



STRENGTHENING SUSTAINABLE REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT THROUGH CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

GABRIELA MEJIA GÓMEZ ^{1 2}

¹ Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, España

² Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Ecuador

KEYWORDS

*Sustainable Development
Urban Regeneration
Urban Management
Real Estate Management
Citizen Participation
Participation Actions
Urban Actors*

ABSTRACT

Urban expansion requires that sustainable development strategies and effective urban governance frameworks are prioritised to delineate the roles of urban stakeholders within participatory civic engagement. The public-private, as a key driver in territorial development, has historically exhibited a skewed perspective regarding the incorporation of diverse social actors, thereby obscuring a multitude of potentially valuable criteria for urban regeneration.

This article forms part of doctoral research, with its central hypothesis focusing on novel real estate management models that incorporate civic participation. The methodology employs a systematic review of the literature, alongside a qualitative analysis of indicators that highlight initiatives designed to bolster real estate management in alignment with sustainable development principles.

The results underscore the significance of collaborative processes, highlighting indicators and actions that reinforce public-private partnerships. In conclusion, citizen participation fosters sustainable development by enhancing urban and real estate management procedures, presenting an opportunity for participatory design within the territory.

Received: 25/ 09 / 2024

Accepted: 17/ 01 / 2025

1. Introduction

When analysing urban growth in relation to sustainable development and territorial governance, it is crucial to identify urban stakeholders engaged in processes of active citizen participation.

Within the present discourse, it is imperative to re-emphasise the significance of establishing linkages between public and private stakeholders in the urban production of built environments, specifically concerning real estate development. This re-emphasis should revisit conceptual frameworks that incorporate considerations of urban regeneration as a strategic approach guiding initiatives towards sustainable development. These initiatives ought to be structured within processes that effectively coordinate actions between public and private developers and implementers.

Real estate and construction actors are a driving force for development in the city and are often aligned with actions and strategies based solely on land use management. However, urban operations in the city must return to seeing multi-scale models in the territory, referring to the neighbourhood scale as the basis of articulation for urban development. Given this premise, the real estate sector, in its dual role as a promoter and a key partner in territorial construction, has exhibited a skewed perspective regarding the inclusion of actors such as local communities, collectives, and neighbourhood organisations. This bias has obscured the diverse interpretations and criteria that could enhance comprehensive territorial projects.

Indeed, a city is not self-constructed. Rather, it emerges from the labour and collaborative efforts of numerous stakeholders. These actors ought to participate in planning processes across both the public and private sectors, bridging political considerations and territorial realities. This integrated approach is essential for effective implementation grounded in the realities of the territory and operating at multiple scales. The research allows us to understand the overlapping of actors with strategies to be analysed from the political, economic, organizational, and even from the psychology of the social collective.

The involvement of diverse urban stakeholders generates opportunities for action, enabling a significant role in cooperative and managerial processes. These processes contribute to Sustainable Development Goal 11 (United Nations, 2017), which pertains to inclusive, resilient, and sustainable cities and communities. This research scientifically proposes to identify guidelines on indicators and actions through civic engagement, thereby strengthening real estate management in the pursuit of comprehensive execution within the planning and development processes of the territory (Mejia, 2024).

Citizen engagement processes ought to be institutionalised within governance structures. The outcomes of this engagement can then be evaluated over the medium to long term, enabling actions towards sustainable real estate management. Research indicates the importance of analysing cooperative procedures to highlight them as integral actions within real estate management.

The real estate and construction industries should recognise and incorporate citizen engagement in their project planning. These findings underscore the significance of citizen participation as an indicator when planning with all urban stakeholders. Furthermore, real estate management procedures will be reinforced through enhanced understanding of social participation frameworks, including initiatives such as opportunities to implement participatory designs, fostering an effective vision for territorial transformation.

This article forms part of the theoretical framework for doctoral research, which posits that new models of real estate management, incorporating citizen participation, serve as a reinforcing indicator for urban regeneration. The methodology comprises two research phases. The first phase involves a systematic review of scientific literature from 2009 to 2024, wherein participation indicators are defined to assess optimal cooperation processes. The second phase consists of a qualitative analysis of the selection of indicators that facilitate decision-making, thereby strengthening actions with a distinct social structure of participation to underpin sustainable real estate management processes.

2. Theoretical Framework

From the standpoint of studies concerning citizen engagement in real estate management, it is crucial to identify an integration of layered concepts pertaining to stakeholders (Mejia, 2024).to comprehend the social phenomena reflected in sustainable urban development. In previous work has identified the importance of urban stakeholder participation and this article proposes a broad definition of the social

structure that should be part of sustainable real estate management. This will allow for a clear identification of indicators that measure the reality of social fabric participation (Li et al., 2024).

This study will examine citizen engagement as a development indicator, alongside the roles of the public-private sector and social collectives as articulators within the territory, to support real estate management geared towards urban regeneration.

2.1. Citizen Participation as a Strategy for Sustainable Development Towards Urban Regeneration.

The framework of the study of citizen participation proposes to analyse the theoretical framework of timely participation and implementation of tools that contribute to the results of sustainable development in the territory. According to Derbal & Tachrift (2022), the primary principle and challenge in citizen participation initiatives, namely, ensuring genuine citizen involvement, often pertains to the participatory design of urban planning. This design may lack territorial scope; furthermore, the communication of knowledge proves ineffective and fails to ensure responsible application within the territory, thereby hindering success.

Building upon this, the targets within the Sustainable Development Goals, including SDG 11 on inclusive cities and SDG 17 on partnerships, provide a framework for applying city planning tools and indicators to land use. Sustainability is not only about environmental practices, but also about long-term social and economic equity. Citizen participation allows diverse perspectives and needs to be considered, ensuring that policies and projects are socially just and equitable.

According to Pontrandolfi and Scorza (2016), the development of participatory concepts should incorporate ideas that promote definitions of economic improvement and enhanced planning within territories undergoing local regeneration. This can be verified through the development of key axes of significance for the territory, such as the natural, cultural, and economic environments, as well as local resources. Their study offers several concepts regarding key indicators of citizen participation, which warrant identification:

Inclusion and Democracy: Citizen participation reflects the extent to which individuals can voice their opinions in decisions affecting their lives and environment. In democratic societies, meaningful participation is essential for ensuring that policies and actions are both representative and accountable. According to Pontrandolfi and Scorza (2016), urban regeneration processes are more likely to succeed when inclusive practices are implemented through methodologies and operations that effectively foster community collaboration. These reflections suggest that democratic inclusion in such processes is a critical consideration for public administrators. Inclusion highlights the importance of considering parallel guiding principles, such as social justice and sustainability, when undertaking collective action and building collaborative networks (González-Romero, 2020).

Urban Governance: This is a concept implemented to guide actions aimed at improving living conditions and the well-being of people (Derbal & Tachrift, 2022). While priorities in cities and developing countries have shifted to other challenges, contemporary territorial management necessitates new management models. These models require the public sector, the private sector, and civil society groups to collaborate for the benefit of the urban environment and its appropriation (Kurt Özman & Taşan-Kok, 2024). Urban governance in a territory emerges from community dynamics, transforming local politics into a process of transformation and actor involvement. Furthermore, territorial governance should contribute community innovation frameworks to facilitate agreements and negotiations among actors involved in territorial regeneration processes. The need for new planning management instruments forms part of a social turn, as argued by González-Romero (2020). Urban areas demonstrate the convergence of diverse cultures, traditions, and socio-economic landscapes, with urban governance serving as the optimal form of representation for creating accessible and inclusive urban spaces (Li et al., 2024).

Building Concessions and Commitments: Concession building is closely linked to urban governance. Analysing this concept allows public policy to be solidified with meaningful characteristics, such as a culture that focuses on community capacities as a foundation for reaching common agreements. Flexibility and adaptability are emerging as key components in the construction of concessions. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a system that coexists with clear regulation in urban governance, particularly in relation to citizen participation led from the territory (Derbal & Tachrift, 2022).

Concessions and compromises make cities more equitable and inclusive, contributing to a global goal for urban areas. This process recognises social tensions and diverse mechanisms of participation, facilitating the development of new models where the distribution of resources is incentivised for actors who commit to urban governance (Bi & Little, 2022; Li et al., 2024). Inclusion and urban governance explicitly recognise the importance of diverse viewpoints, ensuring that under-represented voices participate in decision-making. This fosters holistic, sustainable, and harmonious engagement, shaping processes within the dynamics of cities. Citizen participation is not a singular event, but rather an ongoing process that fosters long-term civic social engagement in sustainable development towards urban regeneration. This is crucial for maintaining and improving sustainable practices as social, economic, and environmental conditions evolve.

Social Innovation and Creativity: Citizen participation can foster innovation in urban areas. Urban actors can introduce novel and creative ideas that complement strategies established by governments and businesses (ISUFH 2023- Neighbourhood Improvement - Mejia. Ceden. Salvador, n.d.). According to Derbal & Tachrift (2022), institutional innovation in public and private organisations enables policy making to commit to channels of citizen participation, with the goal of comprehensive communication. Innovating the process of citizen participation allows for the creation of flexible systems of action for actors who negotiate on the reality of the territorial context to achieve comprehensive change. Territorial planning for sustainable development must be framed as a strategy of socio-territorial innovation that promotes management related to cooperation and participation networks within urban governance (González-Romero, 2020).

Another component of innovation is technology, which facilitates the integration of resources and tools for the development of participation models. According to Pontrandolfi and Scorza (2016) experience in mastering participation platforms enables the identification of the most representative stakeholders and the collection of data to innovate citizen actions. Data allows for the identification of potential users, owners, and investors with the capital required to invest in urban regeneration. The integration of social innovation concepts introduces a new dimension to urban policies, implying the management of power and the improvement of decision-making among a network of collaborators, whether public or private actors (González-Romero, 2020), who actively participate in decision-making. Social innovation processes must be creative and dynamic to ensure that their results are implemented in the territory and lead to a sense of ownership, which serves as a tangible indicator of citizen participation.

Monitoring and Evaluation: In citizen participation processes, urban stakeholders actively participate not only in the design but also in the monitoring and evaluation of sustainable urban development initiatives that contribute to urban regeneration. Urban governance should provide for the design, implementation, and monitoring of processes to strengthen trust between public and private institutions. Including monitoring and evaluation indicators allows for the delimitation of urban management models within a timeline, where applied strategies can be measured both quantitatively and qualitatively (Wang et al., 2024). Decisions made in participatory processes strengthen the legitimacy of urban management models (Lin, 2022), fostering greater interaction with urban actors, such as the public and private sectors, and incorporating monitoring by social collectives in the territory. The spatial interaction of actors in the territory allows the social structure for monitoring and evaluation to contribute from various axes, such as economic and socio-cultural evaluations, providing an integrated perspective.

Communication and Dissemination: The social media landscape in the field of communication has significantly impacted the last decade, and its potential influence on the role of urban planning is a subject of analysis in the literature. Lin explains that an understanding of networked communication serves as a support function for information sharing, providing individual and collective citizens with the opportunity to organise themselves and build collaborative networks. Furthermore, the authors state that the cross-linking of layers of information enables collective actions to be taken in the territory, diversifying interaction and leaving data records that are measurable as indicators of the impact on citizen participation. The potential for dissemination in citizen participation processes needs to include up-to-date information, real census data, stakeholder involvement, collaboration, and the empowerment of citizens for decision-making in processes that integrate sustainable development for urban regeneration (Pflughoeft & Schneider, 2020). Urban regeneration, when carried out in

consolidated areas of the territory, requires information anchors and mega-data to measure the impact of public and private actors, who contribute needs in real-time and space to strengthen the processes of the social fabric. Disputes in communication management can be minimised when collective actions are effectively communicated and disseminated.

2.2. Public-Private Sector as Articulators for Urban and Real Estate Management.

The empirical basis, derived from scientific literature that contributes to the theoretical framework, allows us to affirm that citizen participation is an integral part of the social structure of urban governance. The exclusion of urban actors as multi-stakeholders in urban management processes has led to the displacement of individuals, rendering cities uninhabitable and causing irreparable damage to the social fabric.

This article contributes, from a theoretical perspective to the pursuit of practical and sustainable solutions. It explores how the involvement of the public and private sectors can be integrated with decisions made within a territory, reflecting the long-term development of cities over decades. However, the construction of territories has often been carried out without clear conditions set by institutional authorities, and the role of the private sector, such as real estate developers or managers, has not been well-defined. This lack of a clear political line in urban governance, combined with roles of actors that are neither balanced nor adequately distributed (Gomez, 2024), results in outcomes that are not inclusive, socialised, or empowering, leading to a loss of democracy in urban management models (Toxopeus et al., 2020).

The relevance of hybrid concepts of governance and participation in achieving sustainable development is underscored by the importance of their implementation across various scales, involving diverse stakeholders, and focusing on the smallest unit of intervention: the neighbourhood level. The main objective of defining this participation in urban regeneration processes is to conceptualise models of participation and implementation.

When public and private entities exert authoritarian self-regulation in governance, lacking a holistic perspective, they neglect the opportunity for organic development and spontaneous observation of the territory's behaviour across different levels of engagement. However, in balancing the obligations and entitlements of urban stakeholders, private entities are frequently hesitant to engage in hybrid urban governance. This reluctance stems from the fact that urban development decisions, regardless of their origin, are managed through discussions of duties and rights throughout the implementation process. Conversely, insufficient public governance by public bodies results in tepid urban planning initiatives, lacking innovative approaches to foster public-private partnerships in urban regeneration projects.

Urban governance processes involving a variety of actors can make participation and inclusion in these processes more flexible, dynamic, and inclusive. Acknowledging and integrating diverse perspectives and requirements into sustainable development is consistent with Objective 11. This objective focuses on fostering inclusive communities where social, economic, and cultural priorities within a given area enable the definition of initiatives. These initiatives should be undertaken with dedication and a clear commitment to enhancing both public and private sector administration.

According to Carlos Montoya, an expert on urban regeneration projects in Latin America, there are successful examples of urban plans that include citizen participation as a key indicator in their design process.

When urban regeneration projects are planned within a framework of common agreement between public and private sectors, initiatives at various scales can effectively strengthen citizen participation. This approach allows for diverse interventions tailored to city governance.

Collaboration between the public and private sectors is fundamental for establishing a cooperative social structure, which is essential for implementing various initiatives and projects within a given territory. Therefore, it is important to emphasise the significance of this collaboration and to reflect upon its outcomes. This reflection is necessary to address the complex challenges of identifying indicators and cross-referencing sustainable actions for territorial implementation. By leveraging the strengths and resources of both sectors within a participatory framework, more effective and enduring results can be achieved for the benefit of society.

3. Methodology

This study employed a review of scholarly articles to reinforce the theoretical underpinnings of the research. The bibliographic search spanned the period from 2009 to 2023; however, several texts pre-date this range, indicating sustained scholarly interest in the subject. Databases used for the search included Scopus, SpringerLink, and Google Scholar, chosen for their academic relevance and reliability. The search strategy involved using keywords as a glossary, the aforementioned date range, and filtering the search field to focus on urban studies, city management, and project management. To broaden the scope, searches were conducted in both English and Spanish. Examples of the search terms used were: (Spanish) “Participación Ciudadana + Desarrollo Urbano Sostenible + Regeneración Urbana + Inclusión + responsabilidad social”; and (English) “Citizen participation + Sustainable Urban Development + Urban Regeneration + Social Responsibility”.

The initial bibliographic searches, guided by the defined key terms, yielded 86 articles based on keyword matching and title relevance. A subsequent review identified 26 articles with summaries of interest, leading to a comprehensive analysis of 10 articles. The literature review also indicated that geographically relevant research is concentrated in Asia, Europe, and South America.

Furthermore, as part of the methodological approach, a Latin American expert with experience in urban regeneration processes in Colombia was interviewed, providing valuable qualitative insights to the study's findings. Following the review, the information was selected and classified, identifying key indicators of citizen participation for analysis and discussion. These indicators, as ratified by the authors, are: Urban Governance, Consensus Building and Commitments, Innovation and Creativity, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Communication and Dissemination. These will form the basis for the subsequent discussion within this document.

4. Results and Discussion

This article highlights the crucial role of citizen participation in fostering urban governance within cities. The authors generally address indicators as measurable variables. According to Mondragon:

There is no official definition provided by any national or international body, these references describe them as instruments for clarifying and defining objectives and impacts more precisely. They represent verifiable metrics of change or results, designed to establish a benchmark against which to evaluate, estimate, or demonstrate advancement towards established targets. Furthermore, they facilitate the exchange of resources, the generation of outputs, and the fulfilment of objectives. (Mondragón Pérez, 2002)

Consequently, within the realm of citizen participation, the conceptualisation of indicators must be clearly defined and identified to be accepted as measurement tools in urban management that contribute to sustainable development. For each indicator analysed, the method of measurement, whether qualitative or quantitative, is specified. This study aims to offer a comprehensive guide for measuring these indicators of citizen participation, framed within a conceptual review focused on the study's objective to contribute to the enhancement of sustainable real estate management. The variables measured by these indicators are not solely for assessing the impact on project management; rather, their application depends on the overarching goal or vision to which the indicator is linked in relation to citizen participation.

4.1. Examining Participation Indicators and Measurement Factors in Real Estate Management

Social Inclusion: The synergy and complementarity of social inclusion measurement factors can inform public policies and development programmes, providing baselines for citizen evaluation frameworks that assess the democratic fulfilment of the Sustainable Development Goal 11 (Pontrandolfi & Scorza, 2016).

The social inclusion and democracy indicator is framed as a quantitative measurement factor, encompassing indices such as gender equality, longevity, education, purchasing power parity, and the inclusion of diverse participative groups in real estate management. Social inclusion promotes

participatory processes wherein empowered citizens actively engage in comprehensive and inclusive decision-making. This engagement allows for the assessment of impact via measurement factors, ensuring efficient and effective participatory processes that contribute to socially inclusive urban regeneration.

To foster sustainable real estate management, the integration of social inclusion measurement factors is crucial. This ensures that policies and projects address the community's qualitative and quantitative needs and promotes comprehensive citizen participation in the face of social challenges within the territory. When the Social Inclusion indicator effectively identifies community members, it becomes more feasible to pinpoint social barriers hindering citizen participation, thereby mitigating mistrust, inadequate information, and the social exclusion of vulnerable groups. Robust community networks strengthen inclusion indices and identify key areas for action within the socio-economic sphere for citizens.

Urban Governance: The challenges of urban governance centre on understanding power relations, the social structure for decision-making, and citizen participation. The democratic processes underpinning urban governance suggest that the key measurement factor is political participation, involving representatives from various public and private sectors, where the capacity for expression and association is assessed in democratic decision-making (The Economist Intelligence Unit).

Social structures, in relation to the urban governance indicator, ensure that stakeholder decision-making is both effective and politically representative, thereby improving urban management. Community empowerment strengthens urban governance, allowing community members to validate their experiences and perspectives. The level of representativeness validates the motivation to participate in governance, where each agreement fosters more informed, committed, and aware citizen participation in addressing territorial challenges. The training of non-public political leaders at various city levels, with the neighbourhood serving as the foundational unit, remains a critical consideration (Toxopeus et al., 2020). Neighbourhood leaders from the private sector will underscore the need for mixed urban governance, which seeks synergistic benefits to build commitments and concrete actions within the territory.

Consensus Building and Compromises: Citizen participation fosters an understanding of consensus-building as a tool for decision-making, thereby enhancing urban governance. Existing literature indicates that the community serves as the primary channel for contextualised decision-making in urban planning (Toxopeus et al., 2020). A specific focus on citizen participation among urban multi-stakeholders promotes democracy and co-governance, strengthening accountability and empowering an inclusive and integrated community.

Urban management should articulate the measurement of factors, such as strengthening neighbourhood agendas, where commitment indicators can be made visible to reflect a course of action with qualitatively and quantitatively measurable elements (Toxopeus et al., 2020). Measurement factors for cooperation can be classified as consultative councils, participatory forums, measurement of urban multi-stakeholder collaboration, and neighbourhood agendas as the primary tool for collecting neighbourhood participation commitments and community activities. From these measurement factors, we derive elements where consensus is measured, such as neighbourhood surveys, percentage of participants in neighbourhood activities, number of annual initiatives to achieve neighbourhood projects, and hours of participation in citizen participation projects. These measurable indicators can be verified, even financially, in participatory budgeting processes, which serve as evidence of the democratic construction of decision-making for urban projects.

However, the primary instrument for compiling these measurement factors is the neighbourhood agenda. This tool facilitates the identification and prioritisation of needs, consensus, and goals for citizen participation, thereby strengthening urban management. A neighbourhood agenda enables the collection of information that can be used to programme actions with short, medium, and long-term planning to achieve global goals for communities within the territory.

The public sector could lead the process of building commitments and consensus without political agendas, by including human resources such as the diverse private sector, with its opinions, actions, and commitment to urban management. A key deficiency hindering the convening of citizen participation processes is the limited or absent information regarding community demands and the identification of key decision-making groups.

Social Innovation and Creativity: For citizen participation to effectively strengthen urban management projects, innovative processes such as neighbourhood agendas and participatory and inclusive methods must be managed effectively. Urban governance policies should promote leadership training at both public and private levels, ensuring that these processes adopt social innovation and creativity as indicators of participation. Urban projects should, in their economic and financial planning, allocate resources for participatory innovation tools. These allocations should come from the public sector, while also motivating the private sector to contribute validated expertise in specific actions or specialised areas within urban processes in the territory.

Identifying the social structure of participation, with the goal of exploring innovative approaches to encourage such participation, provides a foundation for citizens to understand, in a context-specific way, the priorities, objectives, and socio-cultural attributes unique to each neighbourhood. Innovation entails including new measurement factors, such as qualitative axes of values, beliefs, and everyday practices, which will lead to creative and sensitive strategies for participation in urban management. Measuring through innovation, using techniques derived from an understanding of urban psychology, introduces new concepts that will facilitate actions on social, cultural, and economic dynamics in urban contexts, considering their specific characteristics within the territory.

Social innovation that fosters creativity can be measured through planning in urban-architectural projects, incorporating spaces for social interaction, neighbourhood meeting points, and community exchange zones that encourage interactions in everyday life. Social innovation must promote new forms of communication to assess the scope of information, commitments, and consensus, adapted to the local realities of citizens. Citizen participation is limited when tools are not technologically adopted by citizens, whether due to physical or economic constraints. Therefore, social innovation must be measured as a factor in the adaptability of tools, with actions that have a high reach within the territory. The search for investment funds to improve process innovation should align with neighbourhood agendas, enriching urban governance with multi-stakeholder involvement and supporting urban management.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Citizen assessment frameworks and monitoring serve as indicators of citizen participation, measurable through tools designed to identify the impact of urban policies, investments, programmes, and projects from the perspective of citizen-determined engagement and concessions. Key aspects to consider when seeking measurement factors within a citizen evaluation framework include open access to projects and planning processes, citizen audit methods, disclosure of results, scientific communication of process achievements, project delivery processes with legal documentation, and project closure. However, even after a project cycle's closure is determined, projects can still be monitored during their development.

Planning tools frequently lack post-implementation evaluation of processes involving citizen participation. Consequently, the approval basis for completed processes can initiate an evaluation pathway derived from citizen feedback mechanisms, financial reporting of projects, measurement of investment impact, assessment of citizen ownership of projects, and short-, medium-, and long-term planning and monitoring of public-private investments within the city.

If these factors are developed to measure project satisfaction and ownership, it will be possible to streamline management models. These models should incorporate public and private actors identified within the territory, facilitating constant monitoring of urban management. It is a matter of concern that the public sector frequently assesses project success based on the accumulation of economic resources, while failing to evaluate the impact of post-implementation assessments at the neighbourhood level and across the city as a whole (ISUFH 2023- Mejoramiento de Barrios - Mejia. Cedeno. Salvador, n.d.). Monitoring and evaluation are also crucial for measuring citizen feedback and interest, which enrich urban management processes. Monitoring actions can financially and chronologically assess the impact of new investments, ensuring they are contextualised and enhanced through consolidated citizen participation framed within urban governance.

The validation, monitoring, and evaluation of policies emerging from urban governance, aimed at enriching territorial planning, enables the development of real impact measurement factors. These factors should reflect improvements in people's quality of life and be adaptable to the daily context of the city.

Communication and Dissemination: Providing support for the communication and dissemination indicator during the organisation of citizen participation processes offers a real-time foundation for evaluating the impact of these processes. Numerous databases managing photographs, documents, interviews, and shared videos offer a direct dissemination message from urban actors. These actors collaborate to identify both positive and negative aspects, facilitating feedback on urban management (Li et al., 2024).

The effective and timely communication of rich information is a qualitative and quantitative measurement factor that alerts the audience, including citizens. Innovative and creative citizen participation processes often remain hidden within cities, forgotten or minimised due to a lack of rigorous capture and dissemination

Scientific research provides further evidence of the importance of communication and dissemination, contributing not only to the scientific community but also enriching the training and learning of citizens who are part of daily life within the territory. In many instances, citizen participation platforms lack a multi-level reach, limiting their ability to disseminate information accurately to diverse urban actors. The media also plays a significant role in measuring the socialisation of citizen projects and initiatives, demonstrating interaction, knowledge acquisition, and empowerment through effective information management (Li et al., 2024).

Communication and transparency in these processes ensure that the public sector (as authorities), the private sector (as institutions), and relevant collectives guarantee that agreed decisions are truthfully communicated and technically supported. This technical support is crucial in both the evaluation and post-evaluation phases of urban management.

4.2. How Is Social Structure Articulated to Develop Actions with Indicators in Real Estate Management?

Social structure, broadly defined, encompasses a group of actors or citizens who live, coexist, interact, and act within a specific context. Urban actors form a component of this social structure, interacting within the complex and integrated system of city management.

The social structure serves as a key framework for cooperation between the public and private sectors, both of which actively participate in shaping the city from the diverse perspectives of urban governance. This structure encompasses the public sector, identified as the institutions, companies, secretariats, and organisations that manage political agendas within local and national governments. Conversely, the private sector, acting as an urban stakeholder, includes roles such as landowners, builders, property developers, neighbourhood associations, and citizen councils. Integrating a social structure within citizen participation processes to oversee urban management and subsequently support appropriate real estate management is crucial for managing urban development in an inclusive and sustainable manner.

The social structure must identify social roles with associated performance expectations to support citizen participation, ranging from individual or group involvement to more extensive engagement in committed and consensual decisions, thereby strengthening urban governance. Citizen participation indicators provide a foundation for developing structured management processes whereby urban governance, social inclusion, innovation, creation, evaluation, monitoring, and continuous communication can be assessed in the daily life of the city at the neighbourhood level. These indicators enable both the public and private components of the social structure to be cognisant of every decision implemented in urban planning.

Unplanned population growth in cities, coupled with challenges in citizen participation and accountability, hinders dynamic and responsible management in the planning of programmes and projects related to real estate.

4.3. Public-Private Partnership - Social Collectives

Collaboration between the public and private sectors is fundamental in articulating the implementation of diverse initiatives and projects within a given territory (Roberts & Sykes, 2000). This article details several actions aligned with indicators of citizen participation for both the public and private sectors.

For public sector entities, the following actions are prioritised: establishing policies for hybrid urban governance; regulating citizen participation processes; fostering local economic development as a fundamental basis for neighbourhoods; planning infrastructure based on neighbourhood needs; seeking complementary national and international investment resources; proposing innovative economic tools for citizen participation processes; establishing rules and regulations for urban resilience; and promoting awareness programmes for citizen participation through education and raising awareness of projects in planning, execution, completion, and post-implementation evaluation. The public sector has an ongoing need to enhance its knowledge of resource management to generate greater investment and engagement with other urban actors, such as the private sector. Specific actions include promoting hybrid management models for investment in cities while upholding the responsibility of social inclusion and democracy (Table 1).

The prevailing indicator for the public sector is Urban Governance, given its crucial role in formulating policies and regulations that promote sustainable and equitable practices. Collaboration with the private sector can ensure that these policies are realistic and effectively implemented.

For private sector actors involved in city-building as promoters, planners, builders, and managers of urban real estate projects, the following actions are prioritised: management of economic resources to promote citizen participation in the design processes of urban-architectural projects; contribution of social capital with experience in the development of public-private investments for the construction of urban projects; integration of public-private collaboration networks; implementation of social and environmental responsibility standards in the projects developed; strengthening corporate responsibility in decision-making during project planning; and creation of budgetary items that include socialisation and dissemination programmes for urban-architectural projects (Table 1).

From a financial perspective, the private sector can contribute to resource management processes for infrastructure development and provide financial expertise for the management of urban-architectural projects. The private sector typically has greater access to technologies, unencumbered by bureaucratic procedures, which can expedite decision-making through citizen participation. Private actors should demonstrate a strong commitment to concession and social responsibility to generate idea incubator programmes focused on integral and inclusive citizen participation. In the field of communication, raising awareness of urban-architectural projects approved for development can be key to contextualised growth in cities. Representing the private sector in social collectives can provide an effective channel for building collaborative networks within the territory. Private managers possess a clear understanding of negotiation with local authorities and other stakeholders, enabling them to take a leading role in achieving consensus and commitment in any citizen participation process.

This study also analyses the identification of social collectives as part of the social structure. Frequently, social collectives are not considered part of the private sector, which distorts their participation and fundamental role as articulators of actions within the territory. In this discussion, we incorporate this urban actor as a component of the social structure within the private sector, thereby broadening the role of the private sector to include representation in social collectives (Table 1).

Collectives are groups comprised of citizens who share common interests and organise themselves to undertake activities that positively impact their community or local environment, with direct representation in their neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood collectives may be represented by neighbourhood committees, local political leaders, non-profit entities, collectives of vulnerable groups, specialists in sustainability issues, and academics engaged in research and teaching. Educational units within the city should also be considered collectives, as they represent a group of inhabitants actively involved in activities within the territory.

Based on this premise, the incidence of collectives is analysed within the indicators of citizen participation, recognising them as a community voice concerned with real-time interests and defined territories integral to urban development. Local knowledge does not originate from actors who construct or promote real estate projects; rather, cultural, socio-economic, and environmental knowledge emerges from neighbourhood dynamics. Urban governance, as an indicator, should designate social collectives as overseers of the rights of the city, ensuring respect for diversity. These collectives can act as urban stakeholders who monitor the development of urban-architectural projects, with defined duties and rights (Toxopeus et al., 2020).

In Latin America, the organisation of citizen councils represents another form of association and participation used to gauge the level of commitment and consensus in urban development. *Cabildos* are structured in a more political manner, as they must be composed of legally represented actors from collectives, companies, and institutions originating from both the public and private sectors. Maintaining permanent dialogue platforms is crucial for improving the identity and quality of life within communities. The concertation of decisions within citizen councils strengthens urban governance, measures the level of consensus among various stakeholders, and can ensure legal monitoring through its representativeness, thereby ensuring that the interests of the majority are communicated and disseminated during citizen participation processes.

Concerning the monitoring and evaluation index, the mobilisation of citizens through collectives, or via citizen councils, forms the basis for initiatives involving collective and consensual action. The value of engagement within the private sector, encompassing builders, developers, landowners, and social collectives, lies in their representativeness within citizen councils, which strengthens urban governance through collaborative networks with defined duties and rights. The public sector should rely on the private sector, incorporating a greater number of urban stakeholders, to facilitate the exchange of knowledge, the incubation of ideas, and the materialisation of commitments.

Representativeness within the public and private sectors, defined by actors with broad participation, can promote policy changes in urban governance. Another action within social inclusion involves sensitising education and learning within projects. Educational activities raise awareness of the need to empower all urban stakeholders for urban management and encourage reflection on real estate management actions. Social collectives, together with other private urban actors, are key to addressing social problems; if these are identified within the local context, solutions, proposals, and projects can offer sustainable solutions in the long term.

The complementarity of resources between the public and private sectors within a defined social structure can enhance actions to strengthen participation indicators. While the public sector can contribute to securing international funding and generating urban planning and management standards, the private sector provides tools for innovation and operational efficiency with the resources invested in city projects. Furthermore, the private sector manages corporate social responsibility programmes and improves the capacity for efficient execution of resources. These are some examples of how this collaboration enriches and improves citizen participation indicators for real estate management.

Participation indicators can measure joint and consensual work to promote economic and social development measures at the neighbourhood level. The motivation to generate urban management, with the support of real estate management through sustainable projects in their entirety, attracts new investments that benefit the city.

Table 1: Matrix of indicators and measurement factors focusing on social structure

SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF COLLABORATION				
		<i>PUBLIC SECTOR</i>	<i>PRIVATE SECTOR (DEVELOPERS, MANAGERS, BUILDERS)</i>	<i>SOCIAL COLLECTIVES / CITIZENS' COUNCIL</i>
INDICATORS	MEASUREMENT FACTORS	ACTIONS		
SOCIAL INCLUSION	Gender equality index, longevity index, education index, purchasing power parity index. Inclusion of diversity of participatory groups. Social structure	GOVERNANCE AND REGULATION	PARTNERSHIP NETWORKS	EDUCATION AND AWARENESS RAISING
URBAN GOVERNANCE	Democratic election processes for decision-making, political participation with representatives. The capacity for expression and association is assessed.	GOVERNANCE AND REGULATION	CORPORATE AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	MOBILISATION AND PARTICIPATION
CONSENSUS AND COMMITMENT BUILDING	Values and beliefs in perception of social inclusion, Surveys, participation and creation mechanism, opinion polls. Consultative councils, participatory forums. Neighbourhood agendas. Measurement of intersectional collaboration with actors. Surveys of neighbourhood leaders and collectives.	LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION / COMPLEMENTARY RESOURCES / RESILIENCE	LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT / INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION / PARTNERSHIP NETWORKS / COMPLEMENTARY RESOURCES / CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	NEGOTIATION AND REPRESENTATION / ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT / COMPLEMENTARY RESOURCES / RESILIENCE
INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY	Innovative processes (tools) methods. Number of public policies adopted for the project. No. of workshops implemented. Resources allocated to projects	INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY / INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANSION	INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY / IDEA INCUBATOR / SOCIAL INNOVATION	IDEAS INCUBATOR / SOCIAL INNOVATION
MONITORING AND EVALUATION	Access to public information on projects, processes. Citizen audit methods. Exposure of results. Project delivery processes. Post investment evaluation and ownership processes. Evaluation reports with feedback. Financial reports measuring investment vs. ownership. Focus group expos. Number of suggestions received, and actions taken based on citizen feedback. Evaluation of project satisfaction.	GOVERNANCE AND REGULATION	NEGOTIATION AND REPRESENTATION	NEGOTIATION AND REPRESENTATION
COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION	No. of campaigns, socialisation of projects and initiatives. No. of participants in feedback activities in creation processes.	EDUCATION AND AWARENESS RAISING	EDUCATION AND AWARENESS RAISING	EDUCATION AND AWARENESS RAISING

Source: Authors elaboration, 2024.

The Innovation and Technology indicator presents an opportunity for the private sector to act as a driver of innovation and technological development. Collaboration with the public sector can enable the adoption and application of advanced technologies in areas such as environmental, urban, and social management, as well as energy efficiency and waste management. This involves integrating lines of action that are socialised, disseminated, and empower citizen participation. Public-private collaboration can also strengthen community resilience to crises and natural disasters, enabling a coordinated and effective response to recovery and reconstruction.

Identifying the social structure can be an effective driver for improving citizen participation, as it provides an in-depth understanding of the social, cultural, and economic dynamics of a community. Understanding the social structure contributes to sustainable real estate management. The social framework offers a rich and nuanced methodology for understanding and improving citizen participation. By focusing on the voice and experiences of the community, ethnographers can develop more effective and sustainable strategies for engaging citizens in the decision-making processes that affect their lives.

The results validate that identifying indicators of citizen participation and activating actions allow real estate management, whether public or private, to make informed decisions on projects that promote concrete and appropriate paths in the city. It is confirmed that strengthening the social structure promotes community cohesion towards sustainable development.

5. Conclusion

The various processes of citizen participation in the pursuit of sustainable development underscore the importance of identifying indicators that enable the measurement of citizen impacts on the territory. Urban management should support real estate management by developing a governance structure that allows for hybrid management models. These models should foresee mixed governance and actions that contribute to proper land management, especially in projects focused on urban regeneration.

In markets where private actors are the promoters, it is essential to strengthen the corporate organisational structure to comply with processes of citizen participation. This demonstrates efficiency and provides a basis for decision-making in the development of more inclusive urban architectural projects that comply with the right to the city.

Citizen participation indicators are measurable factors that allow local and national governments to identify whether public-private investments have a social impact focused on citizen empowerment and ownership.

The social structure, developed as a triad, contributes to and enables the sharing and understanding of the significance of hybrid models for sustainable development projects. These models include measurable variables, both qualitatively and quantitatively, during the model development processes.

Specifically, the social structure can manage neighbourhood agendas as tools that develop actions within the framework of evaluation and citizen engagement. This contributes to effective citizen participation for the improvement of urban environments. Inclusive planning and constant evaluation of city projects are evidence of urban management linked to sustainable development objectives towards inclusive communities.

One of the important indicators to promote these studies is communication and dissemination as a potential in the different phases of collaboration of urban actors. Information and communication are highlighted as a relevant index of knowledge, learning, and empowerment for citizens. A lack of knowledge and information can lead urban actors to make incorrect decisions regarding the territory, hindering real estate management processes whereby the public and private sectors lose trust and credibility among citizens.

Citizen participation generates links of agreements and understandings, which are then used to disseminate the results of various collaborative networks. This strengthens the social fabric, leading to planning with agreements and common criteria for the improvement of the territory.

The social fabric enriches the multidisciplinary nature of urban actors by providing a deep and contextualised understanding of urban dynamics. By integrating this perspective into urban planning and action, more effective and just solutions can be developed, promoting more inclusive, sustainable, and liveable cities for all.

Private actors, such as developers, neighbourhood collectives, and citizen councils, can promote more equitable, inclusive, and sustainable urban development. By working together, these actors can leverage their respective strengths and expertise to improve the quality of life in local communities and ensure a more resilient and liveable urban future.

Participatory tools, such as neighbourhood agendas and citizen assessment frameworks, are essential to involve residents in urban planning and ensure that decisions and projects respond effectively to local needs. Dialogue, negotiation, and transparency are guidelines that can be reflected in urban governance towards a commitment to sustainable development.

This article initiates a clear discussion regarding citizen participation, which not only indicates the level of community involvement in sustainable policies and practices but also strengthens the democratic and social foundations of a social structure of urban actors engaged in planning and property management processes within the city.

6. Acknowledgements

This article is based on the theoretical framework developed in a doctoral thesis within the research project, "Models of Real Estate Management towards Sustainable Development". This project is affiliated with the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid and Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, as part of the doctoral programme in "Sustainability and Urban Regeneration".

References

- Bi, C., & Little, J. C. (2022). Integrated assessment across building and urban scales: A review and proposal for a more holistic, multi-scale, system-of-systems approach. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2022.103915>
- Derbal, K., & Tachrift, A. (2022). Citizenship participation in local and urban planning in Algeria. *Estudios Demograficos y Urbanos*, 37(1), 121–157. <https://doi.org/10.24201/edu.v37i1.1966>
- González-Romero, G. (2020). La innovación social como estrategia de desarrollo. Políticas urbanas y acción colectiva. *Teuken Bidikay - Revista Latinoamericana de Investigación En Organizaciones, Ambiente y Sociedad*, 11(16), 29–54. <https://doi.org/10.33571/teuken.v11n16a2>
- Kurt Özman, E., & Taşan-Kok, T. (2024). From entrepreneurial to responsive spatial governance: Unveiling innovative strategies of self-organization in Istanbul. *Cities*, 151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2024.105144>
- Li, B., Katz, I., Fang, L., & Kumar, S. (2024). Social inclusion, social innovation, and urban governance. *Urban Governance*, 4(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ugj.2024.01.004>
- Lin, Y. (2022). Social media for collaborative planning: A typology of support functions and challenges. *Cities*, 125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103641>
- Mejia, G. (2024). URBAN STAKEHOLDERS AS KEY TO MANAGE MODELS FOR URBAN REGENERATION: CONTRIBUTION FROM SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE (2009-2022). *Proceedings of International Structural Engineering and Construction*, 11(1). [https://doi.org/10.14455/ISEC.2024.11\(1\).AAE-05](https://doi.org/10.14455/ISEC.2024.11(1).AAE-05)
- Mejía Gómez, G., Cedeño Guerra, M., & Salvador Erazo, R. (2022). El mejoramiento de barrios como metodología aplicada para promover reactivación en la participación ciudadana y sostenibilidad por medio de los modelos de gestión en el Distrito Metropolitano de Quito. *Cuadernos De Investigación Urbanística*, 142, 96-115. <https://doi.org/10.20868/ciur.2022.142.4889>
- Mondragón Pérez, A. R. (2002). ¿Qué son los indicadores? *Revista de información y análisis*, 19, 52-58.
- Naciones Unidas. (2017). *Nueva Agenda Urbana*. Habitat III.
- Pflughoeft, B. R., & Schneider, I. E. (2020). Social media as E-participation: Can a multiple hierarchy stratification perspective predict public interest? *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2019.101422>
- Pontrandolfi, P., & Scorza, F. (2016). Sustainable urban regeneration policy making: Inclusive participation practice. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 9788, 552–560. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42111-7_44
- Roberts, P., & Sykes, H. (2000). *Urban Regeneration A Handbook*. Sage publications.
- Toxopeus, H., Kotsila, P., Conde, M., Katona, A., van der Jagt, A. P. N., & Polzin, F. (2020). How ‘just’ is hybrid governance of urban nature-based solutions? *Cities*, 105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102839>
- Wang, J., Li, G., Lu, H., & Wu, Z. (2024). Urban models: Progress and perspective. *Sustainable Futures*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2024.100181>