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Summary and Introduction

This report is an outcome of a feasibility study carried out by the Civics Research Cooperative and funded by the Ontario Trillium Foundation. The purpose of the study was to consider the feasibility of a shared-space facility – A Centre for Community Innovation and Design (CCID) – that would enable and support small, socially or environmentally oriented businesses, non-profit/volunteer organizations, entrepreneurs, artists and community groups in urban and rural areas of Waterloo Region. The shared space and associated resources, services and programs would bring individuals, enterprises, and groups together in ways that would stimulate and enhance their work and capacities. As a result, the centre(s) would aid in progress towards environmental and social sustainability and would serve as a catalyst for creativity, innovation and community economic development. Additional objectives of the project were to share what was learned with others that are interested and to develop a network of partners and relations to enhance the capacity for moving forward with the initiative of developing the CCID.

The report is presented in three parts. The first part provides a rationale for developing shared spaces in Waterloo Region. In the second part, the vision of the CCID – as an association of centres across the Region – is described. The results of surveys, workshops and consultation are presented in relation to different facets of the shared space. These include location, mandate, tenants, financial considerations, services and programs, space and facilities, and ownership and governance. Several scenarios are also described. Scenarios can be an idea that has traction, a proposal arising from this study, or an initiative that is already underway.

The initiatives are:

- Charles Street Development in Kitchener by the Ray of Hope,
- Education and Retail Centre for Sustainable Energy, Food and Health in Wellesley by the Local Organic Food Team and Local Initiative for Future Energy Co-op,
- Community Innovation Centre in Cambridge by the Social Planning Council of Cambridge and North Dumfries and partners,
- Centre of Community Innovation at Wilfrid Laurier by the Laurier Students Public Interest Working Group, and
- KWartzLab in Kitchener.

Proposals are:

- **A shared multi-tenant space in downtown Kitchener** that would offer space, services and programs to a diversity of social enterprises and would be dedicated to facilitating cross pollination and collaboration across clusters and sectors, and among non-profit, artistic, and for-profit enterprises – all in aid of green community economic development and social or community innovation.
- **A developer, manager, and broker of shared spaces** where the principle interest would be enabling social enterprises and facilitating collaboration, innovation, and community economic development by retro-fitting or developing unused or underused spaces, connecting enterprises with spaces/arrangements suited to their needs, and managing these spaces on behalf of the tenants and patrons.
- **Development of the CCID as an association of centres**, where each would be of different sizes, in different communities, with different, although complementary, mandates. The association would be based on shared goals and principles.
and would be supported by a governing structure designed and sustained by those involved. Participation in the association would be voluntary. Involving those from initiatives already underway (mentioned above) in dialogue over how their initiatives would contribute to and benefit from being part of the CCID association would be invaluable.

The third part of the report describes a framework for development of the CCID. The framework is comprised of several points and action items. A significant feature of the framework for development is the focus on kernels – collaboratives of people or agencies that are engaged in developing one of the initiatives above or interested in developing one of the proposals listed above. Other items in the framework include development of a governance structure and approach through the Placemaker’s Circle; setting and sharing principles, vision, and mission; additional research and development of models and business cases; connecting to or creating clusters and building partnerships; continuing to build capacity; outreach, communication and marketing; and, finally, financing and sustaining further development. Given that the CCID remains a work in progress, next steps are critical.

There is considerable interest in the development of shared spaces in Waterloo Region. Those we spoke with are excited by the possibilities that various configurations of the CCID present.

Although we started this study with a vision of a single centre, an association of integrated centres seems best suited to this Region. We consider this to be the most unique aspect of the concept developed in this study – one that holds potential for addressing the diverse needs of small enterprises across the Region. Centres emerging from the efforts of collaboratives that choose to cooperate with one another is a way of capitalizing on the energies of those committed to various projects while retaining some of the more ambitious goals of the CCID. The development of such an association is an initiative in its own right.
Part 1: Background, Trends and Approach

Much of the work of the Civics Research Co-operative is motivated by an interest in sustainability and a conviction that, collectively, we have tremendous potential to achieve great things. As a very small non-profit, mission-driven cooperative, we understand the demands and challenges that small non-profits face, indeed, that small social enterprises face.\(^1\) Many recent reports document a number of troubling trends; even if some more recent forecasts are optimistic.\(^2\) Many more in the world are have-nots than haves, and their legion seems to be growing; people are resigned to their fates and are angry, fearful, or anxious over their futures. Debates continue on those many disparities and declines, with questions over what actions to take and what investments to make.\(^3\) After all, persistent anxiety and hardship, and barren or bleak landscapes – however those arise – do not bring forth creativity or innovation.\(^4\) And the emergence of resilience is precarious.

Solutions and positive alternatives to business as usual, on both macro and micro scales, try to create conditions that facilitate development and productivity; that is, create “systems” that increase effectiveness and efficiencies, facilitate competencies and dismantle obstacles, and increase resource flows without a concomitant increase in waste flows. On the micro scale, one way of achieving many of these objectives – and the reason for this feasibility study – is to create shared multi-tenant spaces, ones that offer fully functional, quality workspaces (inclusive of services and programs) that are customizable, adaptable, and flexible. Sharing space and services can reduce operating costs by introducing economies of scale.\(^5\)


These same spaces, with appropriate stewardship, also bring into being informal opportunities for collaboration, creative and critical exchange, and learning. Equally important to many who are self employed, these spaces also create opportunities to mingle and socialize with a great many others, and, importantly, people who are not their coworkers.

As you read this report, keep in mind that a shared multi-tenant space of the sort that motivated this study is not about making do – it is not about “cheap” space filled with equally “cheap” technology, or sub-standard services and programs. It is about integrating affordability, functionality, quality, performance, and aesthetics, into spaces that are filled with people who inspire and challenge us, and with the products of creativity and innovation; it is about considering all of these together as a package.[6]

Also keep in mind that shared multi-tenant spaces have many different names, and come in many guises. For example, a shared space might be a centre with walled office spaces – where tenants share few common spaces and share the costs of basic office services and equipment, but rarely interact with one another. Such business centres obviously fill a niche; there are many of them. However, there are radically different designs – ones we think are both appealing and well worth entertaining because of the opportunities their physical and organizational design manifest. Among the less common are workplaces that house people and organizations from very different sectors – artists, social entrepreneurs, non-profits, activists, and for-profit businesses. People question the utility of such centres because there is often no apparent or plainly observable link between one’s enterprise objectives and mingling with others who do business so differently. Others consider the approach one that unobtrusively encourages or facilitates innovation, creativity, and collaboration – to tremendous benefit.

Obviously different configurations of a Centre for Community Innovation and Design, or perhaps (as we propose in this report) the Centre for Community Innovation and Design (CCID) would offer different benefits to different sets of clients, whether they be entrepreneurs, volunteer organizations, or social enterprises. The “basic” shared multi-tenant space commonly offers office space, back-end business services, and select programs that suit a particular market – likely established office-based organizations. There are a number of other options to consider: a non-profit, arts or social enterprise incubator[8] or some hybrid of these options. We are excited by the challenges various configurations address, and are even more excited by the pos-
sibilities each presents. Needless to say, sustainability is a reflection of relevance – measured against client’s or patron’s interests and requirements, if not also against community, regional, or societal needs, as well as various financial, resource, and/or waste flows.

**Trends, points, and forecasts**

There are a number of points, trends and/or forecasts that inform the rationale for developing a CCID in Waterloo Region, and also inform its mission and vision, and design. Larger, global trends are discussed here and more local trends are discussed in another section below.

**Supporting small enterprise**

First, we would like to point out, as others have, the many contributions that non-profits, charities, and volunteer groups make, whether they are direct service non-profits, or non-profits that have educational, social, or environmental missions.[12] We would also like to draw attention to the role of small entrepreneurial businesses in the local economy, not only in terms of creating jobs, but also in generating new businesses and industries. These benefits are much more likely when those entrepreneurs and enterprises have appropriate support.[13] Recent reports highlight the value of the arts sector, given the sector’s contribution to our quality of life and economic prosperity.[13]

**Toward green industry**

Recent economic upheavals, persistent if not rising economic and social inequity, the rising cost of formal education, and links between human activity and degradation of one sort or another have given rise to a great deal of dialogue. Debate has, on occasion, turned to strategies and solutions that offer prosperity for all without so much degradation. Indeed, there are even more far-reaching discussions centered on the impossibility of economic growth as conventionally conceived[14] – echoed in local newspaper articles and conferences.

---


[9] “As discussed earlier in this paper, there is strong evidence that entrepreneurial activity creates economic value by creating jobs. The same is true for social entrepreneurship - both in for-profit business and the nonprofit sector. Social entrepreneurship also creates economic value given its social mandate - by reducing the burden on government for service delivery and, in some cases, stimulating employment for economically disadvantaged regions or individuals.”


[10] “We are already seeing opportunities to make inroads for economic recovery that would have been unthinkable six months ago,” he said, citing the province’s plan for the energy grid (which creates green jobs), investments in public transit (more jobs) and discussions on creating consumer products that are less toxic (more possible jobs).

Ontario Environment Minister John Gerretsen said environmental transformation is the “silver lining” of the downturn: “It has placed a greater emphasis on ensuring that the jobs of the future are all aligned with the green economy. In effect, thousands of jobs will be created from renewable energy projects alone,” he said. “It is an opportunity for us to retool the economy and put in greener initiatives.”

“Every major ecosystem, whether marine or terrestrial, is under stress. The world economy is depleting the earth’s biodiversity, ocean fisheries, grasslands, tropical forests, and oil and gas reserves. We are massively and quickly changing the climate. These trends are occurring on a planet of 6.5 billion people and with economic activities that are already unsustainable as practiced. Yet with the economic successes now propelling India and China and the momentum of global population growth, we are on a trajectory to some nine billion people and a GWP of perhaps $275 trillion by mid-century.”


Increasing interest in social enterprise

Reports have pointed out the challenges that direct-service non-profits are facing as a result of our recent economic crisis. In general, the majority of smaller non-profits are facing difficulties, and will likely continue encountering difficulties in light of current economic realities. It seems fair to say that any organization which relies on government or philanthropic funding is facing — and will continue to face — a revenue squeeze, while also grappling with increasing demand for their services, as well as change, competition, and calls for greater efficiency and accountability. Given public sentiments, many point to the appeal of social enterprise from two directions. One, that non-profits might benefit from adopting for-profit, business approaches. The other, is moving beyond profit toward business practice that meshes “money and meaning”; that is focused on the triple bottom line (people, planet, profit). Indeed, social entrepreneurs and innovators, and social capitalists have gained the attention of the public in recent years.

Toward an “artisan economy”

We have already mentioned the sizable portion of the Waterloo labour market that small businesses hold, but we also call attention to the increasing number of single owner businesses, and of people that are self employed or work as “free lancers”. As already mentioned, reports emphasize the significant role small businesses and entrepreneurs play in the labour market, in the creation of new industries, and in job creation, some reports also suggest that small business plays a role in decreasing various disparities. Those who predict the future of business suggest that we are moving into an artisan economy. From our perspective, certain configurations of

---

16 Visit the Waterloo Region Food System Roundtable website at http://www.wrfoodsystem.ca for more information.

the CCID would accommodate these trends and forecasts exceptionally well. There are numerous reports emphasizing the challenges of being self-employed – social isolation being one that the CCID could well address.

**Creativity and innovation**

As briefly alluded to above, the value and contribution of the arts and culture sector is documented – as is the continuing challenge of being an artist or an arts organization. Various policies, plans, and studies at the provincial and municipal level, including those of Waterloo Region, promote development of the arts.[vii] Recent recommendations by the Prosperity Council are also calling for active support of the arts.[viii] What strikes us as particularly noteworthy is the role that innovation, creativity, and continuous learning – and, with that, increasing capacity – plays in the success of any sector, and its importance to our collective prosperity and resilience. Needless to say, there are calls for infrastructure and support to facilitate all of these. A number of research initiatives are underway to explore what conditions facilitate social innovation or enterprise in both rural and urban contexts.[ix] One of the findings most relevant to this study is the central role that place (along with services) plays in facilitating innovation.[x]

**Implications**

To us, trends and forecasts point to why a CCID in Waterloo Region is a good idea. They also hint at possible configurations, especially potential missions – which could include: community economic development towards a green economy; community development and capacity building around social innovation or around dialogue, collaboration, and learning; incubation of social enterprise; and/or development of a highly functional workplace and resource network that, in the end, support non-profits, entrepreneurs, and artists, and collective prosperity. Properly designed and tuned, a CCID would reflect aspirations and address challenges.

Especially when coupled with the results from surveys and consultations that are presented later in this report, the foregoing discussion suggests that the CCID might assume a number of configu-

---


[vii] Consider the Regional Growth Management Strategy (Fostering a Strong Economy). For more information visit http://chd.region.waterloo.on.ca/web/Region.nsf/fmrgms?OpenForm.


[ix] The Social Enterprise Rural Alliance is developing a functional social enterprise framework for rural areas. See http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca/?q=en/node/593

[x] Social innovation policy tour 2009: Key insights from the UK on enabling social innovation with social finance and social entrepreneurship march 29th to april 1st.
rations that would be very relevant. It also suggests that, depending on the approach taken, the CCID could address a diversity of objectives, reflecting various diversities, the Region’s social and cultural geography, and its infrastructure.

Box 1. A rough sketch of the Social Enterprise Continuum

Traditional business

Socially-conscious purchasing
Corporate social (environmental) responsibility

Social enterprise

Separate revenue-generating entity w/ social element
Earned revenue project operating within an NPO

Traditional NPO


“The idea of social entrepreneurship has struck a responsive chord. It is a phrase well suited to our times. It combines the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation, and determination commonly associated with, for instance, the high-tech pioneers of Silicon Valley. The time is certainly ripe for entrepreneurial approaches to social problems.”


The Meaning of “Social Entrepreneurship”
Our Approach

The points raised above suggest potential configurations for the CCID, where each configuration might serve a variety of “clients” or market segments. In proposing this study, we were aware of that potential, and intentionally assumed a very broad mandate in order to explore how the CCID might support entrepreneurs, artists, and small or micro enterprises (including businesses and non-profits) throughout Waterloo Region. Potential mandates and services of the CCID that we wanted to consider ranged from offering workspace and select back-end business services akin to those offered in multi-tenant non-profit centres, to centres with programs typical of an arts or social enterprise incubator, to those with programs and goals around community engagement, community based development, collaboration, and innovation. The only criteria we have kept in mind throughout this study was that tenants and patrons run socially/environmentally responsible enterprises or have socially/environmentally oriented missions. Most important to us was to remain as open as possible to configurations of the CCID that would serve a significant number of enterprises across all of Waterloo Region, would be unique but still complimentary to the Region’s many assets, and would be focused on community economic development, social innovation, and capacity building.

We also wanted to allow for the rapid development of a shared space – one that would not necessarily serve the entire region or a great number of diverse organizations, but would serve a number of committed organizations – if a sufficient number of compatible enterprises came together and expressed an interest in doing so. Our role would have been to synthesize a model from the data and information we collected, and assist in partnership building, site selection, and funding campaigns/drives. Alternatively, we were also ready to build a comprehensive model of a CCID based on detailed information collected through our surveys, interviews, and workshops, and grounded in our understanding of best practices. Neither a small group of organizations coalesced or self-organized around sharing workspace, nor did we collect sufficient information from a sufficient number of committed organizations to merit building a comprehensive and detailed model of a CCID that aligned well with study objectives. We realized early in the study that we were not likely to be researching the development of a single centre, but rather of multiple centres; that a single centre would not address the needs of those we interviewed across the Region. What was called for in this Region was a network or association of centres. We think this is the made-in/for-Waterloo variation on the increasingly popular shared-space concept that makes this study – and the recommendations that arise from it – unique.

This feasibility study

At a very basic level, we view the CCID as a shared multi-tenant space that would offer tenants affordable, functional, and quality space and services. These characteristics would arise from efficiencies of scale and through customized “solutions” that would reflect preferences and requirements and would significantly reduce waste. Organizations would not have to make large overwhelming and burdensome investments in infrastructure. Space, services and programs would be more accessible because of innovative approaches to provision and affordability. We would expect, as other such centres mentioned throughout this report have documented, that sharing workspace with other entrepreneurs, artists, and organizations would catalyze innovation and creativity, and would increase the likelihood of new and potentially productive partnerships and opportunities. Simply by working near others, the CCID would reduce isolation, and – with a few unobtrusive “interventions” – would create a social context within which patrons or tenants...
Box 2. Examples of shared multi-tenant spaces:

- Evergreen Brick Works, Toronto (http://ebw.evergreen.ca/)
- 10 Carden, Guelph (http://www.civics.ca/library/index.php/publications/show/268)
- 401 Richmond, Toronto (http://www.torontoartscape.on.ca/)
- Artscape Wychwood Barns, Toronto (http://www.torontoartscape.on.ca/)
- Centre for Social Innovation, Toronto (http://socialinnovation.ca/)
- Community Enterprise Centres (http://www.entemp.ie/press/2006/20060103.htm)
- Hackerspaces (http://hackerspaces.org/wiki/)
- The Hub, Halifax (http://thehubhalifax.ca/work/)
- ShoreFast, Fogo Island and Change Islands (http://www.shorefast.org/)
- The Network Hub, Vancouver (http://www.thenetworkhub.ca/)
- The Toronto Food Business Incubator (http://www.tfb.ca/)
- Social Fusion, San Francisco (http://socialfusion.org/about.html)
- Building Opportunities with Business, Vancouver (http://www.buildingopportunities.org)
- Pratt Center for Community Development, New York (http://www.picced.org/)
- Hamilton Arts Collective (http://hamiltonarts.org/home/)
- The Workroom, Toronto (http://theworkroom.ca/)
- The Workantile Exchange, Michigan (http://workantileexchange.com/)
- The Factory: Hamilton Media Arts Centre (http://www.hamiltonmediaarts.com/)
- Queens Street Commons, Charlottetown (http://queensstreetcommons.org/)
- London Creative Labs (http://londoncreativelabs.com/)
- http://thew-hub.net/

can mingle with one another. Magical things follow. We think it important to emphasize the quality of place that – while hard to describe – is plainly felt in centres like the CSI in Toronto. We suspect that this quality is a consequence of those who call the CSI home, and also the result of careful design and continuing investment in creating such an environment.

The study was to examine how a CCID could best serve small enterprises (including for- and not-for-profit enterprises) or entrepreneurs across all of Waterloo Region that are socially and/or environmentally responsible, or have a social or environmental mission, including artists and arts organizations. The potential mission of the CCID ranged from a shared space that offered a number of basic services that were also shared, to an organization that was much more actively involved in incubation, community economic development, and/or capacity building. While a CCID in Waterloo Region made a great deal of sense to us, we certainly accepted the null hypothesis: that no configuration would serve or be useful to prospective tenants and patrons in Waterloo Region.

In general, those who shared their opinions with us were interested and excited by the idea or vision of a CCID, but were either unfamiliar with shared spaces of the type we were talking of, were not in a position or interested in moving, and/or were not prepared to commit their energies to developing a concept that may or may not result in a real space or tangible product. We have sufficient information, insights or recommendations, and ideas from those we consulted to suggest options and configurations for the CCID. Needless to say, principal among the feedback we did get is that stakeholders see some version of the CCID as a valuable asset to Waterloo Region. There were very few – if any – objections to the CCID. The only critiques were: cautions over developing specific configurations in particular contexts prematurely; an interest in critical and realistic market analysis; the view that a shared multi-tenant space was more appropriate for urban than rural organizations/patrons (although the CCID, as an incubator for small businesses or as meeting and gallery space, was seen as beneficial for the latter); or that the benefits versus complexities of a centre that would facilitate the work of artists and social enterprises – together – might be overly ambitious.

The descriptions above refer to configurations of the CCID as a physical building. We have received support for, or feedback that points to the CCID as a district, a developer and manager, and/or a broker of shared spaces, services, and resources.

“Convergence centres can address many creative sector needs.
Affordable space for creative activity and enterprise is a consistent and enduring issue.
Business support for creative enterprise is an essential component of building a city’s creative economy.
The most effective way to ensure access to affordable creative space on a long term basis is by securing ownership of buildings.”

Local trends
Sharing workspace is not new. It seems straightforward to draw connections between productivity (if not more ambitious goals of well being and growth), and attractive, functional and healthy work spaces, coupled with access to state of the art equipment, exposure to inspirational works of art and architecture and informal and frequent opportunities to be creative and learn. Making and sustaining such spaces, however, appears not to be so straightforward. Our assumption is that sustainability is as much a reflection of relevance as it is resource/waste flows.

So, our principle objective in this feasibility study was to draw up promising configurations for the CCID that suited prospective tenants and patrons from target markets, and to meld these with lessons and best practices. An equally important part of the study was a brief introduction to inspirational and innovative examples of shared spaces to stimulate imaginations and as a demonstration of the possible (see Examples of shared multi-tenant spaces in Box 2 on the preceding page).

As mentioned earlier, configurations for the CCID took shape as larger trends and opportunities were considered. There are a number of features and trends unique to Waterloo Region that deserve attention.

The spread-out geography of Waterloo Region
If the CCID is to serve Waterloo Region, an informed response to how the CCID is to serve rurally based sectors is fundamental. In addition to rural areas and towns, there are three distinct cities: Kitchener, Cambridge, and Waterloo. The distinctiveness of each is often applauded, concomitant with an express interest in bridging various divides. Movement between them is not necessarily facile.

Established shared multi-tenant spaces
There are a number of established and successful shared multi-tenant facilities in Waterloo Region. Some are business centres such as Regus and Embee Office Suites. Others serve the social, community, or health sector exceptionally well, and include the Woolwich Community Health Centre, the Wilmot Family Resource Centre, MOSAIC Counselling and Family Services, the Community Resource Centre (at 151 Frederick St in Kitchener), Farm Village Association, and the Family Centre (Family and Children’s Services of Waterloo Region). A number of businesses or building owners offer shared spaces, such as the Tannery District, Globe Studios, and The Button Factory. Artists, or arts organizations do share leased space in buildings throughout the Region – as do a number of non-profits. As well, the provincial government has taken steps to open public school facilities to community groups and non-profits.

“Rural Ontario has a higher percentage of the labour force who are self-employed at 17%, compared to 14% in urban Ontario. Self-employment in rural Ontario grew at a slower rate (6%) compared to urban Ontario (15%) between 2002 and 2007. 30% of employment in Rural Ontario is in goods producing sectors (agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, oil & gas, utilities, construction, and manufacturing sectors) compared to 21% in urban Ontario. The manufacturing sector in 2007 remained the largest sector in rural Ontario employing 261,000 people. Over the last five years the decline in manufacturing employment was 8.5% in rural Ontario compared to 14.7% urban Ontario. Rural Ontario has a high level of employment specialization in Agriculture, Utilities, and Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Oil and Gas sectors, compared to the provincial average employment in these sectors.”

Rural Economy 2007 Update

“Rural residents described a rural culture characterized by self-reliance and resiliency, pride and privacy. In many areas there is a strong influence of spirituality and the Mennonite culture and values. Social support and sense of community are valued, yet there sense of self-reliance and privacy means that often people prefer to handle difficulties themselves, rather than seeking help from others.”

Rural Health Study in Waterloo Region
Clusters
There are also a number of regional clusters the CCID might initiate or join. The most obvious are ones focused on entrepreneurship and small enterprises (with a social and/ or arts focus); creativity and innovation (again, with a social and/or arts focus); as well as ones on collaboration and community economic development. Organizations of interest are those affiliated with the University of Waterloo or Wilfred Laurier University, as well as local business organizations with considerable expertise or knowledge in business and in incubating businesses, or organizations supporting or working in the arts, community capacity building, and non-profit sector. Among those are the Social Innovation Research Group (SIRG), Canada’s Technology Triangle, and The Accelerator Centre. Of particular interest is Capacity Waterloo Region, an organization that is committed to supporting non-profits and social enterprise. In addition to organizations in Waterloo Region, there are a number of networks beyond Waterloo Region that may be of interest.

Community Assets
There are also a plethora of well established community assets, among them The Working Centre, the Cambridge Art Centre, the Waterloo Community Arts Centre (at the Button Factory), the Potter’s Guild, and the Manufacturing Network. Each brings to mind a number of partnerships and collaborative agreements – agreements that, in their design, would benefit all involved.

Policies and community support
Regional and municipal governments are supportive of the arts and creative economies. The Prosperity Council has most recently put forward a call to action and drawn attention to shared space and an enabling organization.

Opportunities
Real estate in a number of downtown neighbourhoods in some of the Region’s cities is relatively inexpensive, unutilized, or empty, and as one interviewee mentioned, underutilized space and, more generally, resources across Waterloo Region present an opportunity.

Initiatives
Interest in developing new industries, driving down operating costs, developing shared work spaces in empty or underutilized spaces, making better use of underutilized resources, and incubating non profits, social enterprise, and the arts have given rise to a number of initiatives in Waterloo Region that are worth acknowledging. These include a range of initiatives at varying stages of development, from proposals to up-and-running organizations. Some have much in common with the principles or concepts that underpin the CCID. Among them:

1. The Four Churches Project
2. The Corridor for Advancing Canadian Digital Media
3. The Tannery Distinct Project
4. Proposed redevelopments of older industrial buildings, for example the Wellesley Mill

---


For more information on Ontario’s clusters of innovation visit The Institute for Competitiveness & Prosperity at http://www.competeprosper.ca/index.php/search/results/d84b4ac3f5fe4f78df07aefd9e6c345a/

http://www.wlu.ca/page.php?grp_id=1009&pg=4899

http://capacitywaterlooregion.ca/

http://centreforthearts.ca/


http://www.creativeenterprise.ca/

http://www.thetannery.ca/

http://www.wellesleymill.com/
5. Ray of Hope’s Charles Street Development[55]
6. The Community Innovation Centre proposed by the Social Planning Council of Cambridge and North Dumfries
7. The Centre for Community Innovation at Wilfred Laurier University proposed by LSPIRG
8. KWartzLab in the Boehmer Box Factory, Kitchener[56]

The above information about local trends and assets informs the rationale for and design of the CCID – perhaps most importantly, in considering how the CCID might compliment and support initiatives already underway or build upon their accomplishments.

**Our perspective on progress to date and next steps**

There were two overriding objectives associated with the study: 1) to develop a viable/feasible configuration for the CCID based on trends, opportunities, best practices, and the preferences and requirements of prospective tenants and patrons, and 2) to pull together a group of people ready to act on that model. A potential outcome to this study was a body of information and data that was sufficiently coherent (detailed, comprehensive, rigorous, and highly suggestive of a single model complete with financial projections) that a business plan and partnership agreements with people ready to act was foreseeable. There was no such confluence, however, and there is no clear winning candidate model. There is, however, clear support for a shared multi-tenant space that offers highly functional and quality workspace, along with quality services and programs that would serve enterprises from various quarters of Waterloo Region. Further market research is required.

Keep in mind that there is quite a difference between offering opinions and insights on a concept as an interested party rather than as a tenant or investor who has made a commitment to occupy space or renovate a building. Many could not entertain being tenants at the time, wanted a clearer sense of what the CCID would be, or wanted an explicit commitment to its construction before investing more time in considering its design. Many of our conversations or consultations were with a small group of “representatives” and well informed members of our community, not assured tenants or users of the centre. The body of data on hand, given its nature and quality, is suggestive of a concept – where further investigation is required. What we have ended up with, is a concept chock full of good ideas, but one that requires focused development and further grounding. So, the concept for the CCID remains a work in progress.

One of the most attractive features of the following model is that it acknowledges and supports the many initiatives already underway in the Region that are aligned with the CCID. The concept incorporates those initiatives as development options – kernels, that we think offer the greatest potential for further development. A second appealing feature is the CCID as an association of centres that rises out of those kernels. The question of whether one of those kernels emerge as the CCID, or becomes an affiliate of it remains to be seen.

Given that the CCID remains a work in progress, next steps and the development process take on some significance. The third section of this report – the framework for development – addresses what next steps might be. Given that this feasibility study was to explore how the CCID might facilitate community economic development (CED) and social enterprise, we recommend that the development of the CCID itself be an example of CED and be considered a social enterprise.

Of particular significance – given interests and objectives and the number of initiatives underway – is the strategic development of one or several of these kernels in ways that satisfy larger objectives. While there was no single concept or model for the CCID endorsed by everyone as workable, there was concern that a centre in the “wrong” place, or an association of centres was not viable, nor in service of the more ambitious objectives. Strategic development and good govern-

[55] http://www.rayofhope.net/content/overall-site-planning-1
[56] http://kwartzlab.ca/
ance takes on some significance.\textsuperscript{[37]}

Finally, those we spoke with are excited by the possibilities that various configurations of the CCID present. We would hazard that their further engagement is likely assured where tangible and constructive outcomes are near at hand.

**Methods and interpretation**

Throughout this study, our approach had a dual focus: 1) to provide ideas, information and examples related to shared-spaces and 2) to gather ideas, interests and preferences of people regarding the development of a shared-space(s) in Waterloo Region. We used a variety of methods to present and gather information. These included surveys, one-on-one consultations and small workshops or focus group discussions, which are described in the remaining sub-sections of Part 1. The information gathered through these different methods – which involved the same or similar questions – is presented in the next part on the CCID and its facets.

The following questions provide a general outline of the key topics or facets related to the CCID that we used to focus conversation – all in aid of pinpointing viable configurations, and the relevant contexts and clients they suited. Note that the development path for realizing a CCID was also raised in consultations and workshops.

1. Is a CCID for Waterloo Region a good idea? Why?
2. Where should the CCID be situated?
3. How should the CCID serve “clients” across Waterloo Region?
4. Who should the CCID serve?
5. What should the CCID offer (in terms of space, programs, and services)?
6. How could the CCID sustain itself?
7. What approach to creating the centre would be best for Waterloo Region, and assure success?
8. Who should be involved in making the CCID a reality?

Questions were designed to focus attention. As noted below regarding the detailed survey questions, some were also designed to be informative. Calling attention to innovative and successful examples of shared spaces also seemed productive. Many of the people we consulted were familiar with shared multi-tenant spaces as one-stop service hubs – likely due to the several excellent examples in Waterloo Region, such as MOSAIC and Lang’s Farm Village Association as well as other variations on the shared-space concept, such as the YMCA/Community Resource Centre in Kitchener and the Working Centre. However, from our perspective, the Centre for Social Innovation in Toronto and other similar centres are unlike the shared spaces we have in Waterloo Region. Moreover, multi-tenant shared spaces come in a great variety of guises with varying missions or mandates, as exemplified by the list in Box 2, above. Showcasing a wide diversity of innovative and exemplary centres in a variety of settings not only assisted in making distinctions and providing demonstrations that these entities exist, but also stimulated creativity and the imagination.

**Data collection**

**Online Surveys**

Surveys were developed following a review of literature on similar initiatives and related discussions. Questions were presented online in three separate surveys – Ideas and interests; Spaces,
services and programs; and About your work and organization. Participants were encouraged to answer one or (preferably) all three surveys. The surveys were quite in-depth – primarily for two reasons. First, in reviewing other initiatives, the importance of having comprehensive information was emphasized. Second, a participatory design process requires involvement early in the process in order to be successful. In addition, the surveys served an educational purpose – by raising questions that others have pointed to as important and by providing some explanatory notes to set the context for those questions. Even in reading through the survey and not answering all of the questions, the hope was that participants would be more informed about shared spaces. On these surveys, some answers were required, many others were optional.

We also developed a short, quick survey as a response to concerns that the in-depth surveys were too time consuming. These surveys repeated some of the required questions from the aforementioned surveys.

We also presented survey questions at most of the workshops using two approaches. One was to post questions that asked respondents to rate their preferences regarding various facets of shared-space centres on large sheets of paper attached to the wall. Participants were given stickers and asked to mark their preferences. Participants were also given a short paper survey. Between these two paper surveys, we included all of the required-answer questions from the online survey. Given the media used in these surveys, however, participants did not have to respond to the questions, although most did.

Responses from all surveys were combined and tabulated. Responses are presented in the next section: Facets of the CCID. Since some questions were asked in multiple places and participation among these varied (Table 1), the tables presenting results indicate the number of respondents.

**Small workshops**

We planned a number of small workshops or focus-group discussions. Workshops provided us an opportunity to explain the concept and to talk to participants about their interest and preferences. Workshops were planned in partnership with interested organizations who, to greater and lesser degrees, acted as hosts for the event (Table 1). Host organizations distributed invitations and encouraged participation from within their networks. The workshops varied in size from three to about 20. Each one had its own character. While they were all to cover the same key topics, discussion would often focus on one topic or another, with people excited by different ideas or concerns. Insights from workshop discussions have been incorporated into the results presented below.

**Consultations**

Consultations also served multiple purposes. Consultations typically involved a meeting with the two researchers and one or two key informants. Key informants included those who could inform the feasibility study, those who might want to be involved in a shared-space (tenants, providers, partners or supporters), and those who might be interested in or who could inform the development of a centre. Those interviewed were identified through our own networks, through a snowballing technique and through self-identification where material on the project (which was widely distributed across the Region) asked people to contact us if interested. The insights gained through these consultations were incorporated throughout the project, for example, by informing the process as it unfolded and by including new ideas, insights or concerns in presentations. They have also been incorporated in the results.

**Presentations and roundtable**

In addition to small workshops and consultations, there were a number of presentations. These differed from the workshops in that – while the presentation itself was similar – there was only a short allotment of time for questions and answers. Presentations were done as a response to invitations. Some precipitated workshops.

The final event, which was designed to present and gather feedback on the concept, was a roundtable. A second objective of the roundtable was to inaugurate the Placemaker’s Circle. The
roundtable included a presentation of interim results from the study followed by facilitated discussion. Insights from this event are also included in the discussion below.

### A few notes on results, interpretation and presentation

Survey questions were based on a literature review and an environmental scan. In questions where respondents were provided with a list and asked to rate their preference, the items on the list reflected options that reports had indicated as important. Because of that, we expected that responses would tend toward “preferred” and “very important” rather than the reverse. As illustrated throughout the tables below, this was generally the case. In most questions, respondents could add other options or suggest additional ideas. While some availed themselves of this opportunity, there were few additional ideas provided.

There is a second factor that may also contribute to the higher incidence of “preferred” and “very important” responses that is notable in the results. Respondents always had the option of not answering. While we cannot be certain why people did not answer, it is possible that an unanswered question is akin to a response of not preferred or unimportant. However, non-answers may also represent uncertainty, ambivalence, or indifference.

Note that the strength of the responses is gauged by two factors – the number of people who responded to a question (indicated at the bottom of each table) and the number of people who marked a preference for an item within the question. For example, in the second table, 41 people responded to this question about the importance of different locational considerations. Of these, 34 people marked ‘viable public transit options’ as preferred, one as moderately preferred, and six marked neither a preference nor lack of preference for this item (i.e. “no answer”). In the same question, but on a different item – “proximity to clients” 22 respondents marked neither a preference nor lack of preference. While there were still more preferred responses in comparison to not preferred, these responses carry less weight because over half of the respondents (54%) did not provide any answer at all.

To make them easier to grasp, survey results are presented in tables, with cells shaded according to their relative preference. The percentage of non-answers are also listed in the tables, but they are not used to determine shading.

We would have liked to have done more analysis according to the size, type and focus of respondent enterprises; however, less than half of respondents provided this information and they could not always be linked with responses. In consequence, little analysis was done in this regard, although we do speculate on such factors with respect to some facets, especially where we can determine this information from workshops and consultations.

We had also hoped for more feedback from entrepreneurs, businesses and rural enterprises. We suspect there are several reasons for the lack of feedback. Most notable among these is that the shared-space concept seems to be deemed an urban phenomenon and for some reason, not necessarily able to address the needs or requirements as depicted. We expect that a more focused promotional campaign around development of a shared space in a specific location with a relevant programmatic theme, would lead to better response and participation from these groups.

---

**Table 1. Tally of participants and responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveys</th>
<th>Online: “Interests”</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online: “Program, services”</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online: “Organization details”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online: Short survey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops: Paper surveys</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest possible total</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>SPC-CND, Cambridge</th>
<th>~20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REEP, Kitchener</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OWR, Kitchener</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRAC/AyrSpace, Ayr</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRAC/MSpace, Kitchener</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIFE Co-op, Baden</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WR PH, St. Jacobs</td>
<td>~15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>~75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation/meetings</th>
<th>Children’s Museum</th>
<th>~10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACAC, Kitchener</td>
<td>~10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GREN, Waterloo</td>
<td>~20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIFE Co-op</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woolwich Healthy Communities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>~45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultations</th>
<th>~50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roundtable</td>
<td>~15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total (includes some repeats)** ~200
Comparative reports

Earlier sections of this report have drawn from a wide range of literature; however, to compare and contrast the results that were gathered, one particular study was very helpful. This was a study by the Nonprofit Centres Network (NCN), based in San Francisco. The majority of members are in the United States, although there are also members from Canada. This report presented results from a survey of thirty-nine centres (including one in Ontario). They note that “Given the limited number of respondents, the data cannot be considered conclusive. Nevertheless, some important patterns and themes emerge” (page iv). We repeat this caution with respect to our own findings; however, comparing their findings with our findings provides greater confidence in some results and raises caution with respect to others.

There were two other reports that were helpful in similar ways – although they did not provide comparable results to the same degree as the NCN study. First of these was a study by Artscape on the potential for developing an art and culture cluster in downtown Kitchener. This study presented results from 50 individual artists (from a range of disciplines) and 14 art/culture-related organizations (not-for-profits, businesses, educational institutions) on a range of questions, including some related to work-space, services and support.

The third report was prepared by Eli Malinsky, program manager at the CSI in Toronto. It draws from two sources – a 2004 evaluation involving eleven CSI tenants and a more recent survey of twelve organizations interested in being members of the CSI that was done by the CSI itself. The report does not present results from these studies, but rather synthesizes them into sets of ranked and weighted criteria for evaluating site selection. This makes only approximate comparisons possible. Additionally, since the report focused on factors related to site selection, results were only partially comparable to the information we gathered; however, it would be valuable at a later stage of developing a CCID in Waterloo Region.

---


Part 2: Our vision of the CCID

Our vision of the CCID is not a single shared-space centre, but a network or association of centres across Waterloo Region that operate interdependently and cooperatively to stimulate and support the work of small socially or environmentally oriented/responsible businesses, non-profits, entrepreneurs, artists and community groups. The centres would have complementary mandates, where each centre would reflect patrons’ interests, and would offer spaces, services and programs suited to their rural and urban locales. Spaces, services and programs would be accessible to everyone who is a tenant or member of the Centres for Community Innovation and Design (CCID).

There is a case to be made for a number of configurations. Physically, centres might be highly flexible multi-functional and well-resourced coworking spaces, or multi-tenant spaces that enable work and facilitate collaboration and innovation across sectors. In terms of mission, there are grounds for an incubator, one that brokers spaces, resources, tools, and expertise to enable social, environmental and/or arts enterprises. There are grounds for a centre dedicated to creativity, collaboration and dialogue across sectors, using innovative approaches, technologies and partnerships to facilitate connections, enhance collaboration and ensure that spaces, services and programs are widely accessible. Finally, there are also grounds for a developer and manager of shared space as envisioned in this feasibility study – which could encompass any of the foregoing as associate centres.

The CCID would fill a niche, compliment other organizations and ventures, make use of local expertise, and partner with organizations that offer relevant services and programs. The CCID would be a social enterprise in its own right. It would be a unique community asset that builds local capacity, contributes to local economic development and facilitates our collective progress towards environmental and social sustainability.

The development of the CCID hinges upon supporting initiatives – kernels, that are in line with the vision and mission of the CCID – and the Placemaker’s Circle, a collaborative committed to the creation of a CCID in Waterloo Region. The approach to development would necessarily be adaptive, evolutionary and strategic, supporting and facilitating promising initiatives that would stand on their own and could be considered milestones in the realization of the CCID. The proposed governing structure and approach (see Part 3, the framework for development) is geared toward enabling those involved in the development of promising kernels, encouraging cooperation and strategic development of those kernels, and developing principles and the vision of the CCID as an entity that serves the region and a diversity of clients. We expect that evolution of the CCID as an entity serving the region and development of initiatives in-line with the CCID would happen concurrently, with every attempt engage to stakeholders in design and decision making.

This vision emerges from consultation with many people across the Region, drawing on the range of input we have received through surveys, interviews and small workshops. People are enthusiastic about the idea – especially those familiar with spaces or centres such as the Centre for Social Innovation (CSI) in Toronto. Endorsements were almost unanimously supportive, although concerns were raised. Most could readily think of ways a CCID would benefit them. Some were visionary, seeing the CCID to be about much more than a shared space; seeing the CCID as a way to support innovation, creativity, collaboration, and community economic development. We concur with these latter thoughts.

This part of the report describes different facets of the CCID. We do not provide detailed descriptions of buildings, locations or tenant mix.

“It’s a great concept. I did a placement in a place like this. That type of collaborative space worked well...”

“We currently don’t have a permanent space. Sharing space at a low cost, sharing of knowledge, and being open to the public would push our organization forward in terms of capacity and sustainability.”

“It’s important to value non-profits and social service networks in a formal, business-like environment.”

Study participants
Rather, what follows are suggestions based on feedback, from which something more concrete can evolve. Recall that we also draw upon results from three other studies carried out by the Nonprofit Centres Network, Artscape and the CSI.

**Facets of the CCID**

The various facets that go together to make up any particular configuration of a CCID are strongly interrelated and interdependent. For example, the design of space, facilities, programs and services will depend on the purpose or mandate of a centre where the latter will depend on the requirements and preferences of tenants or patrons, as well as the community the centre sits within.

This part of the report discusses the results as they relate to each of the different facets: location, mandate, tenants and tenancy, financial considerations, services and programs, space and facilities, and ownership and governance. Some of these contain sub-sections. For example, the first section covers three intertwined elements that were a central focus of many discussions – all of which relate in some way to locational considerations for a CCID. Note that we began this study referring to the Centre for Community Innovation and Design and very soon pluralized this, referring to “Centre(s)” as a way to indicate an openness to locational considerations. By the end of the study, it is clear that a diverse association or network of centres would suit this region best. The responses discussed in the following section support this vision and discuss the different facets that are relevant to their design.

**Location**

Waterloo Region is geographically spread out and comprised of cities, towns, and smaller communities – each unique. The question of where a centre might best be located arose early in the study – and continued to be a primary focus of discussion in consultations and workshops throughout the study. (The CSI report states that “respondents identify geographic location as the most important variable in site selection” (page 4). Our experience aligns with this statement.) Our conclusion is that a single centre is unlikely to serve Waterloo Region well – that a number of different interconnected, if not integrated centres in communities across the Region would be best.

There are a variety of factors that come to play in considering the most suitable locations for centres. Everyone recognized the benefit of centres within community; centres that are locally accessible and responsive to local interests and requirements. In surveys and discussions, almost everybody preferred a centre closer to their workplaces, homes or their clients – although few said they didn’t want to see a centre located elsewhere in the Region. Everyone also recognized the notion of a “critical mass” – that there must be a sufficient number of people/enterprises, committed to their missions, working in the same place and mingling with one another to make a shared space successful. Success here refers to financial viability, but also to the capacity for generating that “buzz” – an often lauded trait of the CSI. However, other measure of success could also be considered – namely the success of achieving centre goals which could rank many factors – such as affordability, accessibility, basic services, or incubator programs – as more important than that “buzz”. Additionally, while these centres are often considered to be an urban phenomenon, the centres that responded to the NCN study were located in communities of varying size.

To compare with the size of communities found in this Region, 18% of the successful centres in that study were in communities with a population under 50,000, 25% in communities of 50,000-150,000 and 15% were in communities of 150,000-500,000 (comparable to smaller towns, the Cities of Cambridge and Waterloo, and the City of Kitchener, respectively).

Financially, economies of scale are important: Sharing a colour printer, photo-copier, a commons, or meeting area among several enterprises will decrease operating or capital costs for each enterprise. Benefits will vary depending on various factors (meeting areas are only beneficial if required, poorly designed space may seem crowded and noisy rather than synergistic and energizing), yet economies of scale would suggest a larger facility. Location and the related trade-off between one large centre versus multiple smaller centres was the most strongly debated topic,
with emphatic statements bolstering each side of the argument.

To draw again from the NCN study, the size of successful centers varies considerably. Ten percent were under 15,000 square feet and 19% were over 150,000 square feet, with a range of others in between. Roughly half were in the 15,000–50,000 range. Additionally, they ranged in size from 3–85 organizations as tenants/members. Size and number of tenants were not strongly correlated. For example, “several facilities under 50,000 square feet serve as incubators and therefore provide space to as many as twenty organizations” (page 15)

In this section, we focus on two aspects of location – what we have termed the regional view (Where in the Region might a centre best be located?) and neighbourhood view (What considerations are relevant for determining specific locations?) – as well as the question of what sort of centre the CCID(s) might be (a single centre/building, a district, a broker, etc.). The NCN study suggests that a range of centre locations and sized can be viable – the question, then, is what would work best in/for this Region.

**Regional View**

Tables 2 and 3 present results relevant to the question of where in the Region a centre should be located. Table 2 indicates the preferences of respondents and Table 3 indicates their locations. In both cases, communities are listed in order of frequency, with the highest at the top. It is not surprising that the order in each table is the same; that the preference for location correlates to the location of respondents. A closer look at the data confirms that (to the degree their location can be identified) respondents marked their own community as one of their preferred locations; however, it is important to note that it was not always marked as the only preference. Nonetheless, we can surmise that results reflect the geographic distribution of respondents and that a different distribution would likely lead to a different order of preferences than those indicated in Table 2. What is most important for understanding the parameters around location, then, is why participants have made their choices – why they prefer particular locations over others. Descriptive survey comments and discussion in consultations and workshops provide some indicators.

**Table 2. City/Township locational preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Moderately preferred</th>
<th>Less preferred</th>
<th>Not preferred</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Kitchener</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Waterloo</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cambridge</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of North Dumfries</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wilmot</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Wellesley</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Woolwich</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Question:** Which municipalities and townships of Waterloo Region would you want to be a home for a Centre for Community Innovation and Design? There were a total of 39 respondents to this question; shading represents relative weight. "No answer" refers to the fraction of people who marked neither a preference nor lack of preference for that location, but who did mark a preference for another location.

**Table 3. Location of those responding to question in Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>North Dumfries (Ayr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wilmot (Baden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Wellesley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unknown/other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among urban participants, core areas were often viewed as the centre of business and activity, making them an obvious place to locate. Locating within these cores was considered essential for their work as entrepreneurs, non-profits or social enterprises. For some, locating in core areas was beneficial to clients, since they would also be able to access other services in these areas. There was also a strong appreciation for close connections between home, work and amenities, especially among those who had chosen to live in core areas. The importance of core areas as having transportation hubs was also mentioned frequently. (See further discussion below.) Finally, there are personal preferences for the unique qualities and character that each of the cities provide. While travelling between each of the three cities is relatively easy by car, and Grand River Transit connects all three cities, it appears that many do not travel between them unless they...
are compelled to. As a result, a CCID in one particular city is likely not compelling.

Among rural participants, there was frequent reference to people that have jobs requiring a high degree of mobility and to the many entrepreneurs, including self-employed highly skilled trades people who work out of their own shops or artists that have home studios and galleries. Many people have access to workspace or would rather create a shared space with friends and colleagues than pay a third party for space. Perhaps most importantly, most had little interest in spending any more time in the city than they already do. Also, those we spoke with had a deep appreciation for their communities, their rural lifestyle, and the places where they lived and/or worked. They have also adapted to rural living, and have no interest in spending more of their time travelling than necessary. Moreover, travelling in bad weather can be risky.

The tendency, then, was for people to prefer a location within their own community. There appeared to be two key reasons for wanting a centre located elsewhere. First was to have a satellite office, which was seen as beneficial for two reasons – to reach clients and to enable and support volunteers. For example, participants from organizations with a main office in Kitchener came to a workshop in Cambridge because a satellite would enable them to better serve clients living in that area. Similar discussion emerged at other workshops, extending the ‘satellite’ rationale to other towns/locations as well. Participants also saw satellite offices (or access to hot desks) as a way to expand their volunteer base: By enabling access to space other than their home office, they could more easily get volunteers from other communities. The other key reason for wanting a centre located elsewhere was to provide meeting or display space that could be used for a variety of reasons, on a regular, but also and especially on an irregular basis. People spoke of being able to rotate board meeting locations, to present workshops or educational seminars in different communities, or to host a business meeting in something other than a coffee shop. Access to display, exhibit or gallery space in other communities was similarly seen as beneficial. People perceived these benefits to be present across urban-urban, urban-rural and rural-rural communities of the Region.

Also relevant to where centres might be located in the Region are more specific questions about where in a neighbourhood they might be located. Most obviously, centres that are easily accessible within the specific/target communities will be advantageous – for people near-by or from elsewhere in the Region. We have referred to this as the neighbourhood view.

### Neighbourhood View

Participants were asked about criteria that could be used in determining suitable locations. Table 4 presents results in order of preference. Results show that all transportation-related criteria were considered to be more rather than less important. They were seen as at least moderately preferred by over half of respondents and less/not preferred by 12% or less. Viable public transit options was at the top of the list, with 83% of respondents marking it as moderately preferred/preferred and no respondents choosing it as less/not preferred. Accessibility (73% moderately/preferred) and onsite parking (59% moderately/preferred) are second and third on the list. “Showers, locker, and change rooms” could also be interpreted as a transportation-related criterion. As such, it was the only anomaly since it received the highest fraction (one third) of ‘not preferred’ responses. Discussion in consultations and workshops also pointed to transportation and accessibility as important considerations. Locating a centre somewhere along main transit corridors was mentioned often, including the possibility of locating on the planned rapid transit line. This
characteristic is intrinsically linked to the Regional view: “I don’t care where it is as long as it’s accessible” was the comment of one participant. There were some participants who correlated ‘accessible’ to parking availability, but – given the emphasis on a centre supporting social/environmental responsibility – it is not surprising that public transit was at the top of the list.

The importance of transit was also noted in the CSI report where accessibility by transit was the criteria of highest importance with respect to location – and where location was seen as the most important consideration in site selection. Preference for the downtown core was also noted. “Importantly, however, potential tenants would be willing to move out of the core if a more peripheral location was located directly on a transit line” (page 4). In their report, safety was ranked as of similar importance to downtown proximity. These were followed by proximity to target populations and public accessibility (page 14).

The CSI ranking were comparable to results in our study, where personal safety, proximity to public and a welcoming neighbourhood were also preferred or moderately preferred by over half of respondents. The remaining items, proximity to amenities, services and programs, and clients were preferred less, however, they were still more moderately/preferred than less/not preferred. Two considerations are important to note here. First, the list of criteria was identified through a literature review as ones important to developing shared-space locations. This means they were pre-selected as important and could be expected to garner more ‘preferred’ marks. Second, many of the items lower on the list had higher percentages of non-answers. It is possible that at least some of these non-answers would be not-preferred-answers if respondents had been required to reply.

Another facet of the discussion over location is whether the centre should be a single “landmark” building, a major tenant with sub-leases, a district (multiple buildings in close proximity), a virtual broker of space or some combination of these. The general and most favoured response has been single buildings, but in multiple locations – although there are diverse opinions. Since the question was only asked online and did not require a response, there were few respondents.

### Table 4. Criteria relevant to locational considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Moderately preferred</th>
<th>Less preferred</th>
<th>Not preferred</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viable public transit options</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite parking</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and secure bike stands/storage facilities</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to public</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and secure walking/cycling paths to other transportation options</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative transportation options (like car share)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A neighbourhood that welcomes the CCID and its tenants, visitors, and associates - and plans on making use of its resources</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to amenities within the neighbourhood</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to services and programs within the neighbourhood (please include examples below)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to clients</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shower, lockers, and change rooms</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Question:** From your own perspective and the perspective of your clients or the public you interact with, what are the most important criteria to consider in deciding where a centre might be located?

41 respondents; shading represents relative weight

---

**Single building vs. other possibilities**

Another facet of the discussion over location is whether the centre should be a single “landmark” building, a major tenant with sub-leases, a district (multiple buildings in close proximity), a virtual broker of space or some combination of these. The general and most favoured response has been single buildings, but in multiple locations – although there are diverse opinions. Since the question was only asked online and did not require a response, there were few respondents. None-
theless, when coupled with discussion from consultations and workshops and with the foregoing points, the results seem worth presenting (Table 5), in part, because they show no strong preference. Only three respondents chose one answer (each different), the rest selected from two to all five. These factors suggest there is no strong preference for the type of shared-space the CCID might be.

This suggestion was born out by discussion in consultations and workshops where ideas were occasionally discussed, but no particular model seemed to receive particular attention. There were a few people that felt strongly about particular models. For example, some strongly advocated for a single centre as the only way to generate the “buzz” and to ensure the centre would be a hive of creative activity providing many opportunities for cross-sectoral, cross-organizational exchange. Others spoke strongly of the need for centres in different locations across the Region as the only way to ensure fair distribution of resources and opportunity. For example, people in Cambridge were concerned that a single centre would be located in Kitchener and would thus be an asset difficult for them to capitalize upon. Similar comments were expressed by people in rural areas. Further, many respondents from Kitchener said they would not commute to a centre located in Cambridge. One participant suggested that people from Waterloo would more likely want to develop a centre in their own community rather than travel to one in Kitchener. These attitudes suggest there may be challenges involved in cooperating and integrating across an association of centres – although most people seemed to find the notion of a network appealing and could see potential benefits. (See discussion in following sections.)

Not everyone had the community-centric perspective, however. There were some who said they would be willing to travel to a centre wherever it might be as long as it had suitable space and amenities – that a centre, and its synergy and atmosphere would be the draw and much more important than location. Another participant commented “Just get it started – wherever – in Kitchener, Cambridge, Ayr... I won’t move it it’s in Ayr, but I’m fully supportive of just getting it going somewhere...”

Generally speaking, the first model listed in Table 5 reflects discussion in the preceding sections – that the most suitable approach is to have multiple centres across the Region.

The notion of an anchor tenant had appeal for some, since they can have considerable positive influence over development of a centre and can be pivotal to its sustainability. Respondents noted the common rationale for their use: “The larger tenant could help off-set the costs of other users whom want to lease the surplus space – [the latter] tend not to have the financial resources to cover rent and utilities”. Another noted that “the anchor tenant is a tried and true way to stabilize an ‘alternative’ minded development.” In contrast, another respondent noted, “I don’t think you *need* an anchor tenant to make this work.” Some of the literature strongly suggests against having a large anchor tenant, noting two key concerns. First is the obvious difficulty that if the anchor tenant closes or moves away, everybody is put at risk. Second is a concern over identity – that the centre will be associated with the bigger organization and smaller organizations will remain un-noticed. There is more discussion related to these considerations in the section on tenant mix, below.

### Table 5. Potential models for shared-space centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A number of permanent buildings throughout the Region that house tenants from nearby areas and provide services to associates. Each site might offer programs, space, and services tailored to meet different needs and interests - but these services, programs, and spaces could be made available to affiliated individuals and organizations</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A permanent building with a larger anchor tenant, with surplus space leased to non-competing people or organizations.</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A landmark building that houses tenants on a permanent basis, and provides functional space for non tenants.</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A permanent “district” comprised of buildings located near one another that house and offer space to tenants and non tenants.</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces provided at cost by agencies who have excess space, where the CCID is a more virtual entity that provides services and programs, and administration, management, and leadership in the delivery of services and programs, and the provision of space.</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Question:** Which of the following do you think would serve Waterloo Region well?

12 respondents; shading represents relative weight; multiple selections were possible, so total is over 100%
Regarding a landmark building, people saw this as a way of attracting attention, in particular, without the negative side-effects of an anchor tenant. For example, one survey respondent said: “Landmark buildings also draw community attention and are more evident than an anchor-with surplus situation as to what they’re trying to accomplish. In that latter scenario, the anchor is the focal point and the actual mission of community innovation is subservient.”

The last model listed in Table 5 – which received little interest from survey respondents – received more attention in consultations. A broker or manager of spaces may be particularly important regarding specialized facilities – especially when considering the requirements of artists and other entrepreneurs. For example, in discussion with people in rural areas, the potential for linking rural entrepreneurs with specialized production facilities was emphasized as a valuable consideration. Consider, also, efforts such as the Four Churches Project and social entrepreneurs interested or actively working to make resources available to other entrepreneurs as well as the general availability of space, the under-utilization of space and resources, and the need for economic innovation. From our perspective, brokering could be combined with any other type of centre and could be quite beneficial in some cases. It provides a good opportunity to capitalize on assets and services that already exist by connecting people with space and resources.

**Location: Recommendations**

We recommend a number of centres across Waterloo Region that are, collectively, the CCID: Centres for Community Innovation and Design. Centres would be unique and of different sizes, with different mandates and approaches, and would offer diverse spaces, programs and services. Centres would serve local communities, build and build-on local capacities and reflect the requirements and realities of tenants and patrons.

We recognize that a single, centrally located, large centre is more likely to obtain the critical mass necessary to generate a “buzz” and to be a well-resourced “flagship” by concentrating assets and resources in one place. However, even a central, easy-to-get-to location means that many would be at a disadvantage regarding accessibility, or would be adverse to making use of the facility – for one reason or another. A number of different centres would be more accessible to local tenants/associates. In addition, as part of an integrated network, well situated centres increase access across the Region for all tenants/members – by decreasing travel time and ensuring space and resources in different locations. This would satisfy those mentioning the benefit of having meeting and display space or a satellite office in other communities. Centres could be of different sizes, with a larger centre that offers social interaction and facilitates encounters on a wider scale situated in one or more cities and made accessible to all patrons of the CCID. Other centres could be smaller and of a type and quality that addresses local requirements and needs. As noted above, the NCN respondents included centres of different sizes in communities of different sizes.

The not-a-single-centre option was preferred by a greater number of people in this Region and more adequately addresses the differing cultures, qualities and characteristics of this community of communities. The NCN study only mentioned a couple of centres with multiple locations. More investigation into these examples could be beneficial for developments in this Region.

There are examples of shared space networks at much bigger scales. Most notable are the Nonprofit Centers Network and the Hub – which are national (US) and international networks, respectively. We have also participated in talks around the potential for a shared space network in southern Ontario, given the increasing interest in developing centres across this area. We have not, however, seen reference to a network or association of centres at the regional level, such as that being proposed here.

To be most successful, there would have to be a strong investment in integration; in making services and resources available across the network and in creating opportunities for cross-pollination.
and the sharing of ideas and innovation. Ideally, each centre would complement other centres, working cooperatively and collaboratively to make spaces, services and programs available to patrons of all centres. Each centre would reflect a unique combination of the elements described in the following sections. Together, they would try to address the range of concerns and preferences. We think that, with the appropriate practices, policies and technology in place, the CCID can reap the benefits of both embeddedness and scale.

**Mandate**

We embarked on this study with a general idea of a shared-space centre supporting small, socially or environmentally oriented businesses, organizations, entrepreneurs, artists, and community groups that might also serve as a catalyst for community economic development. While people were attracted to this very general idea, we wanted to determine a more specific purpose or mandate for the CCID. Results and discussion indicate that there is support for a variety of mandates. Survey respondents selected two as key: Enabling and supporting tenants and facilitating innovation, creativity and collaboration among tenants and associates. Community learning also ranked high. In consultations and workshop discussions, these goals were frequently discussed. In focused discussions or in meetings with local organizations, cross-sectoral collaboration, community economic development, incubation and community engagement were topics of conversation.

**The Purpose of the CCID**

Table 6 presents survey results from a question around goals. All of the listed goals were seen as important/very important by more than half of respondents. As with questions above, the listed goals were derived from research and are thus not surprisingly seen as more (rather than less) important. Perhaps of greater significance, then, is their relative ranking. Generally speaking, goals supportive of tenants ranked higher than those supportive of community. (We recognize support for tenants as ultimately supporting community, given the focus on enterprises that are socially and/or environmentally responsible; however, we take that as a more indirect support.) Two goals were seen as important by more than 80% of respondents: To enable and support tenants (87%) and to facilitate innovation, creativity and collaboration (82%). Only 2% of respondents saw these as less/not important. Community learning and engaging citizens ranked third and fourth at 71% and 66%. For these and the remaining goals quite a few more respondents saw them as less/not important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Goal preferences</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enable and support tenants (for example, by facilitating productivity through healthy, high quality, and functional spaces)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate innovation, creativity and collaboration among tenants and associates</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support community learning</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage the citizens of Waterloo Region</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To incubate new and early-stage enterprises and organizations</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To catalyze community economic development</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To become a centre or centres of excellence for innovative initiatives and groups that do not have one</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question: Please indicate the importance of the following goals for a Centre for Community Innovation and Design from your own perspective, and from your understanding of other artists, nonprofits, community groups, charities, entrepreneurs, and small businesses.

44 respondents; shading represents relative weight
Three key themes that arose in survey comments and discussions provide additional support for this greater emphasis on tenants and associates. These are the importance of reducing costs, of making resources more readily accessible to small enterprises (especially through sharing), and reaping the benefits that arise when working with/near others. Other suggestions included a focus specifically on artists, especially with regards to live-work space. Another suggestion was to encourage and/or facilitate collaboration across sectors, clusters and communities. This was seen as a potentially unique purpose for the CCID, making it different from multi-tenant facilities (hubs) that already exist in the Region. Potential benefits and disbenefits are discussed under Tenant Mix, below.

There were also comments that supported goals aimed at the community, in particular, for the inclusion of an educational mandate and emphasis on spaces that are client-centred – where “clients feel that they are welcome and being treated in a respectful manner”.

In rural communities, two additional purposes were highlighted: incubator-type support for rural entrepreneurs and meeting and storage space for small not-for-profits and community groups. In urban communities, discussion was more frequently around ways to enable mingling across sectors, but also around sharing space with like-minded people and organizations, and providing comprehensive service delivery to clients, whether those services were around environmental sustainability or some other area of interest. Among artists, ensuring access to affordable studio space (including collaborative studio space and live-work space) was highlighted.

Objectives of the CCID

A second question asked for more detail with respect to mandate and objectives (Table 7). Topping the list of preferences was the objective most directly related to cost: lower rent, which 88% of respondents saw as important. Only 4% of respondents did not answer the question, emphasizing the strength of the response. Two other financial considerations – stability of rent and other costs, and affordable technology, programs and services – were seen as important by 77% and 68%, respectively. High quality, healthy, functional space was third on the list (77% important), putting the characteristics/qualities of space ahead of other factors such as collaboration, services and programs.

As with other questions, the items on the list were known to be important in designing or operating shared-space facilities. In this question, however, quite a few items were reasonably similar with respect to the number of respondents who saw them as important and unimportant. In the bottom half of the list (below the line drawn on Table 7) the difference between those identifying the objectives as important vs. unimportant is 11% or less. (In the top half the differences are 25% or more.) Nonetheless, state of the art computers and software, and specialized facilities are the only two that had more respondents ranking them as less/not important. Obviously, responses reflect the realities and needs of respondents.

The other notable item in this regard is provision of benefit packages and investments, which had as many respondents – 21% – marking it as ‘not at all important’ as those marking it as ‘very important’ (although the totals were 38% and 27% for important and unimportant, respectively). We were a bit surprised at this ranking as the advantage for small enterprises of being able to buy into health benefit packages arises frequently in discussions around the challenges faced by small enterprises, not-for-profits in particular. Benefit packages and equity-building both came up in consultations.

“Make it possible for emerging businesses and organizations to reduce costs, and benefit from the synergy potential of shared values and space.”

“I imagine a facility that serves the public as well as the businesses and organizations that may be tenants.”

“I knew someone - a filing box in her car was her office... These are the challenges of a small organization...”

“We need to provide space that meets the needs of the people using the space... Not inferior space, quality space...”

“I would suggest that supporting small groups that have trouble covering office rent is one of most important roles of the building...”

“Social atmosphere, inspiring collaboration, community economic resilience, networking are all of prime importance.”

Study participants
Mandate: Recommendations
Central themes from surveys and consultations – as described above – suggest a core mandate that revolves around support for small social/environmental organizations, enterprises, entrepreneurs, artists and community groups through the design and creation of affordable, quality environments that facilitate work, innovation, creativity and collaboration. Functional, inspiring workspaces would be augmented by suitable services and programs. In the NCN study, 94% of respondents “cited affordable, stable office or program space as an overarching purpose” (page 6) and 90% had an additional programmatic theme, which covered a diverse range.

If we assume a concept that entails several centres, each centre in the network could have a different, complementary mandate and could approach the core mandate in a unique way. For example, rural areas might be home to small, flexible coworking/meeting spaces focused on community support and engagement. The centre might also be an incubator that acts as a broker to match existing facilities (from industrial kitchens to kilns to machine shops) with the needs of local entrepreneurs and artists. Our cities, on the other hand, could be home to larger multi-tenant facilities, some with a not-for-profit focus, others with a more eclectic, cross-sectoral, cross-community focus.

The mandate and consequently the other elements of each centre would be developed with local stakeholders/tenants and communities, reflecting their interests and requirements. Development would also attend to each centre’s connection to and place within the regional network.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Program</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Rent</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent stability, and stability of other costs</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality, healthy, and functional space</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable technology, programs, and services (through sharing)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration between tenants, associates, and program and service providers</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming that facilitates creativity and innovation</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building services (such as housekeeping and building maintenance)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incubator programs</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of art computers and software</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of benefits packages and investments on behalf of CCID tenants and associates (health benefits, professional memberships, insurance)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/back end services (such as accounting)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to build equity</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development and risk management</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized equipment and technology (not computers and software)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized facilities (such as a recording studio)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question: There are a number of ways a Centre for Community Innovation and Design might achieve the goals listed above. Please indicate the importance of each of the following objectives from your own perspective, and - from your understanding - the perspective of other artists, nonprofits, community groups, charities, entrepreneurs, and small businesses. 35 respondents; shading represents relative weight.

The line splits the list in half and also separates items on the list that have greater differences (25%) between important and unimportant than those with a lesser differences (11% or less, the bottom half).
Tenants and tenancy

There is general agreement that the core intent of shared space facilities – at least in this Region – should be to support and enable the work of tenants and patrons (already established as enterprises with social or environmental focus or awareness). Reducing costs and enhancing capacities are two key aspects of this support – with the former pointed to as more important. (We also see the former as a contributor to the latter by ensuring that enterprises can focus on their main objective or mandate rather than spending their time scrounging for money and other resources.)

This section provides rough profiles of the enterprises that responded to surveys and discusses tenant mix as well. The next section – Financial Considerations – discusses related results around respondent’s willingness and capacity to pay for space as well as other factors.

Tenant profiles

As noted in the section on methods above, invitations to participate in the study were broadly distributed across the Region. As intended – and as illustrated in Table 8 – respondents were small enterprises, averaging 3.4 workers. (We use “workers” to refer to all persons who work on a regular basis, including paid staff and/or volunteers; part-time and/or full-time. We also use “enterprise” as a generic term to refer to all types of organization, including not-for-profits, businesses, community groups or individual artists or entrepreneurs.) Tables 8 and 9 provide a bit more detail about the size and type of enterprises that responded to questions. (We note that these questions were only answered by slightly more than half of total respondents.) Not surprisingly, those enterprises with full-time workers were slightly bigger, averaging 5.3 workers (ranging from 1 to 20); those with part-time or mixed full/part-time ranged from 1 to 3 workers. The latter two types had an average of 0.6 and 1.7 full-time-equivalents, respectively. A few enterprises also had volunteers (variable numbers) that would need to use space frequently or occasionally. Four respondents described themselves as part of co-operatives or collaboratives where participants shared space, but these respondents provided little information on their size or membership.

Organizational type varied and included not-for profits, cooperatives, entrepreneurs, artists, businesses and advocacy organizations. Other respondents were part of community groups or looser affiliations without any formal incorporation status. Still others responded as individuals that were not necessarily associated with any particular group and might be considered community entrepreneurs – people who, through their work and/or personal interests, are committed to involvement in their community.

The main foci of respondents were, in order of frequency, environmental, social, art/culture and others (Table 9). Enterprise mandates or missions covered a wide range and included (but were not restricted to) renewable energy, sustainable design, education, creative expression, enabling independence among people with disabilities, providing/arranging housing and other basic needs, community development, leadership development, enterprise development, environmental awareness building and many others. Services and products included sculpture, paintings, prints, research, energy audits, consulting services of various types, education, Regional orientation to newcomers and many others.

Clients included seniors, refugees, environmentally aware consumers, environmentally unaware consumers, people with disabilities, people that feel marginalized within their communities, students, home-owners, small not-for-profits, large and small businesses and many more.

Few respondents provided information on the age and stage of development of their enterprise, but through

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Enterprise character: size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>working schedule of workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both full and part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Focus of enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arts and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the information that was provided, coupled with knowledge of responding enterprises, we can point to a significant range. Those interested ranged from well established organizations that have been involved in the Region for decades to new and emerging organizations, to enterprises that are little more than ideas in the minds of the entrepreneurs who see their potential.

In comments and discussions, participants pointed to challenges of being a small enterprise: finding sufficient funding/income and resources to make ends meet and to do the work they want to do; coping with the changing social and economic landscape; coping with feast-and-famine cycles; finding the right people to work and to help grow the enterprise; and, finally, coping with the loneliness and isolation of working alone. People also pointed to the creativity, energy and motivation of small enterprises that make them an important community/economic asset worth fostering. Artists noted that there was a lot of talk about live-work space but that none was available. Community groups spoke about the challenge of working without resources and the difficulty of finding (free) places to meet.

**Tenancy**

In surveys and consultation, three types of tenancy were described and discussed:

- tenants – who would lease a work area, with access to additional facilities and services
- associates – who would have a membership plan allowing use of some services such as a mailing address, telephone and storage, and occasional access to desk and/or meeting space
- community members – who would have occasional, as-needed access to meeting space, programs and/or services

As indicated in Table 10, respondents were interested in all three types. Multiple choices were allowed and half of the respondents chose more than one type; two thirds of these chose “tenant” and one or both of the others. Roughly one quarter of respondents also noted an interest in being partners – enterprises that would be involved in development or realization of the CCID in some way.

In providing reasons for their interest in being part of a CCID, two factors came up repeatedly in comments and discussions: First, is a need for permanent (long-term) space and, second, an interest in collaboration and the subsequent synergies that arise in working together. Respondents also mentioned the benefits of sharing costs and of having access to diverse spaces – for example, to have a regular studio workplace as well as meetings rooms for workshops or teaching on an as-needed basis. Participants also pointed favourably to the benefit of being able to socialize and exchange knowledge and ideas, and of working next to like-minded groups and individuals. There were also discussions about activities such as promoting groups, events and/or interests and issues as well as the potential benefits of working together to share best practices and expertise on such endeavours.

The first four of these were of particular interest to those who wanted to be tenants (i.e. as opposed to being associates or community members). Stability was also mentioned as an important factor drawing people toward being a tenant. As mentioned in the section on financial considerations, below, the possibility of being able to build equity (although not necessarily an option that would be available) was another reason. As well as permanency and stability, some saw being a tenant as a way to increase their public profile.

In choosing associate, respondents thought it would work well for part-time work or as a way to test whether or not the shared-space option was suitable for them. One respondent noted that they would need permanent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Tenancy Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses (some respondents chose more than one option)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Question:** We envision the center being a place where tenants lease or rent workspace. Those lease agreements include access to additional functional spaces and amenities (e.g. meeting space), and to a number of services and programs. We also think the centre might offer non tenant membership plans that would serve individuals or small organizations (which we are referring to as associates) that need a mailing address, telephone services, secure filing drawer, and occasional access to desk or meeting space. The centre could also offer space, programs, and services to the community at large through some sort of service and funding agreement. In light of the preceding paragraph, which suits you or your organization best? Being a tenant, associate, community member. (Multiple choice allowed.)
space in the future and would therefore want to be a tenant eventually, but that associate or community member could work in the interim.

In choosing community member, respondents saw benefit in having access to space for meetings, workshops and other kinds of events: “I’d love to be able to have bookable space for events/gatherings/meetings in a centre with such a reputation. It would be well loved and well used by folks like me.” The potential for building and enabling community partnerships was another reason provided.

Respondents choosing multiple tenancy types pointed to some degree of uncertainty with respect to what would be involved. For example: What are the roles, responsibilities and benefits of the different types? What might the costs of the different types be? What types of space would be available – and on what terms? How much influence over design details would be allowed? We expect that once a building model and concept were made clear, respondents would provide more definite responses. Other reasons for selecting multiple types include one respondent who noted that they liked the idea of a satellite office, but were not sure what tenancy type would be most appropriate and another respondent who said that it would “depend on who else was in the facility and whether there was a unifying concept”.

Tenant/patron mix
Equally important to the types of tenancy is the mix of tenants, associates and community members that are involved in any particular centre. In considering this mix, three considerations were seen as important by over 60% of respondents and unimportant by less than 30% (Table 11): knowledge sharing (78% as important), complementary services that offer a continuum of client services (66%) and informal support through collaborative arrangements (61%). At the other end of the spectrum, half of respondents saw two considerations to be unimportant: concern over competing for clients and funding (58%) and concern over blurring of organizational identity (48%). Somewhat to our surprise, compatible mandates and values was in the middle of the list, with 51%/34% split on important/unimportant (although 29% saw this as very important and only 7% as not at all important). Discussion around tenant mix received considerable attention in consultations and discussions and this question of compatible mandate and values received considerable attention. Many people pointed to the value of working alongside others who shared their values, mandate and interests. The potential for sharing knowledge and experience as well as the potential for mixing of client base were all considered attractive. For example, participants at one work-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question: Which of the following strike you as particularly important when considering other organizations you would consider working alongside?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 respondents; shading represents relative weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Preferences regarding tenant mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary services that offer a continuum of client services</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal support through collaborative arrangements</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatible mandates and values</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over competing for clients and funding</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort or tensions between clients or patrons, and/or staff from different organizations</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over blurring of organizational identity</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
shop that were already familiar with each other were excited by the idea of working within close range of each other, seeing the potential to draw on each others’ talent and expertise. For some, the benefit of sharing a ‘store-front’ location that would draw the public into the shared-space was seen as important and especially effective if tenants shared or held complementary values and mandates. Another participant who already works in a shared-space pointed to the benefit of having customers learn of their organization when coming in to visit another, complementary, organization. On the contrasting side, many pointed out that this benefit could be expanded by having a diverse mix of tenants – for example, that people coming to visit an arts enterprise may then learn more about an environmental enterprise, etc. A relevant finding from the NCN study was that “few Centres translate a broad thematic focus into a narrow mission or rigid guidelines for tenant selection... nearly all represent a mixture of agency foci” (page 5).

Many also pointed to the benefits of working in a place with a diverse mix of people and interests; factors that lead to creative synergy and that “buzz”. Benefits were seen to arise from mixing artists and art enterprises with other types, from mixing businesses and not-for-profits, and from mixing environmental groups focusing on green practices, with others that were not necessarily so environmentally focused. This is consistent with the Artscape Kitchener study, which states that “For individual artists... synergy with a variety of commercial and not-for-profit uses (e.g. galleries, creative sector enterprises and arts-based retail) was also identified as being attractive” (page 30).

Discussion in the literature points to potential challenges over competition for clients and funding; however, this item was not seen as particularly important by respondents/participants. Concern over competing for clients and funding was the item seen to be least important, with 29% of respondents seeing it as not at all important. One participant even noted that they could “see cooperation being more important than competition in how potential tenants would get along”.

Another participant introduced the notion of co-opetition as a merging of co-operation and competition, ideally as a positive feature. From the literature, we also draw attention to concerns over competition between tenants and the CCID owner/governing body, which is discussed below.

Compatibility among the sizes of enterprises is another topic raised in the literature – particularly around the notion of anchor tenants, which was discussed a bit above, but also more generally. As typically applied, for example regarding development of malls, anchor tenant refers to a large department or grocery store that will bring patrons to the mall thereby providing a stable and significant rental return for the development owners – and benefits to other smaller tenants. For shared space facilities, anchor tenants are usually not recommended. There is a particular concern that their identity and norms would overwhelm other enterprises – although this is not always the case. Again, it may depend on other elements, a centre’s mandate in particular. There may also be options for thinking about anchor tenants in ways that would be more suitable for considering appropriate tenant mixes in the types of shared space centres being considered here (i.e. as opposed to a mall development). For example, one respondent (noted above) pointed to their potential value in alternative developments. The example used was Gen-X video store in Waterloo, which “reliably brings 50,000 people through their door every year” and has a stabilizing effect on the small development that it is part of. Another participant mentioned a shared space facility that had operated in London (over a decade ago). It had a coffee shop that not only provided for tenants in the centre, but also brought income to the centre as a popular venue for...
many others that otherwise had nothing to do with the centre.
Data collected in the NCN study “highlights that Multi-tenant Nonprofit Centers are truly mixed-use, and that tenants often include commercial retail, private sector offices, and government agencies” (page 15)

**Tenants and tenancy: Recommendations**

We envision centres offering a diversity of tenancy types – including tenant, associate and community member – as suitable for the diversity of small enterprises of various different types and focus that exist in Waterloo Region. This could include membership across centres (i.e. for the network as a whole). Access to resources in all centres would enhance the value of membership and could enable and enhance the potential for collaboration even in those centres that are smaller, with fewer members. For example, tenants or associates from a small centre might participate in events or make use of services provided at larger centres. Sharing in this way could also lead to less duplication of services and amenities.

Low cost, healthy, quality work spaces with appropriate services and amenities are important and should be planned with the input from those interested. Fitting with the notion of multiple centres across the Region, attention to local interests could readily address the diverse interests. For example, with shared memberships, development of specialized facilities in particular locations due to local interest, could benefit others with similarly specialized needs. Tenant mix in each of the centres and their mandates and context would obviously intertwine – with consideration given to the potentially challenging relationships among tenants that are identified by other shared-space initiatives. The CCID would acknowledge complementarity and differences among tenants, while still trying to be inclusive.

**Financial considerations**

As noted above, lower rents and the reduction of other costs are identified as key reasons for interest in shared-space initiatives. In the NCN study, half of the centres have policies to keep rents lower than market rate. Rents of respondents in that study were 33% lower, on average, and as much as 75% lower (page 19). It is surprising to learn from the CSI that, on average, tenants have seen an increase in costs – until understanding why: For some tenants, office costs have been reduced, but many tenants moved to the CSI from free space (home-offices or doing the coffee-shop rounds). Despite the increase in costs, however, people continue as members of the CSI because of the energy and atmosphere. It is telling that an online video depicting some of the benefits of being part of the CSI is titled “Thank God it’s Monday”. It is also important to recognize that shared-space facilities can make office space more affordable, even if it is more costly. Because resources are shared, there can be a lower minimum cost than would be incurred for renting a full office. This makes renting work-space possible for some that would otherwise find it impossible. For example, many people will work in a home office because they cannot afford to support an office on their own. They might, however, be able to afford to rent a desk (with basic services) – and be quite happy doing so. Along similar lines, initial capital and other expenses can be a barrier for start-up and growing enterprises. A shared space centre can provide a way around the need for this initial outlay.

This section covers results from the surveys on willingness and capacity to pay for space as well as some additional discussion from the literature on broader financial considerations.

**Willingness and capacity to pay**

Tables 12, 13 and 14 present results from a few survey questions about willingness and capacity to pay for space. While the number of respondents to these questions is quite small, the results present relevant insights for considering financial matters.

In total, 28 respondents provided information about their willingness to pay for space. To compare results, the amounts were normalized to $/month/worker. Since two respondents interested in sharing the shared space (e.g. a cooperative wanting to share a studio amongst their members) did not provide enough information to calculate this amount, they are not included in Table 12.
Some other respondents (especially those who felt they lacked the capacity to pay anything) provided only comments, which are discussed below.

Respondents noted a willingness to pay that ranged from an average of $188 to $359 per worker per month, with the full range covering quite a span – from $25 to $800/worker/month. Tables 12 and 13 show the results categorized according to size and tenancy-type, respectively. As expected, ‘larger’ enterprises (although still small, averaging seven workers), were willing to pay less per worker per month than smaller enterprises. As indicated in Table 12, they were willing to pay a full third less at $138-$230/person/month – whereas those with 2 workers or less were willing to pay $265-$385. Those with part-time workers were willing to pay roughly the same, although the range was much greater. Some of the variety may arise from different expectations relevant to where respondents are located. For example, office rents in Waterloo are much higher than Kitchener.

Table 13 shows willingness to pay by the type of tenancy respondents were interested in. As expected, the average and range for those interested in being an associate was less than for those interested in being a tenant. The top of the range for community member (and subsequently, the high average) suggests to us a lack of understanding with respect to the description of community member rather than suggesting that community members might expect to pay more. (See description in preceding section).

There was insufficient data to make any assessments by location or by sector. However, results from the Artscape study suggest that artists were willing to pay roughly $400/month (and most wanted individual space, so this could be considered as $400/worker/month). This was also the amount paid by the handful of artists that already had space outside of their home (page 33). While their results suggest that artists are willing to pay considerably more than others, it is worth noting that the Artscape study was carried out prior to the recent economic downturn and so may reflect a more positive economic outlook – although real estate and rents in Kitchener have not changed dramatically between the Artscape study and this study.

Table 14 presents results of a question about capacity to pay, which asked people how secure they felt about being able to pay what they were willing to pay. Just over half of those responding said “yes” (Table 14), a few more said “reasonably”, and others noted increasing amounts of uncertainty, explaining that they were “hopeful” or that their ability to pay depended on market conditions, funding options or other factors. It might be expected that the ‘larger’ enterprises, with full-time workers, would be more secure regarding their capacity to pay. As shown in Table 14, however, over half of respondents answered ‘yes’ in all enterprise size/types except one. In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>worker schedule/size</th>
<th>average low end $/mo/worker</th>
<th>average high end $/mo/worker</th>
<th>full range $/mo/worker</th>
<th>responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full-time; more than 2 workers (avg:7.1)</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$80 - $343</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time; 1-2 workers</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$150 - $500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part- and full-time workers</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$200 - $467</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time workers</td>
<td>$199</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>$25 - $800</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$25 - $800</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all small (1-2 workers)</td>
<td>$213</td>
<td>$359</td>
<td>$25 - $800</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared</td>
<td>cannot compare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>potential lease/membership type</th>
<th>average low end $/mo/worker</th>
<th>average high end $/mo/worker</th>
<th>full range $/mo/worker</th>
<th>responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tenant</td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$324</td>
<td>$80 - $800</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associate</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$50 - $200</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community member</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>$25 - $500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>$188</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$25 - $800</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question: If you had an opportunity to lease in your preferred model, how much would you be willing to pay each month (not including services and programs)? Feel free to list a range if that would be more appropriate.

Survey Question: If you had an opportunity to lease in your preferred model, how much would you be willing to pay each month (not including services and programs)? Feel free to list a range if that would be more appropriate.
the category of mixed part/full-time workers, none of the five respondents said ‘yes’ and only one felt ‘reasonably’ secure about their capacity to pay. Admittedly, the number of responses in all categories are small.

As mentioned above, several respondents provided only comments, noting that resources were scarce or non-existent. Discussion in consultations and workshops raised concerns around small organizations and community groups that would be unable to cover even small user fees. Participants felt it was important for the CCID to provide opportunities for the inclusion of such groups. Such a consideration is not uncommon: half of the centres in the NCN study had a policy formalizing their commitment to ensuring space remains affordable.

Although few responded to survey questions about their current arrangements, the topic was often covered in consultations. Several explained that they currently had a shared-space arrangement – most commonly a small (1-2 person) not-for-profit that had a small office within that of a larger not-for-profit, social enterprise or corporation. In some cases, these were more or less permanent arrangements, but in other cases the smaller tenants were filling space that the larger organization expected to take over as the enterprise expanded and grew. Such arrangements were viewed as beneficial since they typically involved rent that was substantially below market rate. However, in addition to impermanency, the other drawback was a concern around loss of identity.

Participants were also asked about user fees for the use of facilities, services or programs. Many saw fees as a reasonable way to deal with the variable need/interest in use of programs and services. These are discussed more in the relevant sections below.

As another financial consideration, some saw appeal in being able to build equity in the centre, perhaps through cooperative ownership or some other type of arrangement. Some definitely considered this to be an appealing option, although others felt this was well beyond the possible, let alone beyond their budget.

Other financial considerations
While it does not relate directly to the potentials that exist here in Waterloo Region, results from the NCN study are informative with respect to potential viability. They note that 80% of the centres in their study were operating at full capacity. Of these, half have waiting lists. Only three have vacancy rates over 25% (page 16).

As discussed further in the section below on ownership and governance, most of the centres in the NCN study are owned by not-for-profits. While this initially seems a good fit, the study points out that this may not be the best option as it may restrict access to financing options such as tax credits and loans. By the same token, other ownership options will also impact financing and funding opportunities.

Centers in that study had a range of development costs: 13% spent $500,000 (US) or less, 16% spent over $15 million (US), the rest ranged in between. There was no clear pattern due to such variations as real estate and construction costs as well as the amount of in-kind or donated resources. Sources of project financing also covered a considerable range, including (in order of importance) capital campaigns, individual donors, organizational endowments and other assets, traditional bank loans and many others (page 11). Although there were few patterns, there was consistency in that centres relied on diverse funding sources. For example, the most significant source, capital campaigns, still only provided an average of 58% of financing and was used by only 39% of centres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>worker schedule/size type</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>reasonably</th>
<th>hopefully</th>
<th>it depends</th>
<th>not sure</th>
<th>total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full-time; more than 2 workers (avg:7.1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>full-time; 1-2 workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part- and full-time workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-time workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all small (1-2 workers)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question: “Do you consider your capacity to cover this amount to be reasonably secure?”

Column headings categorize responses to open-ended question.

Table 14. Sense of security regarding capacity to pay
The study also raises the important point that “financing does not end when the doors of the centre open” (page 13).

The NCN study did not gather sufficient information to analyze operating costs, since there was insufficient detail to understand the range of services, programs and facilities that might be covered in these costs, thus making it impossible to compare the costs across centres. What can be said is that many centres were able to cover these costs through rent. When debt servicing is added in with operating costs, however, only half of the centres were able to cover the costs. Perhaps not surprisingly, those able to cover the latter costs tended to be those with a higher number of tenants and slightly higher rents – ten of the fifteen had over sixteen tenants and ten charged rent of $10 (US)/square foot or more. Of the centres that were not able to cover the combined operating and debt servicing costs, ten of sixteen had less than ten tenants and nine charged less than $10/square foot (page 14).

As another example, the CSI began with a benefactor or angel investor and the volunteer efforts of the start-up director. It was a few years before the centre broke even. They now recover basic costs through revenues from rent and the provision of telephone service. Additional funding from grants and foundations provides for enhanced services and amenities.

Two other points made in the NCN study are of note – even though they caution that the data is inconclusive. One is that “centres with mixed-use functions that include housing and other community facilities are more likely to rely on other funding sources to cover operating costs” (page 14). The other, is to note a range of other sources of income, including special event fundraising, revenue from parking and room rental, in-kind contributions, individual donations and government and foundation grants (page 14). The study also draws specific attention to centres that are created and operated by foundations, which tend to charge lower rents, including one centre that does not charge any rents. Further research or updates of this information could be beneficial with respect to development of a centre in this Region.

Financial Considerations: Recommendations
Securing the financial sustainability of the CCID requires further exploration – especially with respect to the different models that might arise in different locations and given that low cost and stability were two key interests of potential tenants and associates. Larger centres may be able to generate sufficient revenue. Smaller centres or centres with an incubator mandate are less likely to be able to generate sufficient revenues through rent because they are, after all, focused on start-ups. Additionally, with the noted concerns around the potential for involvement of small enterprises, volunteer organizations and community groups, consideration must be given to finding alternative revenue streams.

We cannot stress enough that the CCID, to be successful, needs to be financially solvent. We know of a small number of centres that have collapsed since we started this study. One observer suggested that financial challenges need to be aired, and that a motto of “spend money like you don’t have it” will increase the likelihood of sustainability. We would expect that the centers themselves would be not-for-profit entities; however, reasons for considering otherwise have been described above. Sustainability, in terms of remaining relevant and in terms of maintaining sufficient revenue flows, is pivotal.

“There needs to be some sort of time frame for subsidizing space for up-and-coming groups/enterprises/organizations...”

“It’s a concern that small organizations wouldn’t be able to afford to be there. There needs to be some sort of time frame for space that is subsidized for up-and-coming groups/enterprises/organizations.”

“I’m an artist, there’s not a lot of money available...”

“We need help for sustainability”

Beth: “What do you think would be most important as a potential tenant trying to consider whether or not to become part of a centre...?”

Everyone: “Cost.”

Survey: “Will your capacity to cover a lease remain reasonably secure?”

Respondent: “Hopefully. – I would like to say yes...”

Study participants
Effective shared-space facilities are more than just well-designed spaces. To fully support tenants, associates, community members and other users, they also have to provide services and programs in keeping with their mandates. The NCN study covered a fair bit of detail with respect to the services and programs offered by respondents. While the results are not drawn upon to any great degree in this section, they could be beneficial in the more detailed planning of services and programs. To learn about what services and programs were of most interest to enterprises in this Region, surveys, consultations and workshops covered these facets as well.

Services

Table 15 presents service preferences, ordered by how frequent and essential respondents would consider services provided by a centre to be. Most respondents saw basic office services as most essential: physical mailing address (71%), computer support (64%), reception (79%) and technical support (59%). Marketing and fundraising were also seen as essential by over half of respondents (59% and 57%, respectively). Financial administration was seen as essential and not essential by roughly the same number of respondents (32% and 27%, respectively), although in workshops there was usually a general nod of agreement regarding its importance. Other services such as day-care and legal services were seen as essential by few respondents, although people discussed the value of being able to access these services when necessary. The only item that more respondents (many more) saw as non-essential than essential was other human resource services (employee relations, performance reviews), where 43% saw this as non-essential and only 5% as essential. Legal services was the only item seen to be more infrequently essential than frequently essential – although the difference was small.

While these results are not directly comparable with those from the Artscape study, there are similarities. In that study, 67% of individual artists saw “shared copiers, fax, etc.” and 53%, saw “broadband internet” as important. Daycare was only seen as important by 23% (page 30).

As with other sections of the survey, items on the list were known to be important based on the literature, so it is not surprising that these services and programs are generally preferred. That some services had a mixed reception can likely be explained by the variation among enterprise size and type. For example, larger, more established enterprises could be expected to have financial systems and human resources already in place, whereas smaller, newer enterprises may be looking for financial services and may consider themselves too small to need human resource services. In consultations and workshop discussions, the provision of such ‘back-end’ administrative/office services was often raised as a potential benefit of belonging to such centres. For small enterprises and entrepreneurs, these – as well as the simple fact of having a permanent mailing address – were seen as benefits.

In another question, respondents were asked about retail services and ranked the suggestions as: café/res (40%) and coffee shop (16%). These preferences are lower than

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Essential/Frequent</th>
<th>Essential/Infrequent</th>
<th>Not essential/Infrequent</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical mailing address</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer support services</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support services</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial administration (bookkeeping, accounting)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail room services</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Day Care/Nursing</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Human Resource Services (such as Performance, Employee Relations)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question: Please complete the following table with regards to your potential use of services that could be associated with a centre.
37 respondents; shading represents relative weight.
those among individual artists in the Artscape study, where 66% and 34%, respectively, saw a cafe or restaurant as important (page 30).

One respondent in our study suggested a store to sell artists work as well as a demonstration area that would allow the public to try out different creative media. Access to a shared car/truck/van was also mentioned by one respondent as a valuable service.

Respondents were also asked what kind of payment agreements they would like to see with respect to services, most particularly, which services they would like to see included in a lease agreement versus those they would prefer to contract on a pay-per-use basis. There were too few respondents to make any assessments in this regard. As with some other questions, we expect that once a context or situation is defined – for example, a particular location and mandate – respondents will be more willing to reply to these types of questions. In comments and discussions, the key concern raised was around paying for services that were unwanted or would only be used infrequently. As one respondent noted “Flexibility is key. I imagine everyone’s needs and what they are willing to pay for will be all over the map.”

In developing services and service models for particular locations, participants noted that it would be important to integrate the client or customer into the model – perhaps having them involved in development – for those organizations that offer services directly to clients or that deal with confidential information.

Programs
In addition to administration and office services, some tenants might be interested in programs that address enterprise development or learning needs. Given the potential goals of the CCID listed in this report, incubator type programs could well be within the CCID’s mandate. We know from other studies that such programs will interest some and not others. For example, new projects, new groups and emerging businesses might want to enlist in incubator programs, while mature not-for-profits would not. As with services, questions are raised regarding how these programs are packaged, delivered and paid-for. To assess preferences in this Region, respondents were asked about their interests with respect to programs identified through our literature review.

As shown by Table 16, respondent preferences were much more mixed regarding their program preferences than those for services, as discussed above. (As a simple indicator, the shading of cells in the table indicates the strength of response. Table 16 is one of few tables where the shading reflects a more disorganized pattern.) Roughly half of respondents (or more) preferred expert/mentorship networks (65%), skill/knowledge workshops and courses (47%) and events to facilitate networking and collaboration (47%). However, many of these respondents saw them as only moderately preferred.

We draw particular attention to the lukewarm interest in programs that facilitate network and collaboration. In consultations with experienced shared-space managers/participants and in our literature research, these activities were pointed to as critical for harnessing the collaborative, creative potential that is one of the core reasons for the success of shared-space centres – and what makes them uniquely different from commercially available shared offices. In the NCN study, they did not ask questions to gather in-depth information around collaboration; however, they reported that “nearly three-quarters of respondents took the time to give examples of ways that their Center has enhanced collaboration among tenants” and go on to provide a sampling of ideas (page 21) that reflect “an extraordinary scope and creativity” (page 22). They do note that 29% of respondents require tenants to collaborate with each other as a condition of tenancy. To

“Innovation, creativity, collaboration, and engagement should not be restricted to one or two organization or people but involve as many people would have some relationship to the issue.”

“I think a key element would be to create common spaces that people will really want to spend time in. Like a good cafe or bar, where people come just to be there.

“Expand beyond just non-profit centre, include grassroots groups, artists, entrepreneurs - it’s the synergy that leads to things happening...”

“I think more community engagement would be needed; increase the ability to increase community economic development and the need for learning to be increased in all areas.”

Study participants
us, this seems a surprisingly directive policy.

On a more informal level, the example most frequently mentioned by members of the CSI is “Salad Club” (now also being referred to as Open Salad)[41] – where anyone who wants to participate brings salad ingredients on the specified day (Thursdays). With the ingredients laid out as one long salad bar, participants are provided with a yummy, unpredictable lunch and an opportunity for socializing, networking and sharing. Those at the CSI suggest that such events are essential for fostering collaboration and for generating the “buzz” – that all-important ingredient contributing to the Centre’s success. Reports do suggest that “interventions” in aid of collaboration or interaction be unobtrusive and gentle.

Two programs – incubator-type programs and conflict resolution training/support – had more respondents mark them as less/not preferred (31% each) than moderately/prefereed (11% and 21%, respectively). However, incubator-type programs and support were mentioned a number of times in consultations, especially for entrepreneurs and innovators, and especially in rural communities. Additionally, we did not reach a great number of social entrepreneurs in the start-up stages of their enterprises who would likely have greater interest in such programs. Other programs, such as board development, organizational capacity building, business and strategic planning, and public relations and marketing were roughly equally preferred and not preferred with the differences between them under 15%. These program options also had up to 58% non-answers.

Preferences around programming are not especially consistent, then. Given the diversity of groups that participated in the study, we think this is not surprising. For example, while organizational capacity building and board development (seen as equally preferred/not preferred) may be beneficial for well-established groups, such groups are less likely to be interested in such programs than smaller, emerging groups. On the other hand most any organization would see the potential to benefit from expert networks and skill/knowledge, which have large differences between the greater and lesser preferences.

In comments and discussion, participants raised a few concerns. Foremost was around cost – with two key questions. One, was whether or not programs would be affordable, the other was a concern that, if programs were an integral part of the centre, tenants or associates might have to pay for programs through lease agreements that they did not want to participate in or would only find occasionally beneficial. Another comment was that interest in the programs would depend on the calibre or expertise of those offering them. One respondent also noted that it might depend on the “constellation of tenants” that was involved. Another noted that reliance on the CCID for the provision of services could end in dependencies that would be harmful if association with the

Table 16. Program preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Description</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>Moderately Preferred</th>
<th>Less Preferred</th>
<th>Not Preferred</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert/mentorship networks</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and knowledge workshops and courses (based on tenant interests)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board development</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events to facilitate networking and collaboration within the CCID</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations and marketing</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational capacity building</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and strategic planning</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incubator type programs</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch bag sessions (learning and education)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution training/support</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question: Please indicate which of the following programs are important to you or your organization. 38 responses; shading represents relative weight

[41] http://socialinnovation.ca/search/node/salad
centre were lost. A final concern was around how space and programs come together: that programs should suit spaces and that spaces would have to allow and enable programs, ensuring that such activities would not be disruptive of other uses.

Among participants there were also those interested in offering programs through partnerships or other arrangements. Capacity Waterloo Region was particularly interested, seeing a potential match between their interest in offering programs and the potential space offered by the CCID. Some mentioned the potential for bartering services – for example Students Offering Support raised the question of tenants offering services to other members and spoke of providing technical support – perhaps through a barter arrangement. Some survey respondents also pointed to the possibility of offering programs or services, although it was noted that this would depend on interests and on their own capacity to provide such support.

Services and Programs: Recommendations

There is quite a range of needs and interests, which is reflected in the results relevant to services and programs. Hardly surprising, given the diversity of individuals and enterprises that participated in this study. These results suggest that basic office/administrative services (reception, computer support, etc.) should be provided by all centres and could be included in the costing of tenancy/membership. This would be consistent with results from the NCN study, which notes that “MTNCs typically provide Internet, meeting space and other services and features not covered in standard commercial leases” (NCN 2004: 20). Other services and programs, however, should likely be provided on an as-needed/as-preferred basis and might best be designed to reflect mandates of the different centres and the needs and interests of their tenants/members. Services and programs that are included in lease or membership arrangements vs. those that are additional could also vary among different locations according to tenant or patron requirements. For example, support of entrepreneurs in rural communities has been mentioned. A centre with such a mandate would be expected to offer relevant services and programs (such as incubator type programs) – and to include them as an integral part of their membership.

To ensure that relevant, quality programs and services were offered, the CCID could build partnerships with local organizations or businesses able to offer the desired programs and services. Where not included in lease agreements, these could be offered through separate agreements or user fees on a case by case basis. Given concerns around quality and relevance and a concern over getting tied into using specific providers, the CCID might offer a number of providers, leaving patrons to arrange services/programs on their own. This might be especially helpful with respect to services such as legal counsel, where needs may differ considerably among tenants/associates. It would be especially beneficial if some sort of vetted list or a list accompanied by a rating system (respectful of both clients and providers) was maintained for the use of CCID patrons.

Experience from other centres, the CSI in particular, suggest that informally engaging tenants/members of a centre through various events is essential to creating synergies, and fostering collaboration and innovation. One caution is that participation should never be mandated, but rather voluntary and approached gently, and never in ways that make the participant or non-participant feel awkward.

“There is always this struggle to get the services required ie phone, internet, etc.”

“Access to shared resources which may not be available to small organizations like meeting rooms, equipment access, reception and phone support, transportation, marketing clout...”

“All of the above [services and programs] depend on the constellation of tenants and the calibre of the joint initiatives.”

“Flexibility is key. I imagine everyone’s needs and what they are willing to pay for will be all over the map.”

“Ideally there would be some management staff that could facilitate the integration required and manage the shared space without too much involvement (but always the broad consent) of the tenants.”

Study participants
**Space and Facilities**

The design of a shared space is critical for providing an inspiring, healthy workplace and in facilitating collaboration, creativity and innovation among tenants and patrons. Functional work areas are not only tailored to meet the needs of tenants and members, but are also designed to be flexible. In addition to work areas, shared-space facilities typically have a variety of spaces that facilitate meeting and collaboration. Participants were asked questions in both regards.

**Workspaces**

Participants were asked about the kind of work area that would meet their requirements or be ideal for them: a fully serviced office, a desk or working surface and/or a well designed and functional studio. (Note that multiple choices were allowed.) Results – presented in Table 17 – indicate that the number of respondents choosing each of these as meeting requirements (at least) were fairly even: 60% for an office, 51% for a desk surface and 46% for a studio. However, there was a bit more variation regarding what was ideal, where the office and studio were most preferred at 41% and 38%, respectively, and a desk at only 22%.

As noted in the section on tenants/tenancy, not everyone identified their enterprise size, type or focus; however, to the degree that it was possible to draw connections, the correlations were not surprising. All respondents in the art/culture sector saw studios as most ideal, although some noted a desk or office as well; those in the environmental sector wanted an office or desk and not a studio; and those in the social sector had mixed preferences, with respondents pointing to each of the categories as well as combinations. Results for the art/culture sector match findings in the Artscape study, where 80% of individual artists saw studio space as important – and 74% saw live-work space as most important (page 30). In contrast, only 7% of their organizational respondents wanted individual artist studios and 69% wanted “administrative space (e.g. offices, reception)” (page 31).

Most of the respondents in our study who had at least some full-time staff pointed to an office as ideal, with some noting other work-areas (a desk, studio or industrial kitchen) as also ideal. Of the three that didn’t, one pointed to a studio and two others – which were small (1 or 2 staff) – thought a desk would be most ideal. Of the five respondents identified as having part-time staff, one considered a studio to be most ideal, one a desk and the others pointed to a combination. There were also a couple of respondents that wanted to share work-areas, such as an artist’s cooperative that wanted to share studio space.

In addition to the respondent who wanted an industrial kitchen, another noted that a store-front would be preferred, primarily for the increased visibility – perceived as a benefit.

**Table 17. Workspace preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question: Please tell us to what extent the following work areas - and their associated use and scheduling approaches - suit you or your organization. 37 and 34 respondents; shading represents relative weight; multiple choices allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workspaces preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would more or less meet my requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased for my private use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared according to the lease; schedules arranged through the CCID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared according to the lease; schedules negotiated with other tenants/associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fully serviced office with workspaces or areas that suit specific requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A well designed and functional studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A desk or working surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
because of their mandate for increasing citizen awareness around environmental concerns.

Respondents were also asked about their preferences regarding private or shared use arrangements for all of these work areas (Table 17). There were no strong preferences and more people provided no answer than chose any of the three options. This differs from the results obtained by Artscape where there was a strong preference for private, secure workspace (82%) and only 40% would consider sharing among 2-3 people and 12% would consider fully communal, open workspace (page 33). In our study, with respect to scheduling all three types of work-area, the least preferred option (by at least 24%) was to negotiate scheduling of shared spaces with other tenants/associates, rather than scheduling through the CCID or having spaces leased for private use.

Other Spaces and Facilities
Surveys also contained a second space-related question asking about additional facilities that respondents saw as important (Table 18). A kitchen, small meeting rooms and storage space were considered essential by most respondents (65%, 60% and 53%, respectively). Many said they would be used frequently (65%, 56% and 53% respectively). A gallery/display area, reception area and studio space were also near the top of the list – and just over 40% said these would be used frequently.

Table 18. Additional functional area preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small meeting room (up to 20 people)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage space</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display area</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception area</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio space</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large meeting rooms (up to 50) - multi-purpose event space (receptions, workshops, seminars)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multispace performance space</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading areas</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal space</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival space</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference room (up to 200)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers &amp; changing rooms</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture hall</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise room/gym</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nap room (for young children)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining room</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquet facilities</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question: Please complete the following table, which lists spaces that may be additional to your basic desk/workspace. 43 respondents; shading represents relative weight.
Survey results are consistent with discussion in consultations and workshops where the kitchen was often mentioned as an important socializing space – as well as an important functional space. Meeting space also came up often – especially for community and community-oriented groups and organizations. Community meeting space and performance space were seen as important by 50% of individual artists in the Artscape study (page 30) and “conference room/meeting room” were seen as a priority by 69% of their organizational respondents (page 30). A variation on meeting space raised in workshops and by one respondent was the need for small, confidential meeting areas to meet with clients. Storage space was also mentioned by community groups as well as others. Some pointed to record-keeping requirements as a challenge with a very small office. Interestingly, in the Artscape study, only 27% saw additional storage space as a priority (page 32).

Among artists and artist groups, access to gallery space across the Region was seen as a benefit. This is similar to the Artscape study, where 80% of their individual artist respondents and 53% of their organizational respondents saw gallery/exhibition space as important. A point raised by the NCN study was that “six of the eleven MTNCs providing performance, gallery or rehearsal space are NOT arts focused” (page 15).

Other facilities or spaces (large meeting rooms, performance space, classrooms, reading areas and others) had mixed preferences – and a considerable amount of ambivalence: many respondents were ‘uncertain’ or provided no answer. A library was the facility seen as most non-essential and only had 2% marking it as essential. Interestingly, over one third of the centres in the NCN study had libraries and many of these were open to the public. The lack of interest shown in our results may arise from a couple of things – in particular, even over the five years since the NCN study, internet use has continued to increase and may be seen as a better – and less expensive – resource than a library. Reflecting emphasis on tenants/associates noted above, a library may be seen as of greater value to the public than tenants – especially in a multi-sectoral environment.

One respondent, however, noted that it would be beneficial to have access to newspapers and relevant magazines. Parking is a ‘facility’ that some added to our list. A couple of enterprises in particular pointed to the need for parking – especially parking that was close to the building and its storage and other facilities. In the Artscape study, 58% of respondents said they “need to have” parking and only 18% saw it as not important (page 32).

In another survey question with minimal responses, very few people pointed to the need for special facilities or technologies such as darkrooms, recording suites, high-load-bearing floors or others. This could primarily result from who we talked with – namely that it did not include a lot of artists or others with specialized needs. Although these responses are similar to the Artscape study, where a metal/wood shop, with 24% of respondents seeing this as a priority – was the only special facility ranked as important by more than 20% of respondents and many were seen as important by less than 10%. An additional point is to draw attention to the discussion around the model of the centre in the first section on location. Since specialized facilities exist, it may make more sense to provide a brokering function rather than to build specialized facilities anew.

When asked about their concerns around space, people primarily pointed to concerns around having incompatible uses in close proximity, such as noisy common areas close to office space or painting studios that could negatively impact the health of others working nearby. Scheduling

---

“The atmosphere is important. We can’t forever work in a hole in the wall or tucked in a corner...”

“The other space required is “community” space - shared space where people can easily have ad-hoc meetings or mini-events and a great “thinking” space when you need new inputs or new stimuli.”

“[The kitchen at the collocation facility] is always busy; it’s very social - everyone needs to eat...”

“It was the loss, not only of space, but of the networking that went with it...”

“Rural groups at one time had access to space or storage space but not now... Things end up in homes but when that person moves on it becomes a problem.”

“I would be concerned about the personalization of space...”

“Would the space have rooms for confidential meetings with clients etc.? “

“I’d love to be able to have bookable space for events/gatherings/meetings in a centre with such a reputation. It would be well loved and well used by folks like me.”

Study respondents
was also noted as a potential concern – with respect to workspace and other facilities such as meeting rooms and display areas. Finally, personalization of space was raised: to what degree would patrons be able to decorate or modify personal spaces and would there be formal guidelines identifying options or “prescriptive covenants about use, schedules, decorations, etc.”.

From the experience of others, we believe that the challenges of working in shared spaces extend beyond these more obvious examples and will require careful design and membership considerations to make centres successful.

**Design of interior and exterior space**

Careful design is not only a consideration that can aid in preventing disbenefits, but can aid in gaining the positive benefits of shared space. Tonya Surman, from the CSI, points to a set of design principles that she sees as critical to the success of the Centre. These include openness, transparency (i.e. windows instead of walls), good circulation (i.e. enabling people to move easily through the facility), and flexibility.

A few survey questions asked for comment on design, and the interior and exterior of the centre; however, they were only asked online and were not required, so few responded. These topics came up for discussion occasionally in consultations and workshops. Following are some of the ideas and issues that were raised.

Suggested design principles included accessibility, flexibility, clean lines, openness, modern, simple, movement, creative, funky and interesting. People noted a concern about the environmental quality of the interior and suggested natural light, natural materials (i.e. no carpets, plastics, etc.), windows that are visible from work areas and sound attenuation or barriers where necessary. Some of these correlate with suggestions from those who promoted green building design and the use of green and locally sourced materials and furnishings. Other ideas were to build creative walls where people could play with ideas or display works of art and also to ensure that there is display space to promote activities.

In the Artscape study, 80% of respondents pointed to natural light as important – far more than any of the other “space characteristics” that were identified. The next most important were high ceilings (45%), special ventilation (37%) and soundproofing (37%) and others, such as high load-bearing floors and special wiring were ranked as important by less than 10% (page 32).

Regarding the building exterior and its connections with the neighbourhood, people thought it would be important to have a street-level presence. A few different considerations were suggested. First was to have a storefront so that centers could increase their visibility from the street. Second was to have outdoor areas (which might also be accessible to the public) and which could include a courtyard or patio, with picnic tables as well as some greenspace. A green roof was also suggested. As mentioned earlier, some also saw parking as an important exterior amenity. In addition to these features of the centre’s design, people also pointed to amenities they thought would be important to have close by (i.e. within easy walking distance). Suggestions included cafes and/or restaurants, basic services (such as banks, post office) and an office supply store – as well as being close to a creative cluster.

In the CSI report, restaurants, followed by office services were considered the most important local amenities (over recreation facilities, daycare and off-site meeting options). Neighbourhood character and public accessibility were seen as equally and most important aspects of the surrounding community (page 14-15).

**Space and Facilities: Recommendations**

We envision each centre of the CCID as a well-designed space conducive to supporting its mandate and the creative potential of tenants and patrons by providing various types of healthy and
functional work areas, including private offices, hot desks and/or studios, as well as common spaces such as kitchens/eating areas, meeting space, and public access to a reception area or gallery. Each centre might also offer additional facilities according to its mandate and to support accessibility to others within the network. For example, an industrial kitchen, dining room, and performance space may exist in particular centres and be used by tenants/members of other centres. Developing a brokering service and building an asset map of these kinds of facilities may increase access to specialized facilities for the tenants/members and also heighten awareness of such resources within the community.

Ownership, governance and management
There are a number of possible ownership options, including third-party owner, owner-operator and co-operative or condominium ownership. There were few responses to the question on this topic, with preferences for all but condominium ownership selected. In comments and discussion, some pointed to the benefit of being able to build equity, others to concerns around permanency, incompatible values of third-party owners, complications of co-operative ownership and control or take-overs by owner-operators. Some of the literature emphasizes that ownership – and especially the governance and management structures that go with it – need to be dedicated to or have as their sole responsibility the provision of space, services and programs as mandated by the centre. Tenants that are also owners or managers (especially sole owners/managers rather than cooperative owners/managers) can easily give rise to tension and uncertainties. Organizations that have missions separate from or in addition to running a shared-space facility are at risk of compromising the quality of their work or the shared space. Based on her experience at the CSI, Tonya Surman is particularly emphatic about this point, suggesting that centres should have a third party (that is a social enterprise itself) that carries responsibility for running the centre. This is the model in action at the CSI.

In the NCN study, centres were more likely to have tenants on advisory boards than on Boards of Directors. Regarding the latter, half of the centres had no tenants on the board and only 6% were comprised of all tenants (and 10% noted the question as not applicable). Regarding advisory boards, 25% considered this question as not applicable and of those that did, one third were comprised entirely of tenants and somewhat more than one third had no tenants.

With respect to decision-making – and still with the NCN study – there was some variation regarding tenant involvement. For example, 58% of centres did not have tenants involved in day-to-day operations and 74% did not have tenants involved in determining rent and lease agreements. In both of these decision-making processes, only 13% had either some active tenants or all tenants involved. In contrast, 48% had some active tenants or all tenants involved in determining types/terms of services and only 25% has no tenants involved. We concur with the comment that “it is surprising that Centers seeking to improve accessibility, efficiency, and impact of clients do not work more regularly with tenant organizations on key management and decision-making issues” (page 20). Among smaller centres, there tended to be fewer formalized structures, but greater tenant involvement in informal decision-making. In the larger centres there were more formal structures and also more tenant involvement in those structures.

Most of the centres in the NCN study (22 of 38) were owned by not-for-profits, however, they noted that this “belies a diversity of non-profit ownership models” (page 10). These models included establishing a not-for-profit or charity to own and manage the centre, an existing not-for-profit/char-
ity developing its assets as a centre or taking on ownership of a new asset to be developed into a centre, and, finally, a joint ownership model involving more than one not-for-profit. Other ownership models, in order of frequency, were: leases (private, public or from other not-for-profits), foundation or sole proprietor, condominium, limited partnership and co-operative.

For a network or association of centres – as suggested for this Region – to be successful, there will need to be good governance, cooperation and contributions that support the network. Participants pointed to a range of challenges and opportunities. Collaboration was mentioned frequently – as both a challenge and an opportunity. The same was noted regarding community/stakeholder engagement and involvement. Regarding both of these facets, communication and the challenge of working together effectively when goals conflict were raised as key challenges. Some pointed specifically to potential challenges in developing and supporting connections and collaboration among businesses and not-for-profits. A few people thought that it would be a challenge to get a centre going – that it “will require new ways of working together” – but that once it is going it will be a “catalyst for future collaboration and innovation” and will provide many opportunities for small enterprises in the Region.

Ownership, Governance, Management: Recommendations

There is potential for different types of ownership – and different approaches to governance and management – to be suitable for different centres across the Region. We strongly recommend, however, that management should be the sole responsibility of an organization dedicated to the provision of space, programs and services that are mandated by each specific centre and the CCID itself. Creating and running a successful CCID is a full time, and involved job that has to stay attuned to relationships among tenants, ensure the provision of appropriate services, animate the community of tenants/members and maintain the building.
Imagining the future: The CCID concept

The emerging vision of the CCID is one of an association of shared-space centres across Waterloo Region; centres that operate interdependently and cooperatively to stimulate and support the work of small socially or environmentally oriented/responsible businesses, organizations, entrepreneurs, artists and community groups. The centres would have complementary mandates, would reflect patrons’ interests, and would offer spaces, services and programs suited to their locations, which would include both rural and urban communities.

This conception of the CCID – the Centres for Community Innovation and Design – draws upon the range of input we received in consultations and discussions with many people across the Region. People are enthusiastic about the shared-space idea and envision benefits for their enterprises and communities. There is considerable variety among the visions; among the interests and preferences of the people we spoke with and among the ways people thought such centres could contribute to communities across the Region. Rather than trying to develop a single centre that would try to address everything (at risk of doing nothing well), or to choose among the many visions or concepts, the innovative suggestion here is to establish a number of different centres across the Region. Each one would respond to particular/local interests and the group of them, working together, would cover the range and variety of interests across the sectors, organizational types and communities of the Region. They might include shared-spaces that already exist, retro-fitting of other spaces and/or the development of new spaces.

The following descriptions provide a mix of ideas and options that sketch out the possibilities.

Preliminary Principles, Sketch and Objectives

Given the notion of multiple interdependent centres, there would need to be a connecting vision, mandate and/or principles as well as some sort of governance mechanism to connect the centres and enable their strategic development and cooperation. We hold that this should be developed in a participatory manner involving those interested in the CCID. A list of principles and ideas to consider follows. Part 3 – A Framework for Development – provides additional discussion on some of these.

- Each centre would support the common principles and overarching vision of the CCID:
  - The vision could be something along the lines of: enabling entrepreneurs, artists and small enterprises and organizations (whether for-profit or not-for-profit) that are focused on social, environmental or artistic ends.
  - Operational principles would include such keywords as cross-sectoral collaboration and cooperation; creativity, innovation and experimentation; fair and respectful practice; complementarity;
  - Design principles would include such keywords as openness, movement, creative, innovative, green, healthy, inspiring
- Each centre would have its own mandate and/or programmatic theme and would offer space, resources, services and programs suited to its mandate. The mandate would reflect preferences, aspirations, and local realities. Centres would build and build-on local capacities.
- Each centre would be a grassroots initiative, yet its development and operation would be facilitated through interaction with other centres.
- There would be a strong investment in integration, in innovation, in making services and resources available across the network and in creating opportunities for cross-pollination and sharing of ideas.
- Each centre would offer spaces, services and programs to the patrons of other centres.
- There would be no overarching, controlling organizational body to dictate the mandate or direction of individual centres. Instead, governance would be performed by a collaborative, consensus-based association where the benefits and strengths of collaboration and of individuality would both be acknowledged. Committees or initiatives would deal with specific challenges and opportunities.
- Most centres would have a physical location – although some might achieve their mandate as a
virtual entity.

- Each centre would be well-designed and reflect its mandate, aiming to facilitate the creative potential of tenants and patrons by providing various types of healthy and functional work areas. Work areas include private offices, hot desks and/or studios, as well as common spaces such as kitchens/eating areas, meeting space, and public access to a reception area or gallery.
- Each centre might also offer additional/specialized facilities according to its mandate and in support of others within the network. For example, an industrial kitchen, dining room, and performance space may exist in particular centres and be used by tenants/members of other centres as well.
- Most centres would offer basic office facilities and services (mailing address, phone, printer, reception, computer support), which would likely be included with costs of tenancy/membership. Other services and programs would reflect the different mandates and tenant/member interests. Costs would likely be covered by a pay-for-service arrangement, although attending to the need and possibility of using sliding-scale fees.
- Partnerships with relevant organizations and businesses would facilitate the provision of programs and services.
- Centres would offer a mix of tenant/membership types. Membership at one centre would typically include access to centres across the Region.
- Tenant mix would be left to each centre to determine, and would reflect their mandates and locations. The CCID would acknowledge complementarity and differences, and aspire to be inclusive.
- Development of the CCID is expected to be an evolutionary, adaptive, organic and strategic process.

**Imagining the future: Centre scenarios**

As noted in the introduction, the following scenarios describe a mix of ideas and proposals of centres that could exist across the Region. Some of these are simple ideas behind which there is some enthusiasm. Although we have not developed them further and they currently lack champions, we consider them ideas worthy of documentation. Others are initiatives that are under development by their proponents. They represent ideas that have the backing or support of an enterprise or partnership of enterprises. Finally, we list some as proposals – ideas that we think have particular traction, based on our discussions and research. All of these are beginnings; ones that, with resources and capacity, could lead to the development of a CCID. They are roughly categorized by their location in the Region. The final section of this report – which describes a framework for development – highlights some of these as particularly ripe for development.

**Rural areas**

**Initiative: Education and Retail Centre for Sustainable Energy, Food and Health (Wellesley)**

“Upon renovation of this currently vacant historic mill in the centre of the community, the Mill will serve as a comprehensive retail, education and hands on experience facility as well as a networking hub for local grain growers and organic food producers.”


LOFT Market (Local Organic Food Team) and LIFE Co-op (Local Initiative for Future Energy) have received funding to do a feasibility study/business plan for development of the old mill in Wellesley. The initiative has a strong educational component, targeting students from local and other areas, aiming to provide learning opportunities around healthy, local food and renewable energies. Two aspects of the project suggest a strong connection to the CCID concept. One is its potential as an incubator type space: Local producers and enterprises will have access to custom milling services as well as other resources to enable/facilitate market expansion. The second aspect is the intended function of being a networking hub, with a meeting room available for educational and other workshops and “for local producers to share and exchange knowledge”.

Feasibility study funded by

[The Civics Research Cooperative](http://civics.ca)
Idea: A rural coworking centre(s)

Based on needs and interests of rural communities, we can envision small but highly flexible, multifunctional and well-resourced coworking spaces. These would provide a healthy functional work environment with basic office features (a mailing address, phone, printer, fax machine, etc.) for the entrepreneurs (often skilled trades people), community groups, artists, and small organizations that need working and meeting space. Centres could also provide storage areas and display or exhibition space. Other services and programs could be delivered – as required – in ways that suit patrons and clients – either through the centres own resources, or, more likely, through integration with other centres and partners.

In some locations, community support and engagement might be the central focus. In such cases, it would be beneficial to have a coordinator to manage the facility (or perhaps facilities), assist community groups and small organizations with basic tasks, provide a conduit for information, and facilitate collaboration among such groups.

In keeping with the cooperative, networked nature of the CCID, rural centres could also provide a satellite office and/or meeting space for enterprises that are members of other centres. This could provide artists, environmental groups, small social enterprises and others access to meeting and exhibition space outside of their local community. In addition, members of the rural coworking centres could have access to centres in other locations across the Region, thus expanding their capacities as well.

Idea: A rural incubator centre

This centre speaks more to function, as opposed to space and could exist as a virtual entity. Its aim would be to support new and emerging entrepreneurs, enterprises and initiatives focused on rural communities/sectors, including agriculture, health, recreation, and artists/artisans. The centre would function as a broker or coordinating body to match space, resources, tools and expertise with the needs of local entrepreneurs and artists. For example, the centre would secure already-existing kitchens, kilns, production facilities and machine shops for entrepreneurs or artisans needing these types of resources or space. The centre might also offer or coordinate programs and services in ways that would support its mandate. These could include book-keeping, business-planning, grant-writing, marketing and mentorship services and programs.

Given that such a centre would focus on new and developing start-up enterprises, it would not likely be able to support itself through market-rate membership fees or rents. There would subsequently need to be innovative sources of funding, including investors and/or foundations interested in rural and/or social enterprises as well as other sources.

Idea: A rural art and artists centre

Reflecting the needs of artists and art groups, such a centre could have both studio and office space as well as an exhibit space that would benefit local artists. As with other centres, exhibition space could also be available to artists from other places across the Region, which could, in turn, highlight the interest in art across the community. Such a centre could also provide spaces for teaching and learning.

Kitchener

Proposal: A multi-tenant centre in downtown Kitchener focused on creativity and cross-sectoral collaboration

In Kitchener, we envision a shared multi-tenant space that houses a dozen or more enterprises. The centre would have a hot-desk or coworking area as well as dedicated desks, offices and studios for tenants. Its mandate would be to facilitate and support creativity, knowledge sharing, and collaboration across sectors – all with a goal of greater sustainability, cultural and artistic

---

42 A note on definitions: We use coworking centre to refer to something smaller and simpler; something more akin to a coffee-shop-with-office-essentials than an office building. (10 Carden in Guelph (http://10carden.ca) is an example.) By multi-tenant facility, we refer to something bigger, with a mix of options from self-contained offices to permanent desks to hot-desking options as well as related facilities and resources, such as meeting spaces, kitchen, reception area, etc. (The Centre for Social Innovation in Toronto (http://socialinnovation.ca) is an example.)
vitality, and social and environmental innovation. The building could be leased from a third-party owner or cooperatively owned by member enterprises. (This could also be considered a two-stage process, with lease arrangements most appropriate for the start-up phase, followed by transition to a cooperatively owned model once the centre is ‘on its feet’.) In either case, the centre would be managed by a body that is a social enterprise in its own right, with a mandate to support the efforts of small enterprises by ensuring smooth running of the facility and its associated services and programs. Services and programs would address the needs and interests of tenants and would be accessible to those who could make the best use of them. Services and programs could be offered by the centre itself, but would more likely be offered through partnerships with other organizations and/or by tenants of the centre (perhaps through barter arrangements). To foster collaboration and community among the tenants/members of the centre, regular, informal events would be held at the centre.

In addition to the mix of private offices, designated desks, studios and hot desks, the space would have other facilities such as meeting rooms, a small kitchen, common areas and display areas. It would be a healthy, inspiring workspace that would enhance creativity and collaboration through its design and work environment. It could also have more specialized facilities such as conference rooms. Partnerships with other facility-owners would ensure that tenants and members have access to the facilities they need.

As a larger centre such a space could develop that buzz of activity, where like-minded individuals gather and connect, creating synergies and fostering collaboration and innovation. It might also be able to generate sufficient revenue through the rent of office space and associate memberships. Grants would support some of the programs and resources that are offered. In particular, grants would be sought to support emerging enterprises and community groups.

There are a number of enterprises in downtown Kitchener or interested in locating in downtown Kitchener that find the shared-space concept appealing. These not-for-profits, entrepreneurs and social enterprises, could form a kernel from which concrete concepts and plans for shared-space emerge.

Idea: An incubator network in downtown Kitchener
Within the central core of downtown Kitchener, there are many empty office and retail spaces. We envision a centre that is an incubator and broker, taking the whole of the downtown core as its base of operations. It would enable entrepreneurs, small enterprises and organizations to take advantage of available and inexpensive space. With a focus on incubating social/environmental enterprises, the centre would partner with local initiatives and businesses that are aligned with and supportive of its mandate. Efforts would be made to make underutilized or available space accessible to enterprises and entrepreneurs in support of start-up and emerging enterprises.

Initiative: Kwartzlab
Kwartzlab is a recently-formed member-driven not-for-profit that runs a hackerspace in downtown Kitchener. Members pay a monthly fee and have access to the space and the tools as well as connections to an “enthusiastic and congenial group of folks”.[43] The intention is to provide a space that allows for creativity, invention, innovation and cooperation.

Initiative: Ray of Hope’s Charles Street Development
The Ray of Hope has gifted property in downtown Kitchener (on Charles St. near Stirling) that they intend for multiple purposes. Part of the site will be used to build below-market-rate apartment units, another part for a youth addiction treatment centre to include residential and program facilities. They are also interested in developing some sort of shared-space facility: We “are now hoping to create an office building that will create an environment that would assist all of the organizations that participate in creating enriched services for their clients while reducing operating costs. We are still actively looking for additional partners to join us…”[44]

43 http://kwartzlab.ca/
44 http://www.rayofhope.net/content/overall-site-planning-1
**Cambridge**

**Initiative: Community Innovation Centre spearheaded by the Social Planning Council - CND**

In Cambridge, a collaborative group – championed by the Social Planning Council of Cambridge and North Dumfries – has formed with the purpose of planning and creating a Community Innovation Centre (CIC). This centre will benefit social, economic and environmental community-based organizations, groups and individuals by offering a co-location facility with multi-use spaces for professional, artistic and enterprising endeavours. The proposed site, near Cambridge City Hall, is a 24,000 sq. ft., three-level facility. The design and layout would encompass a variety of uses, including office space, hot desks with support services, conference/workshop and meeting space, communications and artistic studios/galleries, entrepreneurial spaces, social enterprises and start-up businesses. Through sharing space and services the CIC will provide a unique opportunity for promoting and engaging a variety of socially responsible businesses, agencies, groups and individuals. The community will also benefit from having access to innovative work, meeting and collaboration space as well as opportunities to share ideas, services and solutions.

The overarching goal of the Community Innovation Centre would be to provide a place where community groups can meet, collaborate and serve the community. The vision for the CIC includes an open door atmosphere where inclusion is the foundation of the centre’s operating philosophy. A high level of diversity and mix of different types of projects, enterprises, organizations, etc. will be sought as part of the overall strategy for design and operations.

The group, which includes organizations from across Waterloo region in the non-profit, for-profit and public sectors, has signed a collaborative working agreement that sets out the parameters for leadership, fund development and decision-making. Through guiding the development, investment strategies, funding opportunities, and networking potential of the centre’s tenants, services, programs and projects this collaborative will be offering creative alternatives for community engagement, action and change.

**Idea: A Design Centre spearheaded by the School of Architecture**

The University of Waterloo’s School of Architecture is exploring the idea of developing a Design Centre in downtown Galt.

**Idea: The former Post Office, Galt**

The owners of the old Post Office are interested in developing an innovation centre in partnership with the School of Architecture and the Cambridge Galleries.

**Waterloo**

**Initiative: Centre for Community Innovation at Wilfrid Laurier University spearheaded by LSPIRG**

The Laurier Student Public Interest Research Group (LSPIRG) at Wilfred Laurier University is interested in developing a Centre for Community Innovation on the university campus. The centre would be home to LSPIRG and would also have space for four to five other small (1-2 person) enterprises that have mandates in alignment with LSPIRG. In addition to relatively inexpensive office leases, these enterprises might be able to benefit from access to some university resources through LSPIRG. As well, co-location of LSPIRG and other enterprises would provide an opportunity for interaction and collaboration among the students involved in any of the diverse LSPIRG groups and the enterprises operating at the centre.

**Idea: The Button Factory as part of a network of shared space centres**

The Button Factory, in the heart of Uptown Waterloo, is home to the Waterloo Community Arts Centre as well as two other enterprises. Although already operating as a shared space centre to some degree, those involved lack the capacity and critical mass for realizing some of the benefits of shared-space. As part of a network or association of centres, they could access additional services and support. As a performance space that can be adapted for many uses, the Button Factory would also be a valuable asset to such a network.
Region Wide
Proposal: An association of shared-space centres across Waterloo Region: the CCID
Throughout this report we have referred to a key finding: that this Region would be best suited by an association of centres – each of different size, in different communities, with different although complementary mandates. Association would be based on shared goals and principles, and would be supported by a governing structure designed and sustained by those involved. Participation in the association would be voluntary. As described further in the next section – Framework for Development – we consider development of such an association to be an initiative in its own right.

Proposal: A developer and manager that facilitates the renovation of currently-existing spaces across the Region
As noted above, there is, across the Region, a surfeit of unoccupied spaces as well as a number and variety of shared-space facilities with varying capacities, mandates and programmatic themes. A centre that acts as a broker, connecting people with these spaces and facilitating partnerships to provide services and programs could be beneficial in making use of such assets. It could assist organizations or centres already in existence to retro-fit or renovate spaces to better serve the community, or develop other spaces for similar reasons – in line with the vision and mission of the CCID as outlined here. In this way, it would provide a good opportunity for capitalizing on assets and services that already exist by connecting people with space and resources – and adapting spaces to fulfill their needs and interests.

Idea: Prosperity Council
The Task Force on Creative Enterprise has made two recommendations that are aimed at facilitating cultural vitality and creative innovation in diverse sectors across the Region. One of the recommendations is to develop an enabling organization for the art sector. Some sort of shared-space centre and/or services is among the ideas or options of what this organization might promote or develop.

Closing thoughts on the concept and scenarios
The CCID – as a network of centres across the Region – would fill a niche, compliment other organizations and ventures, make use of local expertise, and partner with organizations that offer relevant services and programs. As a social enterprise in its own right, the CCID would have a governing structure and approach geared toward cooperation and strategic development of the centres, nodes, and networks of the CCID. It would be a unique asset that would build on local capacity, contribute to local economic development and facilitate our collective progress towards environmental and social sustainability.

Development of the CCID will necessarily be an evolutionary process, with an approach that is adaptive, organic and strategic. There are kernels of interest across the Region – some specifically associated with the foregoing scenarios. The evolution of the CCID as a region-wide entity and the development of initiatives in line with the CCID could happen concurrently. Every attempt would be made to create tangible outcomes that benefit the CCID community and to engage tenants and prospective tenants and patrons in design and decision making.
Framework for Development of the CCID

An adaptive and principled approach to development focused on viable and promising kernels and an association of centres

As already noted, there is considerable enthusiasm for a CCID in Waterloo Region, although responses we received did not point to a single centre. There was no consensus on where a single centre might be located, nor confidence that a single centre would serve a diversity of requirements and circumstances – if not a number of diverse goals – well. Given the social and cultural geography of Waterloo Region – as a community of communities, with three distinct mid-sized cities, a number of rural towns, and the infrastructure it has – this isn’t surprising. So, the concept for the CCID is an association of centres.

As an association of centres, the vision and mission of different centres or nodes reflect specific, if not local interests, preferences, and circumstances – while also being sensitive to a broader mission. A centre of the CCID is not necessarily a building, but might be a resource network, a district, a broker, or a developer and manager of shared multi-tenant spaces committed to serving and supporting social enterprises. While people endorsed this concept, endorsement was by no means unanimous. Many expressed concern over “critical mass” and the viability of an association of centres across the Region.

As noted in preceding sections of this report, there are benefits to an association of centres throughout Waterloo Region. Moreover, there is benefit in having those centres rise from initiatives already underway or through collaborative partnerships that lead to the further development of established and well respected assets. Initiatives move forward where people are energized, and build upon accomplishments. We refer to these initiatives as kernels. Supporting the development of kernels and assets allows for a less centralized and less bureaucratic approach, allows for community economic development, is more responsive to local preferences, and builds capacity by enabling the active participation of smaller organizations and entrepreneurs in the exercise of building the CCID. While each kernel would evolve into a distinct centre that offers services and programs, and spaces that serve a particular market segment, we doubt that the development of any kernel or asset would evolve into a CCID, or if it did, it would be because there was a concomitant cultural or social shift across Waterloo Region.

Initiatives could be championed by a single organization, a collaborative of agencies, or by a collaborative that wants a shared multi-tenant workspace. Joining the association of CCIDs is voluntary and is left to the discretion of those engaged in developing spaces for social or environmental enterprises or artists/arts organizations. In the majority of cases, kernels refer to people, but may very well have sites or other resources associated with them. In a few cases, they are an idea that appears to have some traction. The list to date follows. (For more detail on these kernels see the Scenarios section of this report).

- The Centre for Community Innovation at Wilfrid Laurier University
- The Education and Retail Centre for Sustainable Energy, Food and Health, Wellesley
A core feature of the development framework proposed here is to enable or facilitate the development of promising kernels that are viable, endorsed by stakeholders, and strategically suited to the overarching vision of the CCID – while at the same time developing the CCID as an integrated association of centres.

Development of the CCID is necessarily adaptive and organic. Keep in mind that the following objectives were received with some enthusiasm:

- to enable and support small enterprises and entrepreneurs by facilitating productivity through healthy, high quality, functional spaces,
- to facilitate collaboration, innovation, and creativity among tenants and patrons,
- to serve and bring together a diversity of enterprises from across clusters and sectors, and
- to consider the whole of Waterloo Region.

The first two of these were well supported in surveys and consultations; the third was raised in consultations and is put forward as a unique objective, making the CCID distinct from other multi-tenant facilities; the fourth was one of the initial mandates of the study.

Such a decentralized, organic, and adaptive approach to development requires some sort of process and structure to hold it all together and strategically guide development. Depending on its approach to governance, an association of centres has great potential to serve a diversity of requirements and objectives while still retaining an inclusive, diverse, and vocal membership keen on meeting objectives around collaboration and innovation and region wide service. Keep in mind that the association of centres emerges from kernels built and championed by largely autonomous and independent collaboratives and through collaborative partnerships. Governance, principles, mission statements, and vision have a significant role to play, as does a pervasive commitment to cooperation and collaboration. To retain the most exciting elements of the CCID and remain strategic, some sort of inclusive, cooperative, and collaborative decision making apparatus is required, even if relationships might be best described as co-competitive.

Given the scenarios and kernels put forward in this report, a great many different configurations for the CCID are possible. There is still need for more detailed and quality information and data, critical analysis and testing of kernels or various configurations of the CCID, further outreach, capacity building, relation and partnership building, marketing, and community engagement.

What follows is a framework for further development of the CCID. The framework is comprised of a number of points and action items. The framework is reflective of the principles and values that motivated this feasibility study. From our perspective, the steps outlined below facilitate the development of a CCID and energize the process.
The Placemaker’s Circle: Developing a robust governance structure and approach

We concluded this study by inviting those interested in the CCID to a roundtable. Thirty-six people or representatives from various organizations responded to our invitation with a statement of interest. Some of them were part of the initiatives (kernels) mentioned above. Of those 36, 15 were able to attend. Discussions touched on our findings, the concept, marketing, vision, mission, governance, and, most importantly, next steps. Suggestions and recommendations were incorporated into this report.

A particularly important agenda item was the inauguration of the placemaker’s circle:

*The purpose of the Circle is to champion and facilitate creation of the Centres for Community Innovation and Design in Waterloo Region.*

*Placemakers are committed to the creation of the CCID, may or may not be potential tenants or partners and have time, resources and/or expertise they are willing to contribute.*

(From the Placemaker’s Circle Invitation Card)

Of the 15 in attendance, 9 indicated that they “would like to be part of the Placemaker’s Circle”. About 15 of those unable to attend also professed an interest.

As alluded to in the previous section, without a process whereby stakeholders have an opportunity to reflect and act on the greater vision and mission of the CCID, there is real risk of drifting – especially in relation to what seems most exciting about the CCID: serving the region, serving a diversity of social enterprises, and facilitating productivity, development, innovation, creativity, and collaboration. The experience of others, even at the scale of individual centres, suggests that creating and sustaining such environments requires not only expertise but one’s full attention.[45]

A singular mandate to manage or create such spaces and represent the interests of social enterprise appears to have a profound impact on success over the long haul.[46]

We think that the concept of the CCID put forward here is best served by an inclusive circle of informed stakeholders whose opinions will impact design and development; a robust governance structure with well articulated goals and approach that is driven by consensus; and an expansive process that speaks to stakeholder engagement, outreach, marketing, and communications. We expect that coherence and synergy between kernels or initiatives, and strategic decision making in keeping with the goals and mission of the CCID will arise through voluntary agreement and engagement,[47] with legitimacy derived from the endorsement of members. We recommend open forums on continuing development of the CCID for those interested in or engaged in creating or developing shared spaces.

The beginning of that inclusive circle of informed stakeholders is the Placemaker’s Circle. Its present instantiation has a degree of representation, and, as importantly, is a resourceful, skilled, informed, and connected group of people. Ideally, the constituency

---

Some questions asked of prospective managers of shared multi-tenant spaces

- Do you have the capacity to run a multi-tenant facility?
  To evaluate your nonprofit colleagues as potential tenants? You have taken on a new core business: building management.
- Is your management and staff supportive, programs strong, and your financial condition good?
- Are you chasing money or an opportunity?
- Is the board actively engaged in planning & fundraising?
- How different will the organization be after the project?


---


[46] Social Innovation in Canada: An Update

[47] For example, consider the Waterloo Region Foodsystems Roundtable. For more information visit http://www.wrfoodsystem.ca/.
would be representative of potential tenants and patrons, as well as those interested in championing the creation of a CCID and able to dedicate their energies or resources toward that end. There would be quite a diversity of groups and people if full representation remained key.

We envision a governance structure and approach emerging through discussions with the Placemaker’s Circle. The topic of governance was raised at the last roundtable. Discussions also touched on approaches and strategies for development of the CCID. Needless to say, there are strongly felt concerns around governance. There are a number of concepts or suggestions regarding governance structures and approaches that appear well suited to the development approach outlined here and the CCID as an association of centres. We refer you to literature on subsidiarity, consociation, and the “Constellation Model” for ideas.[48]

Finally, a working group has assumed a degree of responsibility for developing vision and mission statements for the CCID. The aim is to propose these – as starting points – to the Placemaker’s Circle, which will be convened again when this report is completed.

### Box 5. The working group
- Martin deGroot
- David de Weerdt
- Juanita Metzger
- Sam Laban
- Eric Tucs
- Beth Dempster

### Box 4. Those interested in the Placemaker’s Circle*
- Harp Arora, Sedona Communications; KW Entrepreneurs Network
- Martin deGroot, Waterloo Regional Arts Council
- Diana Drackley, Self Employed
- Jeff Henry, Laurel Centre for Social Entrepreneurship
- Cheryl Ives, Opportunities Waterloo Region
- Lauren Judge, Waterloo Community Arts Centre in The Button Factory
- Jeff Lederer, School of Architecture, University of Waterloo
- Andrew McMurray, University of Waterloo; Civics Research Cooperative
- Juanita Metzger, Region of Waterloo
- Tamara Minns, RareFunk
- Mike Morrice, Sustainable Waterloo
- Greg Overholt, Students Offering Support
- Laura Perrin, artist, Cambridge
- Katherine Pigott, Public Health, Region of Waterloo
- Matt Riehl, Extend-A-Family Waterloo Region
- Judith Rosenberg, Spark of Brilliance
- Michelle Scott, MS Business Management Solutions, Baden
- Terry Smith, kidsLINK
- Michael Snyders, Future Focus Inc
- Dwight Storring, Centre for Governance Innovation (CIGI)
- Graham Whiting, Whiting Design
- Wm. Harry Whyte, Ray of Hope Inc.
- Glen Woolner, Community Renewable Energy Waterloo
- Yvonne Zyma, Local Initiative for Future Energy Cooperative Inc. (LIFE) Coop

(This list includes those who signed a card at the roundtable meeting, or who sent in their regrets, but noted their interest in becoming part of the Placemaker’s Circle.)

### Setting and sharing principles, vision, and mission

An explicit vision and mission statement, along with a list of guiding principles and values would be a much needed reference point for such an open ended approach to development. Typically, explicitly-stated principles clarify expectations, provide reference points in conflict resolution, and lead to shared understanding. Among the noteworthy principles of the development approach described here are ones that – as have been described above – are aligned with the mission of the CCID itself: treating the development of the CCID as a case for community economic development[46] in support of a green/sustainable economy, if not capacity building, and treating the development of the CCID as a social enterprise.

A number of principles are mentioned in the literature on shared spaces. These and others have been alluded to in reports and the many conversations had throughout the course of this study. Principles for consideration include:
- those aligned with grass roots approaches to community development,
- ongoing learning and creative play,

---


innovative, visionary, green,\textsuperscript{[50]} and socially responsible design,  
sensitivity to physical, cognitive and cultural diversity in designing spaces and services,  
integrated decision making and design that considers all relevant factors, such as  
affordability, excellence, functionality, and environmental and social responsibility  
transparency and accountability,  
fair and equitable practice and a sensitivity to wage differentials,  
genuine, early, and sustained engagement,  
going and effective communication with stakeholders and the community at large,  
collaboration within and across communities, sectors, and clusters,  
commitment to supporting and enabling initiatives,  
working with communities across Waterloo Region,  
building on community strengths, capacities and assets, and  
respect for cultural and natural heritage.

This list is best considered a starting point for further development by partners and collaborators.

**Additional research and development of a model(s) and business case(s)**

Recall the following: Respondents from a diversity of sectors from across the Region shared their preferences and requirements regarding a number of pivotal topics. Feedback did not support a single facility, especially one that would be able to serve prospective tenants and patrons from across the Region, and also serve a diversity of objectives. Instead, feedback gave rise to a diversity of configurations for the CCID that reflected a diversity of preferences and requirements. More importantly, there was insufficient commitment and not enough information to merit developing a business case for any of the scenarios or kernels listed here. (We do note, as described in the scenarios section, that there are initiatives underway or envisioned by others that might become associated centres.) Moreover, we have feedback from a relatively low number of respondents from each of the market segments called for in the study. Lastly, the information collected was not necessarily comprehensive or detailed. More importantly, it is likely wise to keep in mind that feedback on a concept offered by interested parties is not akin to feedback on plans from soon-to-be tenants, investors, or owners.

Our principal recommendation in this section is to confirm the requirements and preferences of potential tenants and patrons that have a strong interest in the most promising kernels or configurations of the CCID. The in-depth surveys used in this study could be helpful in this regard. As noted, respondents may be more willing to provide details when a specific configuration or kernel is being considered. Confirmation would be followed by the development of a business case or plan – along with development funding – for respective kernels.

Several ideas and proposals have been listed in the “Scenarios” above. Among them are initiatives that are proposed or managed by local organizations, including the Ray of Hope, the Social Planning Council of Cambridge-North Dumfries, LSPIRG, and LOFT and LIFE. Each of these initiatives are in a very early stage of development, with the Ray of Hope as the only initiative with committed funds, property and designs.\textsuperscript{[51]} Further, each of these initiatives is primarily focused on their own development and has a different degree of interest in or capacity for being involved in the development of CCID centres and/or an association of centres that would be the CCID.

To further development of the CCID as an association of centres, we draw forward four kernels from among the scenarios that appear to have significant traction:


Haner, U. \textsuperscript{(2005)}. Spaces for creativity and innovation in two established organizations. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 14*(3), 288–298.

\textsuperscript{[51]}Overall site planning: Charles Street site plan. \textsuperscript{(2009)}. Ray of Hope. Retrieved December 2009 from \url{http://www.rayofhope.net/content/overall-site-planning-1}.
1. A shared multi-tenant space in downtown Kitchener
   As described above, this would offer space, services and programs to a diversity of social enterprises and would be dedicated to facilitating cross pollination and collaboration across clusters and sectors, and among non-profit, artistic, and for-profit enterprises – all in aid of green community economic development and social or community innovation.

2. A developer, manager, and broker of shared spaces
   Here the principle interest would be enabling social enterprises and facilitating collaboration, innovation, and community economic development by retro-fitting or developing unused or underused spaces, connecting enterprises with spaces/arrangements suited to their needs, and managing these spaces on behalf of the tenants and patrons.

3. Development of the CCID as an association of centres
   We consider this to be the most unique aspect of the concept developed in this study – one that holds potential for addressing the diverse needs of small enterprises across the Region. As described above (in this section and the “Scenarios” section) we see this as an association that realizes the benefits of both collaboration and self-determination; that would act as a connector, facilitator and supporter.

   As noted in the paragraph above, involving those from initiatives already underway in dialogue over how their initiatives would contribute to and benefit from being part of the CCID association would be invaluable. Once again, those initiatives include: Ray of Hope (the Charles Street Development, Kitchener), the Social Planning Council of Cambridge-North Dumfries (Centre for Community Innovation, Cambridge), LSPiRG (Community Innovation Centre, Waterloo), LOFT and LIFE (the Old Wellesley Mill), and KWartzLab.

   Recall the other ideas put forward earlier in the report that could also be worthy of further research and consideration.

Filling a niche and connecting to, or creating a cluster - building partnerships (on the arts, social innovation or community economic development)

As mentioned in the introduction, there are a number of successful multi tenant spaces in Waterloo Region. There are also a number of arts facilities and centres, and a small number of businesses or building owners that offer studio space for rent. There are also a number of established community assets that have much in common with the CCID concept – as two very different examples, consider the Working Centre, and the Manufacturing Innovation Network. Non-profits continue to explore shared-space options in an effort to drive down operating costs. There are a number of other initiatives or development projects underway, such as the Tannery District, and the Digital Media Convergence Centre. Again, these are projects that have goals and objectives that are different from, but may still be consistent with those of the CCID. There are also organizations that offer resources, services, and programs that mesh well – if not match quite directly – the resources, services, and programs potential tenants and patrons of the CCID noted to be of interest. (See the results section on services and programs.) Among these organizations are Capacity Waterloo Region, The Waterloo Region Small Business Centre, and organizations such as the Waterloo Potters Guild. Finally, there are a number of organizations and institutions in (and beyond) the Region that are focused on community economic development, social innovation, community building, and capacity building, that might support particular objectives of the CCID. These include WLU’S Schools of Social Work and of Business, the Waterloo Wellington Community Futures Development Corporation, The Ontario Rural Council, the Centre for Rural Leadership, and the Canadian Community Economic Development Network.

A number of suggestions or recommendations come to mind based on the observations above.

---

9 Kitchener Downtown Arts and Culture Cluster study
11 http://www.waterloopotters.ca/
Box 6. A selection of potential partners and resources:
- Capacity Waterloo Region (http://capacitywaterlooregion.ca/)
- Wellington-Waterloo Community Futures Development Corporation (http://www.wwcfdc.com/)
- Local business associations and BIAs
- Waterloo Region Small Business Center (and associated small business network)
- The Ontario Rural Council (http://www.torc.on.ca/)
- The Nonprofits Centres Network (http://www.nonprofitcenters.org/)
- Communitech (http://www.communitech.ca/)
- The Accelerator Centre (http://www.acceleratorcentre.com/)
- The Canadian CED Network (http://www.ccednet-rcdec.ca)
- Centres and research groups at local universities and colleges
- Canadian Innovation Centre (http://www.innovationcentre.ca)
- Canadian Center for Community Renewal (http://www.cedworks.com/)
- Community Economic Development Center (http://www.sfu.ca/cedc)
- The Under One Roof Project (http://www.ssw.umich.edu/public/currentProjects/underOneRoof/bib.htm)
- The Canadian Social Entrepreneurship Foundation (http://www.csef.ca/about.php)
- The Centre for Sustainability and Social Innovation (http://www.sauder.ubc.ca/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Centre_for_Sustainability_and_Social_Innovation)

Continuing to build capacity

Associated with this feasibility study were complementary objectives around capacity building related to the design and building of a CCID.

We suggest the following:

- Continue development of the Placemaker’s Circle as a movement or group dedicated to manifesting the CCID as envisioned by stakeholders. As other sections of this report and framework for development indicate, there are a number of facets to the development process and the concept of the CCID that require further attention, including informal or formalized partnership agreements and terms of reference. We expect select members of the Placemaker’s Circle will assume responsibility for these facets, solicit others who might assume responsibility, and/or secure funds to support further work.

- Continue efforts to build working relationships and partnerships with colleagues in aid of better understanding the market, synergies, and complementarities, and to strengthen or create clusters.

- Continue efforts to build working relationships and partnerships with service and program providers in line with the interests of the CCID.

- Continue efforts to build working relationships with collaborators and practitioners, and/or to join networks that are relevant to the development or running of the CCID. The creation and design of a CCID – especially one that is an association of centres with a diverse compliment of mandates, services, programs, and spaces – will necessarily require

One, is to be sure that the CCID fills a market niche and goals that are not yet well served. Ideally, the CCID would be an entity that is unprecedented but still complements established community assets – if not contributes to the synergies that exist among them. We have heard repeated calls for an end to the unnecessary replication of established assets and organizations – which we fully support. Given that defining ‘unnecessary’ and ‘replication’ or ‘duplication’ merits critical dialogue, we recommend ongoing efforts to clarify distinctions while also establishing where synergies and complementarity lie.

A second recommendation is to establish or become part of the various clusters relevant to the CCID. Potential clusters were listed in the introduction. To reiterate, clusters include social innovation, micro and small business development, the incubation of arts and social enterprise, community economic development, and green industry (in particular, in the manufacturing and energy sector).

Our last recommendation refers to the CCID’s approach to service and program provision. We would recommend developing partnerships with those organizations that are in a position to offer resources, services or programs to the patrons and tenants of the CCID.

Much of the development outlined in this section requires dialogue, partnership development and an understanding of assets and gaps. A number of contributors to this study have suggested that relationship-building start with an asset mapping exercise that profiles enterprises, initiatives, and underutilized resources. A gap analysis may also be a helpful exercise.
considerable expertise in a number of areas.[52] Continue efforts to build an open library of seminal works, and valuable information sources pertinent to the CCID and its development.

**Outreach: communications and marketing, sharing progress, asking for opinions and preferences**

Over the last year we gathered information relevant to the design of the CCID from our target audiences, aware that the uncertainty around its actual construction would likely dissuade many from investing considerable time in sharing their preferences and requirements, or in fine-tuning concepts and visions. The ideal outcome was a concept grounded in a body of detailed, comprehensive, and accurate information, coupled with unequivocal commitments to future tenancy – both of which would ground a business case. This was not the outcome. While we have a set of preferences and requirements from prospective tenants and patrons, only a few respondents noted an express interest in being a tenant or patron. Further, the information provided is suggestive rather than conclusive, and, while we made attempts to reach a large number of organizations or people from each “market”, the number we reached was not necessarily high. Given constraints and pressures, and, in some cases, an assumption that the shared-space that was the subject of this study would be no different than other well established shared-spaces in the Region, the lack of in-depth or extensive responses is completely understandable. Keep in mind that these comments refer to the collection of information.

We want to emphasize that the observations about responses and involvement to date do not, in our minds, undermine the enthusiasm for the idea that we were witness to. As indicated by the results, there are many consistencies among the preferences and priorities of those interested in the CCID. There is merit, then, in continuing to solicit the preferences and requirements of prospective tenants and clients of the CCID, especially those who might very well be interested, but did not commit or contribute to the present concept. We suspect that the most promising kernels or configurations for the CCID have been determined, but suggest verification. More information would assure the relevance and viability of the concept or of promising kernels, would demonstrate even greater support, and could suggest revisions that would ultimately strengthen the business case.

A well articulated vision and mission and clear descriptions of various defining qualities and operational aspects for the CCID – if not also for the most promising kernels – would help build and sustain interest and enthusiasm. Briefs on progress, commitments, and timelines would also help in this regard.

**Ongoing engagement: opening up, continuing with a participatory design approach**

While there are a number of approaches to design, many designers emphasize the benefit of engaging “clients” or the public in the design process as early as possible to avoid errors in translation and to ensure the creation of a facility that really does serve clients or users well.[56] When appropriate, we would

---

[55] Social Innovation in Canada: An Update
[56] For more information on participatory design visit the Institute for Participatory Design at [http://www.participatory-design.com](http://www.participatory-design.com)

---

One strategy to combat a metro-centric or urban centered focus as a barrier was to draw attention to strong connections between cultural and environmental sustainability as part of strong national policy discussions of sustainable development.

Three strategies are being used to advance creative rural economy opportunities in the United Kingdom.
1. Profile Existing Artists and Craftspeople
2. ‘Farmer Creativity’ - A second research project in 2006 found farmers were already producing creative and cultural products to a much greater degree than anticipated. …But the research also drew attention to the expanding international phenomenon of ‘art farms’; obsolete farms converted to creative spaces such as live-work spaces, studios, galleries, etc.
3. Creative Rural Communities - Here the focus is on the role of creative industries and activity in community-building.

One of the strongest messages is the need to get more farmers and rural creators telling their success stories to a much greater extent than presentations by researchers and policy makers.

We suspect that the “best” vision for a CCID in Waterloo Region rises out of certain virtues, such as an openness to considering a wide range of possibilities, including the unfamiliar and “radical”. Showcasing inspirational examples of shared spaces designed for a diversity of purposes, complete with lessons and insights would facilitate the creation of a CCID that is grounded in exceptional design and best practices. Allowing time to consider the most appealing facets of each would stimulate creativity in light of the realities and aesthetics of prospective patrons. Where possible, we would recommend designing exercises in ways that offer clear benefit to those attending, where the exercises themselves are playful and open in nature.

Sharing work space and business services or resources to reduce costs is not new or novel. However, there is still something unique about centres like the CSI in Toronto. Such multifunctional workspaces (inclusive of services and programs), remain ground breaking. Their spaces and organizational dynamics reflect the best practices of centres that:

- are relevant, functional and of exceptional quality,
- serve a diversity of very different clients well,
- are inspiring, healthy, green, and affordable,[57]
- are built to specification but retain a certain adaptiveness and flexibility, and
- facilitate productivity, creativity, innovation, and collaboration across very diverse organizations.

Many we spoke to were familiar with shared multi tenant space, usually of a type that served a particular sector – often health and/or social services. However, fewer people were familiar with centres such as the Centre for Social Innovation in Toronto, co-working centres, social enterprise and arts incubators or labs. (See examples listed in Box 2, above.) Nor were they familiar with centres comprised of work spaces and services suited to a diversity of sectors where there was a great deal of interaction between tenants and patrons. We also suspect that such open, transparent, flexible and ‘funky’ office settings are well beyond the norm. Questions arose often over the benefits of working across sectors, and how a CCID like centre would be relevant or sustainable in a rural setting. In recommending open, creative, participatory design approaches, then, we also advocate for research into innovative designs and re-uses as well as best and promising practices relevant to the type of centre being developed.

Enabling development of the CCID: financing and sustaining further development
Perhaps the most significant challenge ahead is sustaining further development of the CCID.[55] Of course sustaining the development of the CCID is as much about ensuring its relevance to ten-

---

[55] Cohnstaedt, J., Shields, J., & MacDonald, M., (2003). New workplace commons, a study of innovative support for cultural and social enterprises in both the not-for-profit and for-profit sectors (401 Richmond). Commissioned by Canadian Heritage; City of Toronto, Culture Division; and Ministry of Culture. (unpublished)


Social Innovation in Canada: An Update
Social Innovation in Canada; How the non-profit sector serves Canadians ... and how it can serve them better
Heads Up Ontario! Current Conditions and Promising Reforms to Strengthen Ontario’s Nonprofit Community Services Sect
http://www.enterprisingnonprofits.ca/

---

The grassroots level is the source for much creative talent.
Creative people and capital assets are powerful forces for neighbourhood regeneration.
Creativity instruction and activity in the public education system is a vital component of prioritising and supporting the creative industries.
There is a need to engage in social and community renewal through culture and creativity.


Feasibility study funded by
The Civics Research Cooperative
519 570 9521  eric@civics.ca, beth@civics.ca  http://civics.ca
Given that the concept for the CCID has embedded within it kernels-of-interest, further development of the CCID centres on sustaining the development of the more viable kernels that have caught the attention of participants and align well, strategically, with the overall vision of the CCID. As described above and in addition to the initiatives already underway, those kernels are:

- A shared multi-tenant space in downtown Kitchener
- A developer, manager, and broker of shared multi-tenant spaces
- Development of the CCID as an association of centres
- Engagement of initiatives already underway

We recommend the development of business cases around these kernels, which could be used to secure funding for the development of that kernel. We also suggest securing funding and resources to enable the other activities outlined in this section about the development framework.

As noted above in the section on financial considerations, development funding for shared-space initiatives typically came from diverse sources. Operating costs often came from rents, with some facilities covering costs in this way and others securing some or even most of their funding from other sources. Results also showed that many of those who indicated a willingness to pay for space in a shared-space centre felt fairly secure in their capacity to pay. Others, however, pointed to the need for free or very low cost space—especially in centres oriented toward incubation and support of small enterprises, entrepreneurs, artists and community groups.

One approach to further development would be for those invested in specific kernels to “own” the preparation of business cases and the securing of development funding. The Placemaker’s Circle would endorse appealing initiatives, and assist in other productive ways. The Placemaker’s Circle could also call for expressions of interest or short presentations prior to more involved work. There is no reason why a number of kernels could not develop simultaneously. Other strategic concerns regarding the CCID would be left to the Placemaker’s Circle. Keep in mind that the governance structure and approach for the CCID is still in its formative stages.

Potential funding sources and approaches to funding include fundraising campaigns, submissions to philanthropic foundations, private donations, the involvement of investors, corporate sponsorship, venture capitalists, inkind contributions, loans and grants from financial institutions such as credit unions and banks, and government funding. Organizations such as Enterprising Non-Profits,[99] which incubate and offer resources and development funds to social enterprises, are of particular interest. (At this time do not know if their catchment basin extends to Waterloo Region, but consider them worth exploring.)

**Focus on the emergence of places, tools, and resources**

Our objective in this feasibility study was to set a broad scope to better understand how a CCID might serve clients across Waterloo Region who are from different sectors, and who have a diversity of interests, preferences, and requirements. We also set out to gauge interest and potential in the idea of a shared-space facility in Waterloo Region—without restricting it to specific loca-

---

[99] http://www.enterprisingnonprofits.ca/
tions, sectors or organizational types. We began with a broad, open-ended vision, hoping to spark interest in the idea, and to learn about the requirements and preferences of those interested and about their own vision for the CCID. We received feedback suggesting that focusing on a specific building or a specific rendition of the CCID would be premature and likely inappropriate. Premature, because there are too many options and, with those options, so many opportunities to reflect upon. Inappropriate, because a single centre could not address diverse cross-Regional, cross-sectoral needs and interests. Our approach has led to a concept and a loose framework that allows possibilities – possibilities that might be surprising in some ways and not in others; possibilities that definitely present challenges, but that also plant the seeds for something quite exciting, unique, and valuable – at least to us!

In the foregoing sections that speak to the development of the CCID, we point to a variety of processes, including the inevitable call for additional research and for collaboration among enterprises and initiatives to facilitate development of the CCID. We note that this is not a call for research in the name of research or collaboration in the name of collaboration, but both research and collaboration in the name of supporting and enabling entrepreneurs, artists and small enterprises (including for- and not-for-profits) with social and environmental missions/interests that currently exist or are under development, here, in the Region of Waterloo. It is critical to recognize that the processes described focus on the development of real centres and tangible assets in our communities – and within a reasonably short time-frame. We feel that interest in the CCID has grown since we started the feasibility study. Opportunities will continue to present themselves as long as there is progress that addresses requirements and interests.