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SUMMARY

This report outlines the initial analytical framework for exploring participatory governance in Europe within GREEN SURGE, an EU FP7 collaborative project, FP7-ENV.2013.6.2-5-603567 (2013-2017): MS 38 "Initial conceptual framework for (innovative) governance arrangements.

Task 6.1 centres on the following research questions that can be separated in two parts:

1: Communalities, differences and trends in the assessments of urban governments, of the purpose and desirability of a more influential role for non-government actors, across a selection of cities in Europe

1.1) Which broader trends (that are not specific to the planning and governance of green space) are at work that have got an impact on current views on participation.
- General trends that cities to a greater or lesser extent have got in common
- Differences between cities

1.2) What is the importance attached to participation?

1.3) Which kinds of participation policies have (peri-)urban governments in Europe adopted in terms of participatory governance? (an example is participatory budgeting policies, or neighbourhood green-plans or of course the ‘traditional’ consultation methods that many cities implement)

1.4) Acknowledging that there is often a difference between the official policies and linked practices and informal practices that may be implemented, which specific practices do urban governments adopt with regard to participation in green space governance? For example, a city government may have its traditional consultation procedures firmly embedded in formal policies, but at a practical level, for example in projects or at a neighbourhood level, the city may implement practices that render a different picture of participation in green space governance.

1.5) What are the kinds of topics that urban governments include in their ‘participation policies’? (e.g. maintenance only, or strategic/structural planning decisions too)

1.6) Which factors do the government representatives consider as the most supportive, respectively the most hindering, for what they consider being ‘effective’ participation?

2: Communalities, differences and trends in and between cities in Europe in terms of actors involved in green space governance and the topics of initiatives

2.1) Which actors have become increasingly, or rather less, influential in green space governance?

2.2) On a spectrum from A) Initiated and led by non-government actors, to B) Collaborative input to initiation and coordination and C) Initiated and led by government actors, what kinds of initiatives were mentioned most?

2.3) Can coalitions (old and new) be discerned in the green space initiatives?

2.4) What are examples of green space initiatives coming from community actors in the different cities and on what topics and objectives do they focus, are there marked differences between the cities in the types of examples that were identified?

Collaboration was sought with Work Package 5 and Work Package 2 to elaborate the first inventory-oriented stage of the project, taking place in 20 so-called ‘tier 1’ cities. This stage of the project involves the conduct of a questionnaire, a desk study and an analysis of policy documents.

The present milestone report presents the framework for this tier-1 study and links this to the next stages of the WP 6 research work.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overall WP 6 objectives

WP 6 focuses on governance arrangements for urban green spaces and linkages between biodiversity and cultural diversity (BioCultural Diversity). We are looking in particular for arrangements going beyond the traditional, government-dominated paradigm, with a particular focus on socially-inclusive decision-making. It aims to identify the broad spectrum of governance arrangements in which citizens, entrepreneurs, NGOs and other non-governmental parties develop and manage networks of urban green spaces at different levels, with or without the involvement of formal authorities. It will investigate which governance arrangements have been successful, for whom and what, in which particular contexts. A core group of partners, consisting of WU (WP leader), FCRA (assistant to the WP leader) and MRI, will contribute to the main work in Tasks 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. Some partners are responsible for one of the 20 case study areas and will in this respect contribute to the comparative analysis of them (UCPH, TUM, ICLEI, UL, UNIBA, UH, SRC, TE, FFCUL). Partners linked to the ULLs (SLU, UNIBA (with FFCUL), FRCA, UL, TUB) are involved in Task 6.3. All partners will be involved in the planned workshop between WPs 5, 6 and 7.

WP6 has the following objectives:

1. To identify and conceptualise innovative governance arrangements in which a variety of stakeholders engage in the governance of UGI and BCD decision-making.
2. To investigate which governance arrangements are most successful in terms of delivering: BD conservation, ESS, community empowerment, connecting people to urban green spaces as well as contributing to the green economy and promoting climate change adaptation.
3. To develop guidelines on effective participatory governance arrangements for UGI planning and management in different contexts and for different purposes.

1.2 Objectives Milestone 6.1 (38)

This milestone report provides an overview of the analytical framework for research in Work Package 6 of the GREEN SURGE project, on the governance of urban green spaces, focused particularly on innovative forms of participatory governance. In the terms of the Description of Work: “Report detailing an initial conceptual framework for (innovative) governance arrangements in which non-governmental actors participate in UGI planning and delivery”. It particularly provides an outline and division of work for the first deliverable of the project: “Report on the status of governance arrangements across Europe, based upon our typology of innovative governance arrangements” (Description of Work).

1.3 Collaboration with Work Package 5 on Green Infrastructure Planning and Implementation

The intensive collaboration with Work Package 5 culminated in a joint workshop early September 2014 in Wageningen, where we shared the most important lessons learned from the studies so far and set out strategies for the remainder of the work. Collaboration between Work Packages 5 and 6 is important as planning and governance cannot be seen as altogether separate pro-
cesses. Planning is not unfamiliar with the idea of striving for inclusiveness. When offering a framework for analyses of the governance of urban green infrastructures, we need to clearly set out how it is distinguished from planning in the context of the GREEN SURGE project. In GREEN SURGE, planning concepts such as UGI still bear a close relationship with ideas of a rational planning, with clear, science-based outcomes as a focus (as opposed to ideas about planning as a collaborative process or interactive governance. In WP 6 on governance, on the other hand, the constructed-ness of the concept of UGI is emphasized, or in other words, the different meanings that different actors give to urban green spaces and their living environment, and how they collaborate to improve this.

1.4 Layers and tiers of research
The four layers of research distinguished in Work Package 6 are linked to the so-called tier 1 (overview of 20 cases), tier 2 (in-depth case studies) and tier 3 (ULL-focused transdisciplinary research) of the GREEN SURGE project. For the tier 1 studies, we have collaborated closely with Work Package 5 (Green infrastructure planning and implementation) and workpackage 2 (assessment of biocultural diversity). The first layer of research in the layered approach to WP 6 (figure 1) and most of the second layer are part of these joint tier 1 studies. The collaboration with WP 5 in particular requires some more attention.
2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Governance

Governance generally refers to a shift away from state-centric government, to focus additionally on the role of non-state actors. Governance has many meanings, ranging from multi-level governance to ‘good’ governance to self-governance. In Work Package 6 of GREEN SURGE we are particularly interested in "participatory governance". Increasingly, governments are relying on citizens, private entrepreneurs and other non-governmental actors to make decisions and implement them with regards to the planning, design and management of urban green space. Participatory governance is often initiated by governments and this has influenced use of the term in a restricted manner to refer to ‘government-initiated participation’. However, in many cases non-state actors have become more vocal and now initiate urban green space-related activities themselves. In the WP 6 research we set out to concentrate on these activities, too.

Our research questions for the first deliverable, therefore, are directed towards 'initiatives', 'participation policies', and their interaction.

Sometimes the government would previously have carried out activities that in the present time are increasingly expected to be carried out by non-government actors (e.g. maintenance of existing green areas). In such situations the increased participation by non-government actors is strongly encouraged. At other times they are new activities. Our tier 1 studies focused on presenting a ‘state of the art’ of the attitudes of governments towards participation and what this means for them, and a ‘state of the art’ of initiatives that governments have got on their radar as potentially promising. We have also focused on the policies in place to encourage participation. In the in-depth studies of tier 2 we will deepen our insights by looking into the dynamics of governance, to the potential conflicts and how these have been solved.

In most cases, we see governments and non-governmental actors working together to fulfill tasks in relation to urban green spaces, but there are also sometimes conflicts between them. The transition from ‘government’ to ‘governance’, as it has often been referred to in the literature, is not a total transition. In the different GREEN SURGE countries, there are different degrees to which non-government actors get a say in decision-making about the planning design and management of urban green spaces. It is important to distinguish between different types of decisions and the level of influence that is expected from non-government actors. In the tier 2 studies, as the research becomes more in-depth, we will be using the four interrelated dimensions of the policy arrangements approach (Arts et al., 2006), which has also provided the basis for a recent paper proposing a research framework for urban forest governance studies (Lawrence et al., 2013). The policy arrangement approach has been widely applied, hence several reference studies are available, albeit not the domain of urban green space planning and governance. We prefer to speak here of ‘governance arrangements’ because not all initiatives have translated (‘stabilized’) into formal policies, yet they can be understood and described in terms of the four dimensions distinguished by Arts et al. (2006): discourse, actors, resources and rules of the game.
2.2 Governance arrangements: the interplay of discourse, actors, resources and rules of the game.

Governance arrangements consist of four interrelated dimensions: discourse, actors, rules of the game and resources. These dimensions have been derived from the ‘policy arrangements approach’ of Arts and Van Tatenhove (2004) and Arts et al. (2006). These dimensions have provided us with the input for our research questions. We will first define our terms:

**Discourse**

We adopt Hajer’s definition of discourse, which implies that discourse and practices are intertwined.

"a specific ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categorizations that are produced, reproduced and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities’ (Hajer, 1995: 44).

Thus, analysing discourse means that developments are assumed to depend largely on how they are perceived and socially constructed and on the ways in which these perceptions or meanings are embedded in social and institutional practices. Words, and policy vocabulary in particular, are an expression of such perceptions, as are all kinds of unspoken practices and communications. The changing relationship between ‘city’ and ‘countryside’ can serve as an example. If city and countryside are, for instance, categorized as separate entities, which are unlikely ever to form a harmonious relationship, then planning practice is likely to be geared to confirming that idea. The concept of a “green infrastructure” is also, not just a term – it is connected to all kinds of practices. In spite of the relationship between discourse and practices, for methodological purposes, we separate them, so that their relationship can be investigated. Practices can be about the formation of actor coalitions, the distribution of (financial or knowledge or other) resources, or the development of (formal and informal) rules of the game. We will now turn to these.

**Actors**

Actors are individuals or organizations involved in specific city or urban region, either as part of the established policy arrangement, or as part of the initiative which has not yet institutionalized into an arrangement. A coalition consists of more than one actor. Actors may cooperate in a coalition to achieve (more or less) shared objectives, by allocating resources in a specific way, agreeing upon certain rules of the game or by employing specific storylines or other discursive notions in such a way as to further their objectives. As Arts et al. (2000: 57) point out, there may be supporting as well as challenging coalitions. When the object of study is a local initiative, then one can look for the coalitions that are formed to promote the initiative. Of course there can also be coalitions working against it. It would be too simple however to say that a certain coalition that is supporting the local initiative is then the ‘challenging’ coalition of established policy, as supportive and challenging acts may alternate continuously. Viewed from the perspective of the actor coalition behind established policy, they can also be perceived as those who challenge the initiators to penetrate their domain. The focus in this study is on how coalitions are formed, how they change and/or overlap, and what they do to express a challenge or support.
Resources
There are different types of resources. Financial resources may be the first to come to mind, but knowledge, land or legitimacy (for instance the size of membership of an organization) are also sources of power. Those who have control over the collection and distribution of resources may influence outcomes more than those who do not have such control. The examples mentioned so far refer to resources and power as something that can be put to use, depending on actors’ capacities. However, they are not often very visible, especially when they are firmly embedded in institutional structures and rules. It is as if they are a contextual ‘given’ that forestalls opportunities for ‘doing things otherwise’.

With regard to resources in the interplay between an initiative and established policy, one can examine the resource availability and use by the various parties involved, to see if anything changes in the way resources are mobilized or allocated. Resources may at some point be consolidated in policy in a way that restricts the scope for changing their distribution. Here we focus on the dynamics of how resources are used by various actors, how an established distribution of resources may constrain or promote innovation, and how various actors try to put the resources to their own use.

Rules of the game
The fourth dimension of the policy arrangements approach is rules of the game. These may be formal or informal. Formal rules are fixed in legal texts and documents; informal rules represent the do’s and don’ts of a political culture. Both formal and informal rules set boundaries to what an actor or an actor coalition may achieve, and they also create possibilities. So they are both constraining and enabling. Rules are not just a property of established policy arrangements. Initiators of innovative ideas may also adopt informal rules of the game. In the interaction between formal policy and local initiatives, the ‘operative rules’ are often claimed to be the main obstacle to innovation. The problem can lie in their discursive contents (the ideas behind the rule) or in the way certain actor coalitions use them and keep them in place.

A policy arrangement is visualized as a tetrahedron in which each of the four corners represents one of the dimensions. A change in one of the dimensions will affect the other dimensions and change the shape of the entire figure (Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Policy arrangement visualized as tetrahedron (Liefferink, 2006)](image-url)
3 THE LAYERS OF THE WORKPACKAGE 6 RESEARCH – QUESTIONS, RESPONDENTS, EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The overall framework for our research in WP 6 on governance is summarized in figure 2.

![Diagram of the layers of research](image)

Figure 2: A layered approach to researching participatory governance

We distinguish four layers of research. The first two layers are more broadly oriented and should generate the background understanding needed to go into more detail in the third layer, when in-depth studies are conducted (this is ‘tier 2’ in the GREEN SURGE Description of Work). The fourth layer broadens the focus again by sharing insights, critical analyses and lessons learnt in the ULLs. Also, other exchanges with non-ULL interested stakeholders are part of this layer. The green shading at the bottom of the picture represents that process of going from a broad (rather shallow) orientation to a more in-depth focus, to again a broader orientation through the ULLs. The majority of the questions of relevance for the first two layers will be dealt with in the Tier 1 questionnaire and desk study, although part of the data needed in the second layer will have to be acquired in the in-depth case study.
3.1 LAYER 1: general developments/trends re urban green space planning and governance

**Questions being addressed:** What kinds of general developments do we see in EU cities/urban regions concerning the actors involved and their roles in participatory governance and planning of green spaces? What makes “good” participation in the view of the respondents and what are hindering factors for participative governance? What are examples of participatory initiatives and what is the role of government in these?

**Respondents:** a selection of experienced, high profile urban planners dealing with urban green spaces in a selection of 20 “tier 1 cities” (one or a few per city).

The research about participatory governance has started with the development of a questionnaire (in collaboration with WP 2 on biocultural diversity and WP 5 on planning). The questions in italics summarize the contents of the questionnaire relevant to layer 1.

The questions raised in the questionnaire provide us with preliminary insights into the roles of governments and non-governmental actors in the planning, design and management of green space. Insights will be limited because the questionnaire will only have input from the chief urban planner in each of the 20 European “tier 1 cities”, or from one or two of his/her colleagues if deemed necessary to acquire the information needed.

3.2 LAYER 2: identification of initiatives and generating a profile of different initiatives

**Questions being addressed:** What kinds of initiatives do the chief urban planners in 20 European cities recognize in their cities or urban regions that address urban green space management, planning and design? Who are involved, with what role and which are their activities?

**Respondents:** a selection of experienced, high profile urban planners dealing with urban green spaces in a selection of 20 “tier 1 cities” (one or a few per city) as a first step. Further interviews in selected cases as a next step (in tier 2).
For those case studies of initiatives covered in the questionnaire, some of the information recorded in layer 2 will be derived from the questionnaire output (involved stakeholders, their roles and activities, role of government). However, additional research and interviewing is likely to be required in order to obtain all information required at this level. Layer 2 will provide a profile of the initiative reflecting the current state. The information in this profile will be recorded in the format of a table, which enables easy comparisons across initiatives (see for example Table 1 in Lawrence et al., 2013). Suggested questions:

**Context**
- What is the name of the initiative?
- What is the city region on which it focuses?
- To what area does the initiative apply (e.g., individual park, neighbourhood, city, city region, nation)? (scale of the initiative)
- What is the year of origin?
- Do the municipality or other layers of government implement policies to support local initiatives? What kind of policies?

**Discourse, Thematic orientation**
- What are the objectives of the initiative (e.g., physical transformation such as the establishment of an urban orchard, agenda-setting, resistance against a development)?
- What are the kinds of ideas, narratives and perspectives being promoted by the initiative? What are the counter-ideas, narratives or perspectives?

**Actors**
- Who has founded the initiative? Categorize: citizen groups/NGOs/government/researchers/private entrepreneurs.
- Who are the other stakeholders directly involved? Categorize each of these: citizen groups/NGOs/government/researchers/private entrepreneurs.
- Who (else) is affected by the initiative?
- Who is allowed to participate in or benefit from the initiative?

**Rules of the Game**
- What “strategy” to influencing decision-making is chosen by the lead non-governmental actors? Categorize: negotiation/ opposition / law suits/ (more suggestions are welcome).
- What rules does the initiative develop right from the start to achieve objective or in the case of an ‘older’ initiative: what rules have been implemented in relation to the initiative?

**Resources**
- How is the initiative being funded?
- What knowledge and expertise is available or being developed by the initiating group?
- What is the (intended) delivery mechanism of the group developing the initiative (e.g., management agreement, partnership working, knowledge transfer)?
3.3 LAYER 3: narratives of urban green space initiatives on the basis of in-depth analysis of the dynamics of initiatives – in – context

**Questions being addressed:** How do the initiatives change over time, what are their internal dynamics, and their dynamics vis-à-vis their contexts? What are dominant and emerging discourses, how have they become linked up with institutional practices (e.g. allocation of resources, implementation of rules). Can specific initiative-related discourse/ institutional practices be discerned?

**Respondents:** As many and diverse respondents from government and non-government organizations that are needed to gain a good insight into the dynamics of initiatives.

Layer 3 serves to provide a change narrative of urban green space initiatives providing detail on the dynamics of initiatives up until the current situation. To this end, semi-structured interviews will need to be conducted, and other methods such as participatory observations will probably also be useful. Examples questions for interviews:

**Introductory questions about the dynamics of initiatives – in – context:**
1. What motivated the development of the initiative? (note for the interviewer: e.g., a protest against unwanted development/ an opportunity to improve an open space or part of the built environment)
2. How has the initiative impacted on urban green space or on decision-making relating to urban development and green space – i.e. what was the outcome of the initiative?
3. Are there any future activities planned by the developers of the initiative?
4. Did the scale of the initiatives change over time?

**Discourse, Thematic orientation**
1. Were there ideas/objectives that changed or disappeared within the course of the process? Why?
2. Which ideas ‘won’ and can you give an explanation for why that was the case?

**Actors**
1. Who have been the primary actors in the initiative at different stages? And for what purpose(s)?
2. Who else has been included/excluded?

**Rules of the game in the initiative**
1. Did the initiative require changes in rules/policies in order to be implemented? Or, if the initiative was not implemented, did it ask for changes in rules (formal or informal)?
2. How, if at all, did the initiators change strategy in the course of the process?
3. As the initiative continued to develop over time, where their rules internal to the initiative that were developed to make it work?

**Resources**
1. Did the initiative require specific resources (e.g, knowledge, finance, land, time, etc.)
2. Has it been able to obtain or create these?
3.4 LAYER 4: Urban Learning Lab Dialogues

Questions being addressed: tbd (in consultation with the ULLs)

The fourth layer research requires a more intensive relationship with the initiatives, or with the “reflecting practitioners” in the ULLs. We see a two-tiered approach in this layer. **First**, we want to know much more about the relationship between an initiative and its context of policies, attitudes and opportunities. Are there “general” trends that potentially interact with the development of an initiative? Considering several initiatives, can we find recurring issues or conflicts which indicate fundamental tensions that cannot be easily overcome? Are there groups that seem to drop out consistently? Are there discursive elements in the initiative itself, or in the wider environment rendering tensions or opportunities? If we interpret the answers to these questions from a little distance, as ‘reflective practitioners’, what do we see? These first kind of questions can be raised in the fieldwork and ULL dialogues. The **second** kind of questions involves the professional identities and ‘routine’ practices of urban professionals that make a difference to how an initiative is received. An important element here are questions about the roles of oneself as, for instance, urban planning professionals: what does an acknowledgement and greater role for local initiatives (if this is what is desired) mean for their professional identities and roles in relation to the kind of initiatives that we have been exploring? This can also be further developed in collaboration with the ULL-facilitators.

We realize that the questions above are still rather general and less specific than the types of questions being raised in layer 1, 2 and 3. The questions to be specified here need to be elaborated in the interactions between researchers and urban professionals and practitioners and provide the basis for more critical and profound recommendations than commonplace such as ‘involve all stakeholders from an early stage in the process’. By taking an approach elaborating upon Layer 3 with its subquestions (see figure 1) such a critical practice-based and practically relevant approach should be further developed.
For a description of the selection methods for the 20 case study cities in Tier 1 we refer to milestone 34 (Hansen and Rall, 2014). One criterium for selecting the Tier 1 cities was their belonging to one of the five planning traditions as presented in the different colours on the map below.
5 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR TIER 1

Task 6.1 was structured by research questions as formulated in the layered approach document (presented in section 3).

5.1 Research questions

The research questions leading WP 5 and WP 6 differ considerably.

The analytical framework for WP 5 Tier 1 is organized in such a way as to allow exploration of the current state of UGI planning across European regions. Specifically, WP 5 “aims to determine the extent of adoption of UGI planning principles, including major gaps in implementation and where there are limitations and opportunities for further development” (MS 34, WP5). Clearly the UGI is taken as the central idea and point of departure.

The leading research questions for WP 6 take a marked different point of departure (Box 1). Instead of starting from the ambition to enhance implementation of predefined UGI (principles), it starts from the green-space related processes and initiatives of a variety of actors that may lead to something altogether different than the adoption of UGI planning principles. Here is a link with the concept of BioCultural Diversity that is the topic of WP 2, which accentuates the different possible outcomes, cultures, places and identities that are involved with how humans live with nature in cities.
Box 1: Tier 1 research questions for comparison*

### 1: Communalities, differences and trends in the assessments of urban governments, of the purpose and desirability of a more influential role for non-government actors, across a selection of cities in Europe

1.2) Which broader trends (that are not specific to the planning and governance of green space) are at work that have got an impact on current views on participation.
   - General trends that cities to a greater or lesser extent have got in common
   - Differences between cities

1.2) What is the importance attached to participation

1.3) Which kinds of participation policies have (peri-)urban governments in Europe adopted in terms of participatory governance? (an example is participatory budgeting policies, or neighbourhood green-plans or of course the ‘traditional’ consultation methods that many cities implement)

1.4) Acknowledging that there is often a difference between the official policies and linked practices and informal practices that may be implemented, which specific practices do urban governments adopt with regard to participation in green space governance? For example, a city government may have its traditional consultation procedures firmly embedded in formal policies, but at a practical level, for example in projects or at a neighbourhood level, the city may implement practices that render a different picture of participation in green space governance.

1.5) What are the kinds of topics that urban governments include in their ‘participation policies’? (e.g. maintenance only, or strategic/structural planning decisions too)

1.6) Which factors do the government representatives consider as the most supportive, respectively the most hindering, for what they consider being ‘effective’ participation?

### 2: Communalities, differences and trends in and between cities in Europe in terms of actors involved in green space governance and the topics of initiatives

2.1) Which actors have become increasingly, or rather less, influential in green space governance?

2.2) On a spectrum from A) Initiated and led by non-government actors, to B) Collaborative input to initiation and coordination and C) Initiated and led by government actors, what kinds of initiatives were mentioned most?

2.3) Can coalitions (old and new) be discerned in the green space initiatives?

2.4) What are examples of green space initiatives coming from community actors in the different cities and on what topics and objectives do they focus, are there marked differences between the cities in the types of examples that were identified?

*For a more detailed elaboration of how this framework with comparative questions will lead into instructions and a format of deliverable 6.1, see annex 1. “Comparison” is to be understood broadly, as a strict comparative analysis would require similar contexts which is relevant in the GREEN SURGE study.
5.2 Study design tier 1

WPs 5 and 6 have joined forces to carry out the inventory of planning and governance approaches in 20 tier 1 cities. The study design has been detailed in WP 5 milestone 34 (Hansen and Rall, 2014). See figure 2 for a summary.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2:** The different research steps for Tier 1 and their interrelations.
6 OUTLOOK ON NEXT STEPS

This Milestone report sets the stage for our analysis of the material gathered in the 21 Tier 1 cities. This first phase of the research is quite broad in its scope, covering ideas on planning and governance in a diversity of EU member states. However, in this first part of the research in GREEN SURGE we only scratched the surface of greenstructure planning and participatory governance. It provides the necessary background to more in-depth research in Tier 2 cities. With regard to innovative forms of participatory governance, we will explore how, in a selected set of examples, a range of actors find the language, mobilize resources and set rules of the game by which they are able to organise the type of green space, and the kind of relationship with the city, that they aspire. We do so whilst acknowledging that these actors may be divided, that the policy context in their particular case may be supportive of, or hindering their ideas, and that what works in one city may not be effective in another.

A next Milestone report (39) will provide the conceptual scaffolding for how the work in WP 2 on biocultural diversity and WP 6 on participatory governance are related.
GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

Here we define the terms that have not yet been elaborated in the above

Initiatives
Key to our focus is the concept of ‘initiatives’. When we speak of ‘initiatives’ we are referring to coherent sets of activities undertaken or decisions influenced, or the attempts made there-to, principally by non-government actors in relation to urban green space. This may concern initiatives that have actually led to the change of a decision or plan, but it may also concern initiatives that have failed to do so. Initiatives may be positioned outside of formal government organisations, but mostly there is some kind of collaboration with one or more government institutions.

Non-government actors
Citizens, NGOs, private entrepreneurs, researchers, their representative organizations or coalitions of those.

Participation policies
The formal policies or processes adopted by local governments to enhance participation.

Participatory governance
An increasing role for non-governmental actors in decision-making and implementation with regard to the planning, design and management of urban green infrastructure. “Participatory governance” relates to the participation policies of governments and the changes in these policies to attract a broader participation or instigate new innovative participatory practices, as well as the participation sought by non-government actors which might range from activism to activities on the ground to improve green spaces.

Urban green spaces
When we are referring to urban green spaces these may be existing green or new green areas: including e.g. derelict land in peri-urban areas under pressure from new developments.

Green infrastructure
When urban green spaces are connected, an emerging term being used to refer to these networks is "Urban Green Infrastructure". It is a key term in GREEN SURGE and is understood as an interconnected network of green spaces that provides multiple benefits for humans and embodies the principles of multifunctionality and connectivity. (Working definition of WP5)

Cities and urban regions
We are explicitly focusing on the wider metropolitan region, not just on (practices taking place in) established city centers.
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ANNEX 1: TABLE OF CONTENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR DELIVERABLE 6.1

A special note to all authors: wherever possible in your part of the deliverable you are invited to use graphics or scales to visualize the outcomes – e.g. by using the scales of the questionnaire. In addition to the ‘raw’ data you can use the PPTs of the Wageningen workshop and the Portraits (if available).

Authors: FCRA: Alex, Bianca; FFCUL: Cristina, Artur; MRI: Eva, Ivan; SLU: Hanna, Tim; UCPH: Maja, Anton; WUR: Marleen, Arjen, Birgit

Chapter 1 General introduction

Section 1.1 problem statement and an introduction into the concepts of this deliverable
Section 1.1 an introduction on the place of the tier 1 study in Workpackage 6 as a whole (this will introduce some more concepts)
Section 1.2 an introduction into the two parts of the deliverable and their driving questions (the first part focused on assessments of urban governments of participation in green space decision-making; the second part focused on initiatives – who are involved, what are the topics and objectives)
Section 1.3 Notes on (the limitations of) the methodology behind this deliverable

Authors: WUR
Targeted number of pages: 5

PART 1: Assessments of urban governments of the purpose and desirability of a more influential role for non-government actors, across a selection of cities in Europe - communalities, differences and trends

Chapter 2 Trends impacting on current views on participation

Main question of this chapter:
Which broader trends (that are not specific to the planning and governance of green space) are at work that have got an impact on current views on participation.

Section 2.1 General governance and planning related trends that cities to a greater or lesser extent have got in common
Section 2.2 Differences between cities, can preliminary clusters of cities be distinguished on the basis of the one interview in each city and a rapid appraisal through desk-study and document analysis?

Sources:
The desk-studies can be used to identify the differences between countries. Insights from the broader literature on participation also help to identify these trends.

Authors: WUR (principal author, assisted by UCPH - Copenhagen)
Targeted number of pages: 5
Chapter 3 Participation policies and practices

Introduction: In this section we distinguish between policies and practices. Of course, policies and practices are intertwined, and policy texts are connected to all kinds of policy practices. We make the distinction between policies and practices here to acknowledge that what is written in policies, is not always implemented on the ground. Also, what happens on the ground, may not (yet) have been taken up in policy. Thus, we first look into the formalized policies, and then look into the actual practices (that may be different from the formal, established policies). For example, a municipal government might not have adopted written policies to have citizens participate in green space decision-making, however its actual practices might be quite participative. Or a municipality might be quite proud of its participative policies, but when you took a closer look into its practices, it might be a quite restrictive form of participation that is bound by narrow criteria. This is also how the questionnaire has been set up.

Note to the authors: Chapter 3 seems to be a big chapter, but there are several sections building upon closed questions in the questionnaire (sections 3.3 and 3.4), so you can rely heavily on those outcomes without doing a lot of extra work, only the analytical translation.

Main questions addressed in this chapter:

Section 3.1 Participation policies
1.2) Which kinds of participation policies have (peri-)urban governments in Europe adopted in terms of participatory governance? (an example is participatory budgeting policies, or neighbourhood green plans or of course the ‘traditional’ consultation methods that many cities implement) Which other levels of government initiate policies that are particularly relevant in terms of participation?
1.3) What is the importance attached to participation?

Sources:
Section 5 of the desk study can be used. This will likely also give an idea of the priority attached to the different forms of participation. You can also check the powerpoint presentations ½ September. Questions IIB) 1-5 of the questionnaire will also be instructive here. For the question about other levels of government you can use question IIB)8.

Section 3.2 Participation practices
1.4) Which specific practices do urban governments adopt with regard to participation in green space governance? For example, a city government may have its traditional consultation procedures firmly embedded in formal policies, but at a practical level, for example in projects or at a neighbourhood level, the city may implement practices that render a different picture of participation in green space governance.

Sources:
Section 5 and 6 of the desk study can be used to gain an understanding of the policies (question 1.2), whereas an insight into the broader range of practices can be obtained from the questionnaires. For example, did the government official list good examples of ‘initiatives with the highest degree of non-governmental actor involvement in urban green space planning, design, management and/or maintenance’ (IIC in the questionnaire) and indicate the role of the city/regional government (question IIC)3)?

Section 3.3 Topics of participation
1.5) What are the kinds of topics that urban governments include in their 'participation policies'? (e.g. maintenance only, or strategic/structural planning decisions too, or sponsoring)

Sources
Question 6 of the desk study can be used to answer this question. Question IIB)4 can also be used.

Section 3.4 Supporting and hindering factors
1.6) Which factors do the government representatives consider as the most supportive, respectively the most hindering, for what they consider being ‘effective’ participation?

Sources
Questions IIB) 6 and 7 from the questionnaire can be used here

Section 3.5 Synthesis
Synthesis: which commonalities can be identified, can differences lead to a satisfying clustering of cities?

Authors: MRI (principal authors, assisted by SLU)
Targeted number of pages: 10

PART 2: Communalities, differences and trends in and between cities in Europe in terms of actors involved in green space governance and the topics/objectives aimed for

Chapter 4 Actors in green space governance

Introduction: some background into the literature on shifts from ‘government to governance’ and how this has presumable lead to changes in actors

Main questions addressed in this chapter:
Section 4.1 Actors involved in green space governance
2.1) Which actors have become increasingly, or rather less, influential in green space governance?

Sources
Here you can use questions IIB) 1, 2 and 3 from the questionnaire, also question 5 (and 6, to an extent) of the desk study can be used.

Section 4.2 From government to governance
2.2) On a spectrum from A) Initiated and led by non-government actors, to B) Collaborative input to initiation and coordination and C) Initiated and led by government actors, what kinds of initiatives were mentioned most?

We refer here to question 6) in the desk study.

Section 4.3 Coalitions
2.3) Can coalitions (existing coalitions, new coalitions) be discerned?
Among others, here too you can use questions IIB) 1, 2 and 3, and also IIC) 3 from the questionnaire. Question 6 of the desk study will also provide you with insights.

Section 4.4 Synthesis
Which commonalities can be identified, can differences lead to a satisfying clustering of cities?

Authors: FCRA
Targeted number of pages: 10

Chapter 5 The contents of green space initiatives

Introduction: introduce the dimensions and the typology (Thomas Mattijsen)

Section 5.1 Initiatives and their contents
2.4) What are examples of green space initiatives coming from community actors in the different cities and on what topics do they focus, are there marked differences between the cities in the types of examples that were identified? You can use the following questions, to the extent that the data are available:

Describe, per city (YES/NO), whether examples include objectives related to:
- the increase of green space areal or the increase of quality of existing green space?
- biodiversity and/or endangered species
- exercising political influence
- experiencing green/nature
- social cohesion, integration, education, health
If yes, please describe the dominant objectives for each category

If data is available, please describe per city:
- Who are involved in the initiatives, apart from citizens? How are they involved?
- What actual activities are undertaken in order to reach the objectives?
- What resources (such as money, tools, expertise) are used? Where do these come from?
- Are there any aspects to the initiative which might be considered as innovative in its country?

Thomas Mattijsen of the WUR team will assist in doing the analysis and provide additional information on. You can use section IIC) of the questionnaire where we asked for initiatives, their objectives, involved stakeholders and roles and activities. You can also use the portraits and the PPTs that have been prepared for the Wageningen workshop.

Section 5.2 Synthesis
Which commonalities can be identified, can differences lead to a satisfying clustering of cities?

Authors: FFCUL, assisted by Thomas Mattijsen
Targeted number of pages: 10
Chapter 6 Synthesis and what's next

Authors: WUR
Targeted number of pages: 4

TIME PLANNING

We are planning to have a draft of the deliverable ready by mid December. We envision the following time-path to achieve this:

**October 7:** we share with you this outline (annex to Milestone 38)

**Plm October 9-15:** you share with Marleen any questions about the outline/ ‘bilateral’ skype meetings Marleen and lead author of each section

**October 30:** mid-term assessment of your own progress

**November 15:** submit your section to the Wageningen team

**November 16-18:** sharing of all the sections and ‘bilateral’ discussion on your section during Edinburgh meeting

**November 30:** submit revision of your section to the Wageningen team

**Mid December:** final full draft of deliverable ready

Writing your section requires access to various documents:
- questionnaires of 21 cities
- desk studies
- document analysis
- overall excel overview
- ppts used at the Wageningen workshop
- portraits (to the extent available)