the same place, sharing experiences, tacit knowledge, and potential business networks among colleagues and with potential venture capitalists. This experience was viewed as successful due to the integration between ‘hard’ factors (working spaces) and ‘soft’ factors such as business networking, knowledge exchange, and informal contacts.

The second milestone was the European Programme for Business Innovation Centres (BIC), launched in 1984 (cf. European Commission, 2002). This programme was the first policy programme explicitly aimed at the spread of new working spaces. At the time, BICs became the first recognized channel for establishing new companies using public support. Nonetheless, importing this model from the US, European policymakers had to adapt the legal and business settings to the European context. Without going into the details of this programme, the expansion of BICs across Europe made these new forms of working spaces a primary channel for new companies, spreading this model across the continent. The strong emphasis on soft factors such as business networking, entrepreneurship training (i.e. accelerator programmes), and knowledge exchange (Theodorakopoulos et al., 2014) became a factor of success for many new companies.

The third phase can be identified after 2000, when incubators, BICs, and other forms of flexible workspaces were already well established as cities deindustrialized. However, growing scepticism emerged, with questions related to the effective use of public funds for such expensive real-estate initiatives (Mian et al., 2016). While the ‘soft’ factors emerged as key elements, the tangible elements of these new working spaces were too expensive, often undermining the economic profitability of such initiatives. This weakness led to questions about the financial returns of BICs and incubators where the revitalization of brownfields was justified in the context of the urban/built environment, but not in ‘economic’ terms, since freelancers, start-ups, and new companies hardly used these new spaces.

In this third phase, CSs have emerged as a flexible compromise between ‘traditional’ incubators, where the real-estate aspect was predominant, and the ‘intangible’ accelerator programme focused on promoting entrepreneurship without providing office space (Aaboen, 2009; Aernoudt, 2004; Albert et al., 2003). While incubators were seen as expensive/unprofitable real-estate initiatives, the accelerator programmes were viewed as ‘just’ training, sometimes associated with venture capital funding or business angel initiatives (Bøllingtoft, 2012). Thus, while incubators were too expensive and mainly focused on real-estate, the accelerator programmes were seen as ‘too light’ and unable to solve the demand for (physical) working spaces for newly established companies. Between these two extremes, CSs provide flexible working spaces on smaller scales compared with incubators while maintaining the ‘soft’ elements.

In this perspective, CSs can be seen as local mediators between multiple needs (cf. Dotti & Lupova-Henry, 2020). Like incubators, CSs offer professional work areas endowed with the necessary business equipment such as desks, Wi-Fi/Internet connection, cafés, lounges, and meeting rooms. In contrast to incubators, the organization of CSs with flexible desks and offices may change daily, optimizing physical spaces and potentially boosting the ‘soft’ elements such as intensifying informal contacts and providing workshops, upskilling courses, and professional/social networking. These soft opportunities facilitate knowledge exchange, collaboration, and joint leisure activities (Gandini, 2015; Bouncken, 2017 in Bouncken et al., 2020), representing critical aspects in boosting entrepreneurship and creativity (Bouncken & Aslam, 2019) in people and organizations. On the other hand, CSs answer the need for offices not offered by the accelerator programmes. With regard to the office market, CSs allow short-term renting, potentially reducing this cost for start-ups and freelancers who might have difficulty meeting a critical mass to rent their own office spaces. These elements are particularly relevant in central urban areas where real-estate market pressure is higher than in peripheral/suburban areas. At the same time, the concentration of a highly skilled workforce facilitates the emergence of new entrepreneurs (freelancers, start-ups, or other forms). Nonetheless, vague terminology and unclear notions undermine the possibility for policymakers to identify a field for intervention (cf. European Commission, 2002).

Conceptualizing new working spaces for policy design

The distinction among incubators/BICs, accelerator programmes, and CSs opens a theoretical issue between public and private initiatives. The first incubator in New York was a purely private initiative, BICs were a publicly promoted initiative, and hybrid organizations like universities have also created these new forms of working spaces. According to Grimaldi and Grandi (2005), the distinction between public and private initiatives can be misleading, since most initiatives have hybrid forms, often adapting to the national legal framework. Along these lines, the following distinction between public and private incubators can help better describe this issue.

The main objective of public incubators was to reduce the costs of doing business by offering a set of services ranging from the provision of space, infrastructures and facilities, to more elaborate services, as well as by offering access to technical and managerial expertise, assistance in business plan development, etc. The main source of profit for public incubators is the fees for the services they provide and the public funding from local, national and international schemes. . . . Private incubators can make money in several ways, including charging service fees, as well as taking a percentage of revenues from incubated companies or liquidity events of incubates. The purpose of for-profit incubators is quickly to create new ventures and in return to take a portion of equity in the new venture as fees.

(Grimaldi & Grandi, 2005, pp. 112–113, emphasis added)

In Grimaldi and Grandi's framework, two models can be identified. In Model 1, working spaces have a business model based on the returns generated by user fees, while Model 2, in contrast, profits from '(re-)selling' the hosted businesses. While other classifications do exist (cf. Aerts et al., 2007; Bergek & Norrman, 2008; Bruneel et al., 2012), this taxonomy has been broadly accepted in the literature because it goes beyond the formal/legal definitions between public and private organizations, which may be affected by differences in the various national legal systems. For policymakers, this distinction is crucial because Model 1 working spaces can offer flexible, often affordable offices in central (i.e. congested) urban areas. In contrast, Model 2 seems more adapted to riskier business initiatives, thus involving more private investors.

The distinction between these business models contributes to conceptualizing CSs as local mediators working between user demands and investor expectations (Dotti & Lupova-Henry, 2020). As incubators, CSs can adopt different ownerships; they can be public, private, or hybrid. Looking at CSs in Helsinki, Kojo and Nenonen (2016) identified a typology of spaces according to two dimensions: the business model (profit vs non-profit strategies); and the level of user access to the places (public, semi-public, or private). The authors describe six types of CSs: public/non-profit spaces (public offices, free of charge); semi-public/non-profit (collaboration hubs); private/non-profit (incubators); public/profit (third places); semi-public/profit (coworking hotels); and private/profit (shared studios).

CS members can be heterogeneous. These spaces attract freelancers, start-ups, and scale-up companies (Talent Garden, 2020). Start-ups are developing their business idea and usually participate in accelerators or incubator programmes (often organized by the CSs) while looking for investors or business angels. Conversely, scale-ups are companies that have already passed the start-up stage and are validating their product on the market, facing the challenging phase of growing to become well-established SMEs. As Talent Garden (2020) highlights, CSs represent a flexible, collaborative, safe environment for scale-ups that want to minimize risk. Scale-ups may grow fast, and CSs can provide a space for the team at a variable cost. At the same time, CSs are places where employees can learn and upskill, be exposed and connected to international communities, and improve their brand image.

From this brief review, we observe that for local policymakers, the challenge runs from offering affordable working spaces to boosting innovation and economic growth, for which they often have limited possibilities for intervention. Especially in central urban areas, the demand for affordable working spaces is crucial for ‘protecting’ or ‘sheltering’ emerging businesses such as freelancers, start-ups, and scale-ups (Pacchi, 2018; Pacchi & Mariotti, 2021). For these emerging businesses, a central location is needed to survive during the most critical phase of the business life cycle. On the contrary, Model 2 working spaces have the highest potential for growth in deprived suburbs and regions where a riskier approach may open the possibility for a substantial socioeconomic upgrade.

Public policies aimed at supporting and strengthening urban social cohesion and local community-building have been at the heart of several localized policy experiments across Europe in the past thirty years (Vinci, 2020). Major structural phenomena such as deindustrialization and overseas migration have occurred, but the impacts on local social cohesion have been very non-uniform across European cities. In the past thirty years, European and national policy responses to the local effects of such trends have been proposed and experimented in the form of ‘area-based’ and, more recently, ‘place-based’ interventions (Andersson & Musterd, 2005; Briata et al., 2009; Barca, 2009). Such policies have generally been based on integrated approaches, matching the focus on renewing decayed physical spaces with policy measures to enhance intangible resources such as social capital and collective efficacy and to foster economic development and employment. The rationale of these integrated approaches has been tied to triggering synergy between the different policy measures and minimizing mismatches and missed opportunities.

Many experiments in new working spaces stem from similar perspectives on the role of urban spaces and the ways to make them lively, accessible, and welcoming. In order to understand and interpret policies supporting new workspaces, we organize the variety of urban regeneration policies tested across European cities in this phase along two axes (see Table 6.1):

- one that connects the two polarities of *top-down* (local or supra-local authority-led urban regeneration) and *bottom-up* (social innovation-based and community-driven regeneration projects);

Table 6.1 Type of policy interventions aimed at urban regeneration. (Prepared by the authors)

	<i>Infrastructure interventions</i>	<i>Projects in the social sphere</i>
Top-down (local or supra-local authority-led urban regeneration)	<i>to fill according to the interventions analyzed</i>	<i>to fill according to the projects analyzed</i>
Bottom-up (social innovation-based and community-driven regeneration projects)	<i>to fill according to the interventions analyzed</i>	<i>to fill according to the projects analyzed</i>

Source: Authors.

- another that highlights the tension between infrastructure interventions to upgrade and refurbish physical assets and *initiatives and projects in the social sphere*, aimed at strengthening social cohesion.

Support for and fostering new working spaces, including CSs in particular, falls within the same categories. In most cases, CSs are a bottom-up phenomenon, emerging from market dynamics, local social dynamics, or both with mixed forms (Akhavan, 2020). These hybrid origins represent a challenge for existing planning processes and regulations concerning office space (Babb et al., 2018; Leducq & Ananian, 2019). While only a small fraction of local and regional authorities have instituted direct support policies, many have indirectly supported and fostered the spread of CSs. This indirect support has been achieved through local development policies targeting youth, entrepreneurship, urban regeneration, and social cohesion. Empirical evidence from different cities confirms that CSs can contribute to local social cohesion and neighbourhood regeneration while also supporting freelancers and other individual workers (Akhavan & Mariotti, 2018). Thus, CSs can be seen as mediators between different policy domains, which both influence urban development and are influenced by the surrounding context (Mariotti et al., 2017).

Within this policy mix, EU funds and programmes, and the EU Cohesion Policy in particular, have played a significant role in providing continuity in experimentation and funding opportunities for local and regional policymakers across Europe. Starting with the seminal URBAN Programme in the late 1990s (Pike et al., 2006) continuity can be seen up to the 2014–20 programming period, in which the EU Cohesion Policy devoted 5% of its budget for urban and metropolitan areas. The result was national and regional operational programmes focusing on employability and entrepreneurship, for which CSs became a crucial tool. In some cases, individual cities promoted policies for CSs to foster urban regeneration and strengthen the local innovation milieu, with specific attention for the social innovation ecosystem (Avdikos & Merkel, 2020). This is the case of Milan, Italy, which has proposed policies on both the supply and demand sides (Pacchi, 2018), that is, measures aimed at CS

managers to improve their infrastructure and equipment, and measures aimed at workers to settle at certified CSs. More recently, the City of Milan has invested significantly in the strategic perspective of the ‘15-minute city’ and in measures to strengthen neighbourhood liveability, which entail the promotion and diffusion of CSs locally as a means to contribute to reorganizing work patterns (Comune di Milano, 2020).

Reflections on the effects of the pandemic on CSs

The European labour market has been impacted significantly by the COVID-19 pandemic and the lockdowns implemented to guarantee social distancing is the most common, visible, and impactful measure across countries (Bourdin et al., 2020). These lockdowns have changed the work-life balance, driving teleworking in its various forms (from home-working to flexible teleworking). This shift has affected and is still creating huge impacts on the residential choices of millions of concerned workers across developed countries in Europe and North America (Manzini Ceinar et al., 2020; Sostero et al., 2020). While around 5% of the working population in Europe worked remotely before the pandemic, during the subsequent lockdowns in different European countries, the share of the remote-working population rose significantly, up to 60% in specific segments of the job market, educational profiles, and demographics (Manzini Ceinar et al., 2020; Sostero et al., 2020).

Moreover, in the post-COVID socioeconomic environment, Florida and colleagues (2021) foresee the emergence of two main scenarios. The first is the ‘youthification’ of cities via the presence of young, educated people attracted by economic opportunities, dense labour markets, social connections, and the related amenities that cities will still provide after the end of the pandemic. The second is the relocation of highly educated households (particularly those with young children) to the suburbs, moving closer to semi-remote working modes in more family-friendly settings, given the more extensive availability of local amenities. In this setting, intermediate cities such as smaller tech hubs and university towns may look more appealing to the latter demographic group because they maintain a cosmopolitan culture and present a safer environment due to the lack of crowding (Florida et al., 2021).

In this critical situation, several governments have had to intervene to preserve and support economic activities while facing the health crisis. Although an exhaustive overview of all policies implemented across the world lies beyond the scope of this work, some examples may be relevant for the case of CSs (see Bonzanni et al., 2020a, 2020b, 2020c). These flexible forms of working are likely impacting the work-area market, though its implications are still unclear. In this perspective, countries like Germany, Luxembourg, Poland, Spain, and the UK have suspended sanctions for unpaid rent. Since many businesses were finding it difficult to pay their lease agreement, this suspension was needed to preserve the existence of such economic activities.

Belgium introduced the possibility of teleworking for all non-essential jobs. This removed legal physical constraints, opening opportunities for teleworking. While CSs had previously been concentrated in large metropolitan areas like Brussels and Antwerp, it opened the possibility to redefine this geography in favour of more peripheral/rural areas, reducing the congestion in and pressure on dense urban areas. In a city-region like Brussels, about half of jobs are held by people living in the rest of Belgium and commuting daily (Adam et al., 2017; BISA, 2018; De Witte & Macharis, 2010). These measures are likely to have an indirect influence on CSs.

These measures for teleworking imply a redefinition of the geography of working spaces. While many businesses seem unlikely to survive while paying high rents in central urban areas, teleworking presents the opportunity to relocate to less expensive areas. However, this has implications for firms that are no longer able to benefit from accessing the ‘local buzz’ that comes with being clustered with other firms (Bathelt et al., 2004). In this context, CSs can offer flexible forms of working organization while being located in different areas.

For the post-pandemic recovery, it is worth mentioning that CSs do not seem to be considered by the Recovery and Resilience Plans, the most prominent policy promoted by the EU to recover from the pandemic and address other societal challenges like climate change. An overview of the plans adopted up to August 2021 shows no specific attention for CSs or, in general, new forms of working spaces. While digitization and flexible forms jobs are crucial, specific measures for CSs have not been adopted. In the Italian Recovery Plan, for example, co-working, together with smart-working, is only mentioned in relation to general aims to reduce intergenerational inequalities, and not as the object of specific, targeted policy measures (Next Generation Italia, 2021).

Beyond interventions by the EU, most policies seem to cover top-down, economy-oriented measures. Urban renovation and local impacts are expected to follow from this, changing the urban working landscape and pushing communities to re-organize. However, national policymakers were not able to address structural urban changes while facing the immediate COVID-19 crisis. By definition, urban renewal has a longer-term perspective, whereas the COVID-19 pandemic imposed urgent needs. Nonetheless, the digital technologies used for teleworking were already available before this crisis, and CSs were already showing the possibility for new, flexible forms of work organization. While independent workers, micro-entrepreneurs, and start-ups were already using CSs, this crisis has raised the interest of large organizations such as multinational enterprises, public organizations, and large companies that need solutions for flexible forms of work, such as employees working partially at home and partially on business premises.

Finally, the pandemic has presented the opportunity and need for new policies. Starting from a national, economy-oriented policy, CSs might arise as a possible solution to permanent teleworking, even after the pandemic. This shift is likely to have implications for the urban work landscape, although it seems too early to draw conclusions.

Conclusions: further directions for policy research

Although we are still in the midst of uncertainty due to the long tail of the pandemic, we have seen that it is possible to envisage different future scenarios in terms of work–life organization across different areas (Florida et al., 2021). Due to their local assets and service provisions, these different spatial and territorial configurations will have particular effects for new working spaces and CSs in particular (Manzini Ceinar et al., 2020). Policymakers can play a crucial role in supporting CSs and, in turn, fostering local employment and long-term place sustainability. While the main national and supra-national recovery plans and projects do not seem to address the possible role of new workspaces – thereby overlooking significant potential – local policy experiments appear to be better able to include such spaces in their strategies, though with very localized, contextual experiments.

Direct policies promoting shared workspaces should be implemented to target territorial contexts differently, since CSs in suburbs will undertake different functions compared to those in cities. More specifically, they represent a different response to various societal, labour, and real-estate needs. In support of direct policies, indirect ones are required to nourish the (re) generation of urban and suburban areas by boosting the excellent quality education, healthcare, and transport networks that can foster the generation of the ‘live–work neighbourhoods’ extensively encouraged by urban planners (Florida et al., 2021).

References

- Aaboen, L. (2009) ‘Explaining incubators using firm analogy’, *Technovation*, 29(10), pp. 657–670. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2009.04.007>.
- Adam, A., Delvenne, J.-C., & Thomas, I. (2017) ‘Cartography of interaction fields in and around Brussels: Commuting, moves and telephone calls’, *Brussels Studies. La revue scientifique électronique pour les recherches sur Bruxelles/Het elektronisch wetenschappelijk tijdschrift voor onderzoek over Brussel/The e-journal for academic research on Brussels*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4000/brussels.1601>.
- Aernoudt, R. (2004) ‘Incubators: Tool for entrepreneurship?’, *Small Business Economics*, 23(2), pp. 127–135. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SBEJ.0000027665.54173.23>.
- Aerts, K., Matthyssens, P., & Vandenbempt, K. (2007) ‘Critical role and screening practices of European business incubators’, *Technovation*, 27(5), pp. 254–267. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2006.12.002>.
- Akhavan, M. (2020) ‘Third places for work: A multidisciplinary review of the literature on coworking spaces and maker spaces’, in I. Mariotti, S. Di Vita, & M. Akhavan (Eds.), *New workplaces – locatiopatterns, urban effects and development trajectories. A worldwide investigation*. Cham: Springer, pp. 13–32.
- Akhavan, M., & Mariotti, I. (2018) ‘The effects of coworking spaces on local communities in the Italian context’, *Territorio*, 87(8), pp. 85–92. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3280/TR2018-087014>.
- Albert, P., Bernasconi, M., & Gaynor, G. (2003) *Incubateurs et Pépinières d’entreprises: Un panorama international*. Paris: L’Harmattan.

- Andersson, R., & Musterd, S. (2005) 'Area-based policies: A critical appraisal', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96(4), pp. 377–389.
- Avdikos, V., & Merkel, J. (2020) 'Supporting open, shared and collaborative workspaces and hubs: Recent transformations and policy implications', *Urban Research & Practice*, 13(3), pp. 348–357. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17535069.2019.1674501>.
- Babb, C., Curtis, C., & McLeod, S. (2018) 'The rise of shared work spaces: A disruption to urban planning policy?', *Urban Policy and Research*, 36(4), pp. 496–512.
- Barca, F. (2009) *An agenda for a reformed cohesion policy: A place-based approach to meeting European Union challenges and expectations*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Bathelt, H., Malmberg, A., & Maskell, P. (2004) 'Clusters and knowledge: Local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation', *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(1), pp. 31–56.
- Bergek, A., & Norrman, C. (2008) 'Incubator best practice: A framework', *Technovation*, 28(1–2), pp. 20–28. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2007.07.008>.
- BISA (2018) *Working population (at place of residence)*. BISA Database. Brussels: BISA/IBSA. Available at: http://statistics.brussels/files/figures/7.3_labour_market_active_working_population.xls (accessed: 24 July 2021).
- Bouncken, R.B., Kraus, S., & Martínez-Pérez, J.F. (2020) 'Entrepreneurship of an institutional field: The emergence of coworking spaces for digital business models', *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 16(4), pp. 1465–1481. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-020-00689-4>.
- Bollingtoft, A. (2012) 'The bottom-up business incubator: Leverage to networking and cooperation practices in a self-generated, entrepreneurial-enabled environment', *Technovation*, 32(5), pp. 304–315. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.11.005>.
- Bonzanni, G., Demelio, D., Mollica, F. et al. (2020a) *COVID-19: Principali misure adottate dai maggiori Paesi UE e Extra-UE in favore delle Imprese (1)*. COVID-19 series I. Milano, Italy: Pirola, Pennuto, Zei & Association, 9 April. Available at: www.pirolapennutozei.it/coronavirus/ (accessed: 18 August 2021).
- Bonzanni, G., Demelio, D., Mollica, F. et al. (2020b) *COVID-19: Principali misure adottate dai maggiori Paesi UE e Extra-UE in favore delle Imprese (2)*. COVID-19 series II, 27 April. Milano, Italy: Pirola, Pennuto, Zei & Associati. Available at: www.pirolapennutozei.it/coronavirus/ (accessed: 18 August 2021).
- Bonzanni, G., Demelio, D., Mollica, F. et al. (2020c) *COVID-19: Principali misure adottate dai maggiori Paesi UE e Extra-UE in favore delle Imprese (3)*. COVID-19 series III, 1 June. Milano, Italy: Pirola, Pennuto, Zei & Associati. Available at: www.pirolapennutozei.it/coronavirus/ (accessed: 18 August 2021).
- Bouncken, R.B. (2017) 'University coworking-spaces: Mechanisms, examples, and suggestions for entrepreneurial universities', *International Journal of Technology Management*, 77(1–3), pp. 38–56.
- Bouncken, R.B., & Aslam, M.M. (2019) 'Understanding knowledge exchange processes among diverse users of coworking-spaces', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(10), pp. 2067–2085. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2018-0316>.
- Bourdin, S., Rossignol, N., Amdaoud, M. et al. (2020) *Geography of COVID-19 outbreak and first policy answers in European regions and cities*. ESPON Policy Brief, Policy Paper, December. Luxembourg: ESPON. Available at: <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-03046489/document> (accessed: 18 August 2021).
- Briata, P., Bricocoli, M., & Tedesco, C. (2009) *Città in periferia: Politiche urbane e progetti locali in Francia*. Gran Bretagna e Italia, Roma: Carocci.
- Bruneel, J., Ratinho, T., Clarysse, B., & Groen, A. (2012) 'The evolution of business incubators: Comparing demand and supply of business incubation services across

- different incubator generations', *Technovation*, 32(2), pp. 110–121. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2011.11.003>.
- Caiazza, R. (2014) 'Benchmarking of business incubators', *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 21(6), pp. 1062–1069. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2013-0011>.
- Comune di Milano (2020) *Milan 2020 adaptation strategy*. Open document to the city's contribution. Milan: Comune di Milano.
- De Witte, A., & Macharis, C. (2010) 'Commuting to Brussels: how attractive is "free" public transport?', *Brussels Studies*. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4000/brussels.755>.
- Dotti, N.F., & Lupova-Henry, E. (2020) 'Creative mediators and their role in the governance of creative clusters', in M. Komorowski & I. Picone (Eds.), *Creative cluster development: Governance, place-making and entrepreneurship*. Regions and Cities. London: Routledge, p. 272. Available at: www.crcpress.com/Creative-Cluster-Development-Governance-Place-Making-and-Entrepreneurship/Komorowski-Picone/p/book/9780367332747.
- European Commission DE and I (2002) *Benchmarking of business incubators*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission. Available at: <http://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/5f01aafc-ef62-457d-93>.
- Florida, R., Rodriguez-Pose, A., & Storper, M. (2021) 'Cities in a post-covid world', *Urban Studies*, pp. 1–23. doi: 10.1177/00420980211018072
- Gandini, A. (2015) 'The rise of coworking spaces: A literature review', *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organisation*, 15(1), pp. 193–205.
- Grimaldi, R., & Grandi, A. (2005) 'Business incubators and new venture creation: an assessment of incubating models', *Technovation*, 25(2), pp. 111–121. doi: 10.1016/S0166-4972(03)00076-2
- Kojo, I., & Nenonen, S. (2016) 'Typologies for coworking spaces in Finland – what and how?', *Facilities*, 34(5–6), pp. 302–313.
- Leducq, D., & Ananian, P. (2019) 'Qu'apporte l'urbanisme à l'étude des espaces de coworking ? Revue de littérature et approche renouvelée', *Revue d'Economie Régionale et Urbaine*, 5, pp. 963–986.
- Manzini Ceinar, I., Pacchi, C., & Mariotti, I. (2020) 'Emerging work patterns and different territorial contexts: Trends for the coworking sector in pandemic recovery', *Professionalità Studi*, 4, pp. 134–159.
- Mariotti, I., Pacchi, C., & Di Vita, S. (2017) 'Coworking spaces in Milan: ICTs, proximity, and urban effects', *Journal of Urban Technology*, 24(3), pp. 47–66.
- Mian, S., Lamine, W., & Fayolle, A. (2016) 'Technology business incubation: An overview of the state of knowledge', *Technovation*, 50, pp. 50–51. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2016.02.005>.
- Next Generation Italia (2021) *Piano Nazionale di Ripresa e Resilienza*, April. <https://www.studiareviluppo.it/recovery-fund/next-generation-italia-il-piano-nazionale-di-ripresa-e-resilienza/#:~:text=Il%20Piano%20Nazionale%20di%20Ripresa%20e%20Resilienza%20%20%20%27insieme,sfide%20ambientali%20%20tecnologiche%20e%20sociali>.
- Pacchi, C. (2018) 'New workspaces in Milan and Berlin: Coworking spaces between defensive strategies and transformative potential', in J.K.Fisker, L. Chiappini, L. Pugalís, & A. Bruzese (Eds.), *The production of alternative urban spaces: An international dialogue*. London: Routledge, pp. 58–72.
- Pacchi, C., & Mariotti, I. (2021) 'Shared spaces or shelters for precarious workers? Coworking Spaces in Italy', *Professions & Professionalism*, 11(1), pp. 1–16.
- Pike, A., Rodriguez-Pose, A., & Tomaney, J. (2006) *Local and regional development*. London: Routledge.

- Smith, D.J., & Zhang, M. (2012) 'Introduction: The evolution of the incubator concept', *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 13(4), pp. 227–234. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5367/ijei.2012.0096>.
- Sostero, M., Milasi, S., Hurley, J., Fernandez-Marcias, E., & Bisello, M. (2020) *Teleworkability and the COVID-19 crisis: A new digital divide?* Seville: European Commission JRC and Eurofound.
- Talent Garden (2020) *Why scaleups are choosing coworking spaces*. Available at: <https://talent-garden.org/en/innovation/why-scaleups-are-choosing-coworking-spaces/> (accessed: 27 June 2021).
- Theodorakopoulos, N.K., Kakabadse, N., & McGowan, C. (2014) 'What matters in business incubation? A literature review and a suggestion for situated theorising', *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 21(4), pp. 602–622.
- Vinci, I. (2020) *Progettare lo sviluppo sostenibile nelle città. Temi, metodi e strumenti (Designing sustainable development in cities. Themes, methods and tools)*. Roma: Carocci.