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1 INTRODUCTION

Work Package 6 of the GREEN SURGE project focuses on participatory governance (of urban green spaces), defined here as 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. These arrangements might contribute to the Urban Green Infrastructure (UGI), but do not necessarily do so. UGI can generally be considered as the product of the hierarchical view on planning typical of the government-dominated paradigm. For that reason, UGI is at the core of attention of WP5.

In contrast and complementary to WP5, in WP6 we also highlight the often spontaneous, local and multi-actor initiatives apart from formal participation policies. These initiatives may perhaps not be as ‘spatially structured’ as UGI, but are still highly influential in determining the quality and quantity of green spaces in a city. The initiatives that we focus on in WP6 each involve different actors, apply different rules of the game and mobilise different resources. When we discuss ‘initiatives’, we are referring to activities undertaken by coalitions of actors in relation to urban green spaces which may be intended to make changes to these spaces or to use them for specific purposes.

WP6 is looking 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 spatial and administrative levels, with or without the involvement of formal authorities. It will investigate which governance arrangements have been successful, for whom and what, and in which particular contexts.

WP6 has the following objectives:

1. **To identify and conceptualise innovative participatory governance arrangements in which a variety of stakeholders engage in the governance of UGI and biocultural diversity decision-making.**

2. **To investigate which governance arrangements are most successful in terms of delivering: biodiversity conservation, Ecosystem services, 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.**

---

Focus is on publicly available green spaces, however it is acknowledged that green space on privately owned land performs an important role in the overall green space networks and may also be publicly available.
Tier 1 studies focus on objective 1, tier 2 studies on objective 2 and tier 3 studies on objective 3. As WP6 does not want to limit itself to UGI-related governance arrangements exclusively, we extent our objectives to incorporate urban green spaces in general.

This report focuses on the methodology for WP6 Tier 2, and thus relates to work on the second objective of WP6. In the next chapters, we will discuss our empirical starting position, the research questions and the methodology for data collection and for the analysis of cases.

Outputs, outcomes and impacts
Tier 2 of WP6 focuses on assessing process, outputs, outcomes and impacts of different governance arrangements within our 20 GREEN SURGE cities (DoW GREENSURGE). Outputs are directly (short-term) tangible and/or measurable products. This can be a produced report or plan, but also includes directly measurable biophysical attributes in the environment such as a row of trees planted in a neighbourhood. Aspects such as biodiversity, connectivity, social cohesion and changed behaviour are not considered outputs, as they are not tangible and also not directly measurable without some pre-assumptions on what they encompass.

Outputs are defined as observable behavioural, institutional, environmental and societal changes that occur over the short- and medium-terms (this can for example be seen in an increased area of green or in the development of a new instrument to facilitate participatory governance). Impacts are ‘effects’ on a longer term (OECD, 2002) (e.g. climate change adaptation or an increase in biodiversity). The difference between outcomes and impacts is hardly measurable in practice as the timescale on which these ‘effects’ can be seen is often not so clear and they are not always easily observable. In addition (partly because of the longer time scale), it is not easy to decide whether an impact is strongly related to a certain action or a result of a set of different actions that happen independently. Also, perceptions on outcomes and impacts this will likely differ between different respondents. We therefore choose to reformulate both into ‘perceived effects’. From now on, when we speak about ‘effects’, we speak about the outcomes and impacts as they are perceived by stakeholders and not about actual, objectively measured data.

Consequently, we define outputs as those aspects which are directly tangible or quantitatively measurable, while effects encompass outcomes and impacts as perceived by stakeholders.

Output and effects are related to success and failures, but are not the same. Success refers to the achievement of objectives. Success is thus (also) in the eye of the beholder, as (1) objective may differ between actors and (2) perceived effects may differ between stakeholders. Again, our analysis on the achievements of objectives will mostly be based on self-assessment by respondents. Consequently, when we speak about ‘success’ or ‘failure’, we also speak about success and failure as they are perceived by respondents.
2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions (=RQ) for Tier 2 are formulated on two levels:
1) Overall research questions for all cases
2) More specific research questions per cluster, which are to be answered only for the cases within this specific cluster

We base the research questions on the policy arrangement approach which we also used in Tier 1; on the conceptual model developed during the Lumen meeting in Wageningen last year; and on the DoW GREENSURGE document.

For the overall research questions, we distinguish between descriptive, interpretative and evaluative questions. Descriptive questions more or less summarize important findings in relation to the data collected. Interpretative questions ask for an interpretation of data and a position on this by the researchers. Evaluative questions are also interpretative in their scope but relate to successes and failures as perceived by stakeholders.

In the remainder of this section, we focus on the overall research questions for Tier 2 which should be part of each case study. These research questions will be important in constructing the semi-structured questionnaire and in the analysis of data (chapter 4).

Descriptive questions:

1. What is the initiative about, which actors are involved in the initiative and how is the initiative organised.

Please refer to the Policy Arrangement Approach (PAA) dimensions:

- discourse
- actors and coalitions
- rules of the game
- **resources.**

To describe what the initiative is about relates to discourse. The organisation of the initiative relates to the other three PAA dimensions, although the actors are specifically mentioned in the research questions.

2. **What are the backgrounds and dominant motivations of the groups and individuals concerned?**

Background refers for example to expertise of actors. Motivations relate to e.g. cultural values and local identity, but also environmental awareness/responsibility, that contributed to the initiatives and the green space.

3. **In what context did the initiative emerge and how has it developed?**

Include essential context aspects, such as political constellation, socio-economic situation, environmental factors. Don’t forget to include the time aspect. Use the dimensions of the PAA to describe change over time.

4. **What effects do actors perceive?**

The effects can be intended or unintended and can also be both positive and negative.

a. Green effects  
b. Social effects  
c. Economic effects  
d. Do actors differ in perceived effects and goal accomplishments?

Green effects refer to effects on an increase in in quality and/or quantity in green space, biodiversity or other ecosystem services. Social effects include effects on social inclusion and also refer to effects on social cohesion and integration, recreation, education, health. Economic effects refer to effects on the level of resources and money.

It is not necessarily to explicitly label effects as being intended or unintended, but just make sure that you don’t only look for the obvious.

**Interpretative questions:**

5. **What elements of this governance arrangement can be seen as innovative and why?**

Where possible, use the concepts of the PAA (discourse, actors and coalitions, rules of the game, resources) to describe this. You may want to differentiate between innovative for the city, innovative for the country and innovative for Europe.

---

3 See also the MS-38 document

4 The institutional effects are included in research questions 6.
6. How do initiatives relate to planning and policies? What is the nature of collaboration between actors? Has the initiative contributed to any change in planning practices or policies? (institutional effects). Also look across scales.

Please describe cooperation, synergies and also possible tensions. Policies, in this context, refers to formal/official policies and institutionalised planning practices. Examples of institutional effects include effects on formal policies, institutional values or rules and resources.

a. Which elements of the PAA (discourse, actors/coalitions, rules of the game, resources) support or hinder collaboration?
b. Has the initiative led to changes in any of the PAA elements?
c. Do you identify any other supportive or hindering factors?
d. Can we witness a shift in power relations between stakeholders?

Elements of the PAA hindering or supporting collaboration might for example relate to shared visions about the importance of urban green in wellbeing of the population, or to conflicting ideas about combatting exotic species (discourse); the unwillingness of certain actors to cooperate with others, or the presence of strong NGO-networks in the city facilitating the formation of coalition (actors and coalitions); bureaucratic procedures impeding certain developments, or a municipal policy which facilitates participatory governance (rules); an abundance of money or a lack of knowledge (resources).

This also relates to whether external stakeholders are included (more than usual) or even have the lead in the decision making processes. Also try to focus on whether power and influence really shifts as a result of the initiative. Maybe some stakeholders are empowered, while other loose influence? Who is in, who is out?

Evaluative questions:

7. Overall, what is seen as the most important successes and failures? And why?

This questions refers to what extent has the initiative managed to accomplishing its objectives. Please be aware that views may differ on what is seen as failure or success and describe these difference if needed. This questions also refers back to the effects described in RQ4, but effects in itself do not necessarily define success and failure and how these are perceived, but is related to the achievement of the objectives or aims.

8. What is the learning capacity of this governance arrangement? How important is the local context for successes or failures?

This especially relates to Tier 3, were guidelines need to be developed on promising governance arrangements

9. How can local/bottom-up initiatives strengthen/contribute to Urban Green Infrastructure?

Distinguish between:
a. Integration,
b. Connectivity,
c. Multi-functionality
d. Multi-scale.

This also relates to Work Package 5, who define Green Infrastructure as a strategically planned network of high quality natural and semi-natural areas with other environmental features, which is designed and managed to deliver a wide range of ESS and protect BD in both rural and urban settings (D5.1, Davies et al., 2015). Any links with WP5 research and planning issues in general is encouraged.

Apart from these common research questions which are to be addressed in all case studies, cases are also grouped in a number of clusters. Each cluster will formulate additional research questions to be addressed by the cases in that cluster. These research questions will be addressed in chapter 5.
3 CLUSTER, CASE AND CASE STUDY

A case is a specific example of what is described as a 'phenomenon'. In WP6, we are studying the phenomenon of innovative participatory governance. In this context, a case in WP6 Tier 2 is a specific example of innovative participatory governance within one of the 20 GREENSURGE cities. A cluster is a collection of cases that focuses on specific issues of innovative governance. Moreover, we have the general level in which all clusters, and thus all cases, are grouped. Consequently, the tier 2 research of Work Package 6 distinguishes three analytical levels:

1. Analysis of the individual cases (as preparation for level 2 and 3)
2. Overall analysis over all cases, based on the general research questions
3. Analysis per cluster, based on general research questions and on cluster-specific research questions in 5 clusters integrating several cases from level 1.

3.1 Clusters

The following clusters and cases (in cities) have been decided upon:

A) Methods and strategies to initiate participation in neighbourhood green plans.
Lisbon, Utrecht, Bristol.
Coordinated by Bianca, WP6 contact person Arjen.

B) Urban agriculture
Malmö, Edinburgh (also in C), Ljubljana, Szeged, Lisbon.
Coordinated by Sander, WP6 contact person Arjen.

C) Community-led management of green spaces
Amsterdam, Berlin, Milan, Edinburgh (also in B).
Coordinated by Thomas, WP6 contact person Birgit.

D) Public private partnerships for green space and ESS development
Aarhus, Lodz, Oradea, + supporting UK and Portugal cases.
Coordinated by Ivan/Éva, WP6 contact person Arjen.

E) Electronic governance in UGI
Copenhagen, Helsinki, Amsterdam (?), Almada (?).
Next to this, Maja will make an inventory of examples across Europe.
Coordinated by Maja, WP6 contact person Birgit.

Consistency in methodology across cases is very important for a comparative analysis between all cases and between cases in a specific cluster. This documents therefore formulates research questions and the methodological approach which are to be used in all case studies.

Clusters formulate additional research questions and/or additional methodological guidelines on top of the methods and research questions developed in chapters 2-4 of this document (for example: additional types of respondents which have to be interviewed). However, all cases need to answer the general research questions and follow the general methodological guidelines as a minimum.

3.2 Case selection
To be considered as a WP6 Tier 2 case, possible cases need to fit a number of criteria described below:

- **The case needs to have a learning capacity for the (bottom up) governance of green urban infrastructure.** This might be somewhat of a vague criterion, but please be aware that the main purpose of our case studies is to learn something from them. So, a guiding principle should be that a local case needs to have a good potential for learning experiences for other European cities and/or countries.
- **The case needs to be elaborate enough for a detailed analysis with multiple interviews (in other words, it shouldn’t be too ‘small’ in terms of e.g. the number of actors involved).** The case study should include multiple viewpoints (see chapter 4).
- **The researcher needs to have or be able to gain access to multiple sources of data in relation to the case, e.g. different types of documents and respondents from different backgrounds.**
- **As GREENSURGE focuses on ‘innovative governance’, please choose examples which can be considered as innovative within the local context.** A case has not to be innovative for the whole of Europe to be considered a case study for GREENSURGE Tier 2, but it should be innovative at least somewhere in the EU outside of its home country.
- **The case should link up to one of the clusters.** Clusters will formulate additional criteria for cases to be included and additional research questions for the cases part of the cluster.

**Delineation**

Before you start your case study, it has to be at least somewhat clear what is part of it and what is not. A case should be limited to a specific site, a specific coalition of actors, a specific participatory policy programme or the like. In terms of our theory: **it should focus on a certain arrangement.** We will not exactly define the borders of all cases, as we feel that this is not constructive and might limit local researchers in their selection of cases which have a good potential for learning experiences.

However, it is important that within clusters, the delineation of cases is more or less similar to allow for a comparative analysis between cases in this cluster. For example, in cluster A, a case encompasses a specific method and/or strategy to initiate participation and to facilitate (bottom-up) citizen initiatives, plus the implications of this on the street level in 1 or 2 concrete examples of citizen initiatives facilitated by this policy.

For a further delineation of cases, the clusters thus have an important role. It is therefore important that local researchers carefully formulate the borders of their cases and discuss this within their cluster so that cases are more or less similar in their scope within the different clusters. If one case in a cluster is about a certain park and another one is about a certain policy, comparison might become difficult.

We have asked each cluster to formulate the delineation of their cluster in a document, together with the specific research questions. The clusters will be discussed in chapter 5 of this document. Next to this, we also expect that each researcher clearly delineates his or her own case study.

**3.3 Methodological points of attention for conducting a good WP6 case study**
A case study is the methodological approach which we will use to examine a specific case and includes the in-depth studying of specific examples of participatory governance. Case studies are a research method used to ‘understand complex social phenomena’ (Yin, 1994 p.4). By focusing on a specific case, researchers can retain a holistic and real-world perspective which includes many (possible) aspects of importance.

By conducting in-depth studies on specific examples of participatory governance, we can learn more about their organization, discourse, innovativeness, perceived effects, (what is seen as) success and failure and many other topics; and also about the relation of all these aspects to each other.

Please be aware that there are some methodological and theoretical implications when conducting a case study.

**Holistic approach and context dependency**

- **Cases are always situated in a specific context which has an influence on the specific case. A case study refers to a practical and real life situation where, in contrast to a (theoretical) experimental setting, conditions cannot be held constant (Yin, 1994). In tier 2, we speak of ‘initiatives in context’ to recognize this.**

- **Cases are thus context dependent: they are located within a specific city where there are specific policies, certain actors, etc. Carefully mapping this context is key to understanding the case. Each case is unique and should be treated as such. The context includes for example the networks of NGO’s within a city or region, specific policies which are locally in place, the availability of resources, the education of the population, the specific location of the city within a certain region, etc.**

**Qualitative analysis**

- **Data collected in our WP6 Tier 2 case studies will be mostly qualitative in nature. It is important to be aware of your own position as a researcher when analysing this data. The analysis presented is based on an interpretation made by the researcher(s) (like in the portraits).**

- **Although we should try to describe and analyse cases as objectively as possible, meanings are also constructed by the practices of the researcher (Bevir and Rhodes, 2005). It is likely that different researchers will describe the same case in a somewhat different way and highlight different aspects. It is thus important to argue and explain how you came to your conclusions. Try as much as possible to use your collected ‘evidence’ for your argumentation (e.g. interview quotes, references to policy documents) to strengthen your story.**

**Reliability**

- **Reliability in case study research is not in objectivity, but rather in a complete, consistent and transparent analysis and a clear argumentation.**

- **Reliability also depends on the possibility to repeat the case study under similar conditions, which makes it very important that all research steps are well-documented. Yin (1994) calls this a ‘chain**
of evidence’ for your research findings, so that an external observer can ‘follow the derivation of any evidence from research questions to ultimate case study conclusions’ (p. 127).

Internal validity

- In case study research, internal validity is achieved by thorough and in-depth research and a ditto description of research findings.
- It is important to use multiple methods for data collection.
- It is also important to use multiple sources of data and to include multiple viewpoints.

External validity and transferability

- As case studies are examples of interesting practices, case studies are not primarily about ‘proving’ but about ‘learning’ (Flyvbjerg, 2006).
- Cases are located within a specific context, and therefore results of a case study can be generalized only to a limited extent.
- When making generalizing statements about a case, this should always be done with care and with the specific context of the case in consideration.
4 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

In our case study research, data will be mostly collected through interviews and through document analysis. Since each case is specific and situated within a specific context, this methodology document will not precisely prescribe what data has to be collected and where this data should be found. We do, however, provide some guidelines which should be followed in all case studies. Following the methodological points of attention described in section 3.2, it is important that all steps in collecting and recording data are well documented and are conducted in a similar fashion across cases, both for the benefits of transparency of your work and for comparability between cases.

4.1.1 Document analysis

Document analysis involves the reading and analysing of all kinds of documents. This can include websites, reports, newspaper articles, blogs, opinion pieces, policy documents and even items on TV or radio.

It is likely that you already have collected some documents related to your case study before selecting it as a case. Before conducting interviews, carefully read through these documents and actively look for more. They will provide background knowledge to the case and will help you in constructing your interview questions. During the interviewing, try to collect additional documents via respondents.

In contrast to the Tier 1 research, we do not demand a specific number of documents which have to be collected in relation to your case study. Some cases might be well documented, but it’s also possible that there's little or no documentation available, for whatever reason. If this is the case, additional data could perhaps be collected by conducting some extra interviews.

For transparency and in order to present evidence for your analysis, it is important that you keep a list of all documents you collected for the case analysis. Refer to these documents whenever presenting evidence which is based on them. Include all documents which are important for your analysis in your case table (section 4.2).

4.1.2 Interviews

To safeguard the internal validity of the case studies, it is important that they should include multiple viewpoints in order to present a picture which is as complete as possible within the allocated time. In this context, multiple viewpoints doesn’t necessarily mean that respondents disagree with one another, but it means that you interview respondents with different backgrounds (e.g. municipality officials on both the strategic and operational level; citizens which are a member of a certain group and citizens who are not). We strongly recommend that, during the process of data collection, you actively approach respondents with a different background than the ones which you have already interviewed. If necessary, you can promise respondents (a degree of) anonymity.
As a starting point, for each case study a minimum of 5 interviews should be conducted. Many times, this will not be enough. Depending on the complexity of the case and the number of documents available, more interviews might be necessary. There is no maximum number of interviews, but try to keep in mind the principle of saturation\(^5\): if you’re at a point where you feel that conducting interviews is not providing you with additional data and you have a more or less complete picture of the case, you should probably stop. If you don’t have a complete picture yet but data seems repetitive, actively look for respondents and/or documents which might provide a different view. Each case study should at the very least include the viewpoints of local citizens and of municipal officials. Depending on their scope, clusters can formulate additional types of respondents which have to be interviewed.

It is important that a number of topics are (more or less systematically) covered in all case studies and, whenever possible and applicable, in all interviews within each case. If not, comparison between cases becomes problematic and the Tier 2 research might lose part of its focus. It is important that these questions are addressed in all case studies, even though they might not all be of application in a specific interview. Therefore, try to follow the research questions which are formulated in chapter 2 of this document when conducting your interviews. Next to this, clusters will also identify additional research questions which are of specific importance in relation to their focus. It is important that these questions are also addressed in each case study within this cluster.

However, there will be no fixed guide for the interviews as there was in Tier 1. We embrace some amount of freedom for local researchers in making up the questionnaires in relation to their case study, especially since cases are context dependent and local researchers will know best what to ask for and in what way to do so. As a starting point, an example of a questionnaire has been constructed in Appendix 1 of this document. Although some of the questions are likely to be slightly different in your local context, we strongly advise you to use this questionnaire as an inspiration and starting point for creating your own.

### 4.2 Data recording and analysis

Following the discussion of case study research in chapter 3, it is important that you carefully record the interviews which you conduct. You may choose between writing a verbatim of all interviews or making an extensive summary of each interview. This is allowed in your home language. However, we do ask you to summarize the findings of all your interviews and of all important documents which you collected in a table, in English.

#### 4.2.1 Case table

This table, which we call the ‘case table’, will be a specific table in Excel with the aim to summarize the main findings of each data source and also with the aim to function as a starting point for your analysis (see also Miles et al., 2013). As a first step, the collected data of each source has to be summarized in relation to identified research topics of importance. There will be space for

---

\(^5\) ‘When you find that you are not obtaining any new data or the new information is negligible, you are assumed to have reached saturation point’ (Kumar, 2005)
additional observations that do not fit into the pre-defined categories. It may be useful to include some citations of respondents or from documents that support your findings. These citations can then be used in the Deliverable 6.2 and possibly in a paper about the cases or cluster. Please note that not every cell of this table has to be filled for each data source, but try to do so for as much as collected evidence allows you to.

The figure below shows a simplified example of what the case table might look like.

Figure 1: a simplified example of a case table

Recording data in this table has the advantage of increasing the transparency of your data without having to completely translate every source of data into English. It is also beneficial for the benefits of analysing data, as it provides an overview of important data sources and their 'evidence' in relation to certain topics. Next, this table will also serve to facilitate the comparative analysis between cases. Clusters can formulate additional topics of importance which have to be included in the case table.

In a second step of analysis, we ask you to summarize your findings in relation to each topic in a separate cell of the case table. This integrates all collected data in relation to a specific topic into a short, topic-specific storyline. In this summary, it is important that you include the main storylines, for as far as you can identify them, but make sure that you also include diverging/conflicting/alternative views. In case study research, it is important to be complete and concise and to also include relevant 'minority' views. See figure 2 for an example of this.

Figure 2: an example of a case table with the summary of some important results.

However, we do wish to embrace here that the case table should not be the exclusive tool for data analysis. Although it can help you to gain an overview of data (Miles et al., 2013), especially
in relation to certain topics, the case study research departs from a holistic view and it is important that analysis will also take place across characteristics in order to paint a complete picture. Next to the case table, researchers will also have to write a case specific narrative for each case study (see section 4.2.2.) in which they (re)iteratively visit their data sources. This narrative will be an important tool for presenting research findings, while the case table is in fact more of a research instrument to increase transparency of data, to gain an overview of data and to facilitate cross-case comparison.

4.2.2 Narrative construction

As a final step in your case analysis and as the main form of an overall analysis and presentation of your research data, we ask you to construct a case-specific narrative describing the case in detail. This narrative should consist of 4-6 pages of full text (excluding tables and figures) and should present and integrate all main research findings in a concise and comprehensive way.

When constructing the narrative, strive for completeness of your analysis and explicitly look for (possible) relationships between aspects of importance. While the case table is an instrument that analyses on a list of criteria, the narrative construction should be more holistic in its approach. The case table needs to be as complete as possible, while the narrative will focus on the most important aspects of your case for answering the overall and cluster-specific research question. In the policy arrangement approach, it is assumed that actors, rules, resources and discourses are explicitly interlinked and that changes in one of these dimensions often result in changes in others as well (Liefferink, 2006). Explicitly look for such relationships and (inter)linkages and present your research findings as part of their context. So: keep the holistic starting point of our case study approach in mind. Also make sure that your narrative can be related to the descriptions in the case table - make sure that's it's clear to other researchers on what it is based.

Following this perspective, there will be no fixed ‘format’ for the narrative with an exact list of paragraphs and what should be described where: it is the task for the individual researcher to describe their narrative and find a middle ground to respecting the specific characteristics of the individual case and relating it to the research questions on which we want to do the cross-case analysis. However, we may want to consider some guidance to make sure that narratives have a somewhat similar format. This guide will be discussed and developed before the analysis of data starts.

You may want to use your summaries in the case table as a starting point for writing the narrative. However, it is very important that you, iteratively, visit your data sources once more when writing this text. Refer to your data sources whenever making specific claims by citing or referring to specific respondents or documents. In general, don’t mention respondents by their name in your text, but mention their role (e.g. municipality official dealing with green space, chairman of the NGO ‘citizens for nature’). If you are posting a hypothesis or proposition, be very clear that this is your own interpretation of data and be aware of your own role as a researcher in this (Bevir and Rhodes, 2005).
As a final part of the analysis, we also ask you to take some time to reflect on the data collection in your case study and your own role as a researcher. What is the quality of data? What are strong and weak points of your research? Did respondents cooperate and did you get access to all data? Do you feel like some research findings are biased as a result of the analytical framework? Did the framework ‘work’ in your case study? What do you consider to be the most important aspects of a case? Include this as an additional paragraph with your narrative analysis.

4.3 Comparative case study analysis

An important aspect of the Tier 2 research is cross-case comparison. Comparing the results from these studies should be done with care and must take into account the context dependency of the cases. Be very clear about what you are comparing and how you are doing so and be specific about the different contexts in which you are comparing and how these contexts might have influenced your findings. Transparency, again, is key.

Comparison analyses are predominantly made in the clusters, although we will also analyse over all clusters.
5  CLUSTERS

This chapter includes a short description and delineation of each cluster and also describes the specific research questions which are addressed in these clusters. Additional information on the clusters and the case studies part of these clusters is included in appendix 2.

5.1  Cluster A: Methods and strategies to initiate participation in neighbourhood green plans

This cluster focuses on municipality initiated (top-down) methods and strategies to initiate participation and to facilitate (bottom-up) citizen initiatives. These methods and strategies might be specifically aimed at urban green spaces but they might also be more general in their orientation as long as they also deal with green space.

Delineation
The cases included in this cluster are in fact all methods and strategies (or, one could argue, policies) initiated by the municipality. These policies are the ‘cases’ which we scrutinize in this cluster, and a case is thus limited to a certain specific policy and its implications. In this cluster, focus is not just on policies and their (possible) implications within the cities. We also need to know what happens when a policy ‘hits the ground’: how it is picked up by citizens and how it is implemented on street level. What are roles of municipality actors and of citizens in this? So, apart from focusing on the policies as a whole and their effects and implications on the city level, the case study should also zoom in on one or two specific examples of citizen initiatives manifested through the policies.

Specific Research Questions

1. Through what means are policies to initiate participation and to facilitate (bottom-up) citizen initiatives implemented within the municipality?

2. What are the implications and effects of the policies on street level?

3. What kinds of projects actually gain support from government actors? (are they small, big, to what extent is UGI incorporated or UGI planning affected?)

4. How far were citizen ideas/vision/proposals actually delivered/realized?

5. How do government actors view citizen involvement? (as democratic decision making, or as an instrumental means to achieve their own objectives?)

6. How is power/influence realized within decision making processes (i.e. the tools which are used, the standards and technical aspects applied, the limitations and framing of the scope) and what are the implications for social inclusion?

5.2  Cluster B: Urban agriculture

This cluster is concerned urban agriculture (UA). The key focus in this cluster is on the role of UA in the creation of UGI. As such, we aim at a better understanding of UA as part of the UGI, not UA
as such. This cluster includes cases illustrating how UA is integrated in contemporary UGI governance across a range of European cities.

UA is also focus of other Work Packages and this cluster therefore includes a few specific questions to contribute to these Work Packages.

**Delineation**
Cases must be about community-led management of green spaces that have a land-based, food growing or farming component as well. Plans and policies can only be considered if they can be linked to specific land-based initiatives. Also, the urban agriculture initiative needs to provide multiple ecosystem services.

**Specific research questions**

*For contributing to the work of other work packages*

1. Does the UA contribute substantially to the income of the urban farmers?
2. Does the UA create new job opportunities, lead to the development of transferable skills or help the urban farmers to get a better social position (improved possibilities to get a job)?
3. What is the business model of the UA initiative?
4. Do the biocultural values and objectives of the different actors support collaboration or raise conflicts/barriers?
5. What social group is predominantly involved? Who can join the initiative and how? Is the initiative socially inclusive?
6. Is there a formal policy on urban agriculture by the local government? What are the main objectives? Are there ways in which the local government informally supports, interferes or hinders the UA initiative?

*On the role of UA in the creation of UGI*

7. What are the effects of UA?
8. What policy concepts (i.e., biodiversity, climate change adaptation, green economy, human health & social cohesion) does this initiative help to deliver, and how? Is this explicitly acknowledged in policy documents or otherwise evidenced (e.g., biodiversity data monitoring)?
9. How is the green space used for UA physically linked in with the wider green infrastructure? Has the initiative led to more interlinked green spaces? Is this explicitly acknowledged in policy documents or otherwise evidenced?
10. Has the initiative contributed to the integration of urban green with other (built-up and transport) infrastructures? Is this explicitly acknowledged in policy documents or otherwise evidenced?

11. Has the initiative led to the delivery of a wider range of economic, socio-cultural and environmental benefits than previously was the case? Is this explicitly acknowledged in policy documents or otherwise evidenced?

5.3 Cluster C: Community-led management of green spaces

This cluster focuses on relatively large examples of community management of green spaces. These studies may be carried out in a variety of greenspace settings and are connected with formal governance arrangements, meaning that the initiatives have some degree of permanence because the space is designated or recognised by function (e.g. parks, woodlands, regenerated brownfield sites, river banks, urban features such as roundabouts and squares/courtyards).

**Delineation**

Cases need to be initiated by non-governmental actors and need to involve the management of green space by non-government actors. This involvement in management needs to be significant. This should mean that a large part of management (but not necessarily most) is done by non-government actors. Cases need to have a ‘physical component’, which means that they have to be part of an arrangement which is physically bound to one or more specific sites. This site-bound arrangement is the ‘case’. All cases need to consider ‘permanent’ green spaces.

**Specific research questions**

1. What is the long-term perspective for community managed green spaces? Do they develop into new institutions? Does the relationship with local governments change over time and does this influence the relationship with neighbourhood actors/citizens? How are these relationships managed/maintained?

2. Has the local identity or culture of people in this community influenced the green space associated with this initiative? If so, how? Have the activities of the group influenced experiences, learning and/or behaviour of local people? If so, how?

3. Has the initiative been made possible due to state retrenchment from providing socio-environmental public services? If so, does the community group aim to restore the provision of such services? What strategy does the community group take to deliver this?

5.4 Cluster D: Public private partnerships for green space and ESS development

This cluster focuses on examples of public-private partnerships (PPP) and includes projects that were implemented in coalition between the public and private actors, aiming at mutual benefits for both parties.

**Delineation**
An initiative in cluster D is either a specific project which was implemented in private (business)-public partnership or a regular practice on PPP which is based on written documents, legal regulations. If a practice is the object of analysis than 1-2 exact projects of the practice should be closely looked as well in order to have the proper basis for a comparative analysis inside the cluster on project level. Simple outsourcing is not considered as a topic for this cluster, as in this case the private sphere only implements the projects acting as a “hand” of the public actor but does not apply the co-governance approach in practice. However, complex outsourcing schemes that provide space for decision for both parties may be part of this cluster.

**Specific research questions**

1. What is the scope of decision making public and private partners have in PPP type of collaborations? How flexible the PPP contracts are?

2. How green values and business values mix up in motivating business actors to enter into PPP contracts? Are there any common characteristics of business actors (differentiating them from other business actors) that are more likely to enter into PP contracts regarding green spaces?

3. What are the mechanisms that ensure the balance between public and private interests (e.g. compensations, swap contracts, marketing)?

4. What are the mechanisms throughout which the public actors can control and evaluate the results of PPP contacts?

5. How do individual PPP projects contribute to the institutionalisation of private and public relations on policy level?

5.5 **Cluster E: Electronic governance in UGI**

The focus of this cluster is on stakeholder involvement in green infrastructure governance in a digital era. In electronic governance (E-governance), the rules, dynamics and behaviors are (partly) established through the use of information and communication technologies (ICT). Cluster E has a particular focus on the participatory aspects of using internet-based communication tools for protecting and developing the urban green infrastructure in a participatory manner.

This cluster encompasses a number of case studies, but also an inventory of UGI E-governance cases.

**Delineation**

We are searching for examples of GI governance where the use of communication technologies works for the benefit of broad stakeholder involvement or in other ways facilitate participation processes. The initiatives and scale of the use of e-governance tools can vary. Initiatives where e-tools are used can arise from bottom-up or top-down initiated processes or in collaborations in-
between. Actors can be government, private firms, NGOs, institutions (i.e. a university) and social society at different levels and intensity at different times throughout the processes

**Specific research questions**

*For inventory and case studies*

6. What innovative examples of UGI E-governance tools are present in GS case cities and additional cities?

7. In what contexts are they represented?

8. What stakeholders are engaged – are there patterns? New groups represented?

9. Who initiates the use of E-tools (in the various GI governance processes)?

10. What typologies show in the examples of GI e-governance? (What is targeted? I.e. policy making, the physical environment, environmental learning, social cohesion, activism)

11. What are the results/outcome/spin-off? (I.e. where there tangible results, did any other projects, initiatives, movements, associations etc. arise from the e-governance approach)?

*For case studies only*

1. Democratic structure: How does e-governance enhance possibilities for participation? How are the e-governance tools developed and are they biased for "official" values?

2. Participative structure: How can different dynamics of e-governance be described? What barriers / challenges can be detected (I.e. not keeping up pace with what is happening in practice, excluding stakeholders, ethics, accountability, costs)? Where in the processes do e-tools serve as most important?

3. How does the use of e-tools impact the process and outcome?

4. How have results been implemented into land-use, management, planning and other practices?

5. How can outcomes be analysed from ecological (biodiversity, ecosystem services), social (social inclusion) and economic (cost-efficient?) points of view.
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APPENDIX 1: SEMI-STRUCTURED LIST OF INTERVIEW TOPICS

This semi-structured list can be used as an important guideline and starting point for conducting your own semi-structured questionnaires, and we strongly suggest you to use it for this purpose. Please be aware that, although this is a semi-structured list of interview topics, you should always adapt your research questions to local situations and carefully formulate questions for each interview. Try to ‘translate’ the questions in such a way that they are ‘understandable’ for respondents (e.g. generally don’t pose too ‘scientific’ questions when interviewing citizens and try to avoid terms such as ‘institutional’).

One important remark: this list already suggests around 70 interview questions. It is likely that you cannot ask this many questions within the timeframe of one interview, so carefully think which questions are most important to ask to this specific respondent. **At least make sure that you gather all data required to answer the research questions.** Some questions will likely not be of application to all interviews/cases and some questions (like those about the name and site of the initiative) can sometimes be taken out before the interview questions if these things are already clear.

Clusters are welcome to make additions to this list if they feel the need to do so.

**Background of respondent**

- *Could you tell me something about your personal background?*
- *In what way do you deal with/are you involved in the initiative?*
  The initiative, in this context, refers to the specific arrangement you are studying.

**Background of case and developments over time**

- *What is the name of the initiative?*
- *What is the city region on which it focuses?*
- *To what area(s) does the initiative apply?*
- *How does this area/do these areas link to the wider network of urban green infrastructure?*
- *What is the year of origin?*
- *How and why did the initiative come about?*
- *What are the current aims and ambitions of the initiative?*
- *What strategies are being used to achieve the objectives?*
  Strategies can be anything ranging from protesting, planting trees, writing opinion papers, educating people, mowing grass, having a barbeque with the neighbours.
- *Have these aims and ambitions changed over time? How and why?*
- *What are the future aims and ambitions?*

**Perceived effects**

- *What are important results of the initiative? What did it manage to achieve? How does this relate to the goals of the initiative?*
• Were there any effects you didn’t anticipate, either positive or negative?
• Could you tell a bit more about the green effects of the initiative? Is this your personal impression or has any research been done to investigate this? Do you feel all actors agree on these effects?
  Explain to the respondent that this includes both direct effects on physical space and more general biological effects. ‘Green’ effects can for example relate to increasing green space area; improving the quality of existing green space; contributing to biodiversity; delivering of ecosystem services; improving connectivity.
• Could you tell a bit more about the social effects of the initiative? Is this your personal impression or has any research been done to investigate this? Do you feel all actors agree on these effects?
  Social effects can for example include experiencing green space/nature (including recreation); social cohesion and integration; providing education; improving human health.
• Did the initiative also have economic effects?
  Economic effects can for example include the creation of new job opportunities, the development of transferable skills, the acquisition of financial profits.

Success and failure

• What do you see as the most important successes which the initiative has managed to achieve?
  Please remember that successes and effects are not the same. If the respondent has already discussed the aspects of success and failure when discussing effects, these questions can be skipped. If not, it’s worth reiterating the point as this closely relates to the main objective of Tier 2.
• Why do you see this as important successes?
• What do you see as the most important failures which the initiative has had to deal with?
• Why do you see this as important failures?
• Are there any important local conditions which have had an influence on this success and failure?

Actors and coalitions

• Could you describe which stakeholders (people and/or organisations) are involved in the initiative?
• In what ways are these stakeholders involved?
• Which stakeholders were most important throughout the process? Why?
  Try to identify why these stakeholders were important (e.g. through, skills, expertise, resources, campaigning, legitimacy, democratic processes, etc.)
• Did stakeholders form coalitions throughout the process?
  If necessary/unclear what exactly is understood as a ‘coalition’, explain to the respondent that a coalition is a group of actors which works together in order to realize a certain objective.
  Process’ encompasses the time which has passed since the establishment of the initiative and the developments which have taken place in this time.
• Were there tensions between stakeholders or coalitions at some point? Why? Did they overcome these tensions?

Background of stakeholders/biocultural perspective

• Could you tell a bit more about the background of the involved stakeholders?
This can include cultural, socio-economic and occupational backgrounds, expertise, local identity and cultural values.

- **Do you think these differences have led to tensions? If so, why?**
  Try to probe for aspects which relate to the cultural values, motivations, the expertise and the local identity of different stakeholder groups.
  Try to probe for aspects which relate to the cultural values, the expertise and the local identity of different stakeholder groups.

---

**Is there an increasing variety of external stakeholders included in decision making as a result of the initiative?**

- **Can you think of people or groups that are not fully represented? Do you know why?**

---

**Discourse**

- **What is seen as the most important functions of green space? What kind of green space do you consider important for these functions?**
  For functions: think for example of recreation, food production, but also about ecosystem services, climate change adaptation and the like. But rather ask this as an open question instead of bringing up all those (sometimes complex) terms.

- **At the beginning of the interview, we have discussed the general aims of the initiative. How do you personally feel about these ideas? Do you have any additional or critical ideas about these aims?**

- **Are there other (conflicting) ideas than those being promoted by the initiative?**
  This has to be seen in context of what’s happening in the city/the surroundings of the initiative. So specify your question accordingly. Ask, for example, what other ideas there are regarding the park in which the initiative is situated.

- **How did ideas/objectives change or disappear within the course of the process? Why?**
  This includes new ideas which came into being during the process, which ideas ‘won’ and why.

- **Do you know something about the opinion towards the initiative of people who live in the surroundings of the initiative?**

---

**Rules of the game**

- **Is everybody free to participate in the initiative, or do specific any criteria exist about who can join the initiative? Who defined these criteria?**

- **Do you experience any differences in how people work between stakeholders and/or municipality? e.g. in formalising meetings and agreements, the importance of scientific knowledge. Can you see any different views on ‘doing things’ between actors within the initiative and/or with organisations with whom the initiative collaborate?**

- **Are there also written rules about procedures, agreements or formalities? Do actors agree on the need for and use of this?**

- **Have important rules within the initiative changed over time?**

- **What strategies are being used to exercise political influence?**

---

6 A difference which is sometimes made in literature is between ‘handbook’ (following formal rules and procedures) and ‘handshake’ (following informal structures)
Resources

- **How is the initiative being funded?**
- **How are non-monetary resources (e.g. expertise, land, etc.) provided and accessed?**
- **To what extent has the initiative been able to obtain or create the required resources?**
- **Did the initiative get any money, material, staff support or other form of support from the government?**

Innovativeness

- **Is there anything which you consider to be innovative/new/inventive about this initiative?**
  Not all respondents will be able to/feel qualified to answer this question
- **If so, could you please describe what this is and why it is innovative?**
- **Is this only innovative within the local context, or can it also be seen as an innovation elsewhere (city, country, Europe)?**

Context

- **Are there specific policy problems or policy discussions in the city that can be related to the initiative? How?**
- **Can you identify external factors which are of importance to the initiative?**
  If this is unclear, explain that this can for example include the political constellation, socio-economic situation, environmental factors, networks in the city.
- **Are there any external factors that challenged the development of the initiative?**

Relation to policies and collaboration with governmental actors

- **Are there any (municipality) government policies that influence on the initiative, either positively or negatively? Can you briefly describe these? Does the municipality implement formal policies to support local green initiatives?**
- **Are there also other policies (national, regional, provincial, ...) which are of importance on the local level to support green space initiatives?**
- **Did the initiative have an effect on formal policies or formal institutions? If so, what kind of effects? Did policies change as a result of the initiative?**
  This encompasses the institutional effects Kati suggested. The term ‘institutional effects’ might be a bit confusing, therefore it’s slightly rephrased for interviewing purposes.
- **How is collaboration between governmental and non-governmental actors within the context of the initiative? How does the local government supports, interferes and/or hinders the initiative?**
- **Do you think the initiative has effect on the power relationship between municipality and non-government actors?**

Closing down

- **Is there anything else you would like to add?**
APPENDIX 2: DESCRIPTION OF CLUSTERS

Cluster A: Methods and strategies to initiate participation in neighbourhood green plans.

This cluster focuses on municipality initiated (top-down) methods and strategies to initiate participation and to facilitate (bottom-up) citizen initiatives. These methods and strategies might be specifically aimed at urban green spaces like in the Neighbourhood Green Plans in Utrecht, but they might also be more general in their orientation. For example, participatory budgeting in Lisbon is not specifically aimed at green space, but many of the submitted and accepted proposals deal with urban green spaces in some way.

Delineation
The cases included in this cluster are in fact all methods and strategies (or, one could argue, policies) initiated by the municipality. These policies are the ‘cases’ which we scrutinize in this cluster, and a case is thus limited to a certain specific policy and its implications.

We see the cases in this cluster manifest themselves on different levels of scale: first of all, they are municipality-wide, top-down created policies which have a municipality-wide impact. Secondly, in Utrecht and Bristol, resources and responsibilities are distributed across several regions within the city for which there are different (green)plans in the city, while within Lisbon there are also regional governments involved in the participatory budgeting schemes. Thirdly, policies are also manifested through ‘bottom-up’ initiatives by citizens who use these policies to pursue certain objectives related to

In this cluster, focus is not just on policies and their (possible) implications within the cities. We also need to know what happens when a policy ‘hits the ground’: how it is picked up by citizens and how it is implemented on street level. What are roles of municipality actors and of citizens in this? So, apart from focusing on the policies as a whole and their effects and implications on the city level, the case study should also zoom in on one or two specific examples of citizen initiatives manifested through the policies. The case study can also focus on a specific regional level within the city, but should always include some concrete examples of citizen initiatives manifested through the policies.

Cluster-Specific Research Questions

- Through what means are policies to initiate participation and to facilitate (bottom-up) citizen initiatives implemented within the municipality?
- What are the implications and effects of the policies on street level?
- What kinds of projects actually gain support from government actors? (are they small, big, to what extent is UGI incorporated or UGI planning affected?)
- How far were citizen ideas/vision/proposals actually delivered/realized?
- How do government actors view citizen involvement? (as democratic decision making, or as an instrumental means to achieve their own objectives?)
• How is power/influence realized within decision making processes (i.e. the tools which are used, the standards and technical aspects applied, the limitations and framing of the scope) and what are the implications for social inclusion?

Case studies
Lisbon: Participatory Budgetting in Lisbon
Utrecht: Neighbourhood Green Plans in Utrecht
Bristol: Neighbourhood Planning Approach

Cluster B: Urban Agriculture and temporary gardening

This cluster is concerned with innovative governance arrangements in relation to urban agriculture (UA). We have agreed as the key focus of our research in this cluster: the role of UA in the creation of urban green infrastructure (UGI). As such, we aim at a better understanding of UA as part of the UGI, not UA as such. All initiatives considered in this cluster therefore need to have a physical green space component. Aspects of groups’ activities beyond creating green spaces (e.g., campaigning, knowledge exchange, marketing, trading activities) might be captured as part of the general questions but fall outwith our cluster-specific research interest.

This cluster includes cases illustrating how UA is integrated in contemporary UGI governance across a range of European cities. We consider all innovative UA arrangements that contribute to UGI. Given the innovative character of temporary gardening initiatives in partnership with local authorities and developers, we are keen to include some examples of this. Studies on temporary gardening may be carried out in relation to initiatives managing green spaces on derelict or other brownfield sites, but also on land in transition.

Delineation

• Cases must be about community-led management of green spaces that have a land-based, food growing or farming component as well. Plans and policies can only be considered if they can be linked to specific land-based initiatives.
• The UA initiative needs to provide multiple ecosystem services.

Cases
Malmoe: To be determined

Edinburgh: Duddingston Field Group. This is a community which planted and manages an apple and plum orchard on public land. There is a focus on education with >100 different varieties of apples, of which many are ancient species that are no longer in commercial production. Managing the orchards is, however, a sub-activity as the group is mainly concerned with habitat regeneration of the field through planting native woodland trees and meadow plants.

Many of those involved in the Field Group, also engage in management of a community garden on an adjacent plot. Although community gardening is by no means innovative within Edinburgh, this project is unique because the land is publicly accessible and not divided into allotments.
Furthermore, the land is in community ownership. The group also manages a flock of free-range chicken for egg consumption.

Ljubljana: A Community-Based Garden Intervention in a Degraded Urban Space. In collaboration with residents of the neighbourhood and other interested people, locals have been transforming an area near Resljeva Street into a community space for urban gardening, socializing, education, and culture. The project shows the potential of degraded urban areas and the possibility of creating new value through temporary use and community-based interventions. The project enhances and promotes possibilities for urban gardening as well as more active inclusion of inhabitants in decision-making about planning, development, and management of urban spaces. The plot owner is the Municipality of Ljubljana and it allows free usage of the land.

Szeged: The "Stopping place" (in Hungarian: Megálló) community garden opened on 21 June 2014 and it is the very first garden as such in the city. It is located in a Community Center’s garden (which is the property of the Municipality) and it is rented by a local NGO (Maszk Association). The Association also got some support to create the place from EU funds. Eleven families have their own place for gardening here, however, many more indicated that they would like to join as well. Unfortunately, there is no more capacity for them within this garden. (Because of this success, a second community garden was opened in October.) The garden is not just about food production, but creating a real, living small community as well. The members like to spend their free time here with each other, and this is especially good for the families' children.

The garden is also used for educational purposes; they bring children from local kindergartens to study about gardening, edible plants and useful herbs playfully. However the community gardens such as this are not very new in many Western countries, for the New Member States they are. This case can be very useful to study because it could be quite innovative for other countries with similar context.

Lisbon: The allotment gardens network in Lisbon constitutes an important element of the city’s strategy for achieving a more sustainable and inclusive future. This network is promoted not only because it contributes to the city’s ecology, but also to self-sufficiency in food production, constituting a key element in the city’s UGI. The city’s allotment gardens policy has a strong educational and recreational focus and fosters relationships between neighbors and cultural groups.

Cluster-Specific Research Questions

Some of the questions will have to reflect the linkages with other work packages to allow for knowledge exchange on this cross-work package topic. The list of questions will be refined based on a quick literature review on the role of UA in the creation of urban green infrastructure.

For contributing to the work of other work packages

- Does the UA contribute substantially to the income of the urban farmers?
• Does the UA create new job opportunities, lead to the development of transferable skills or help the urban farmers to get a better social position (improved possibilities to get a job)?
• What is the business model of the UA initiative?
• Do the biocultural values and objectives of the different actors support collaboration or raise conflicts/barriers?
• What social group is predominantly involved? Who can join the initiative and how? Is the initiative socially inclusive?
• Is there a formal policy on urban agriculture by the local government? What are the main objectives? Are there ways in which the local government informally supports, interferes or hinders the UA initiative?

On the role of UA in the creation of UGI

• What are the effects of UA?
• What policy concepts (i.e., biodiversity, climate change adaptation, green economy, human health & social cohesion) does this initiative help to deliver, and how? Is this explicitly acknowledged in policy documents or otherwise evidenced (e.g., biodiversity data monitoring)?
• How is the green space used for UA physically linked in with the wider green infrastructure? Has the initiative led to more interlinked green spaces? Is this explicitly acknowledged in policy documents or otherwise evidenced?
• Has the initiative contributed to the integration of urban green with other (built-up and transport) infrastructures? Is this explicitly acknowledged in policy documents or otherwise evidenced?
• Has the initiative led to the delivery of a wider range of economic, socio-cultural and environmental benefits than previously was the case? Is this explicitly acknowledged in policy documents or otherwise evidenced?

Cluster-Specific Interview Questions

• Are there any products and/or services provided as part of the initiative and are these traded, consumed by group members or given away free of charge?
• Do different stakeholder groups use or relate to the farmed green space in different ways? Does this lead to conflict?
• What has been the effect of practicing UA on the quality of the green space for each of the following purposes: biodiversity, social cohesion, human health, green economy and climate change adaptation? Can these effects be evidenced (e.g., visitor numbers, biodiversity surveys, using companion planting and/or crop rotation versus previous use of pesticides)?
• Are there ways in which the local government informally supports, interferes or hinders the UA initiative? Are the benefits described in IQ 3 acknowledged and valued by city officials?

Cluster C: Community-led management of green spaces

This cluster focuses on relatively large examples of community management of green spaces. These studies may be carried out in a variety of greenspace settings, and are connected with formal governance arrangements, meaning that the initiatives have some degree of permanence.
because the space is designated or recognised by function (e.g. parks, woodlands, regenerated brownfield sites, river banks, urban features such as roundabouts and squares/courtyards).

Delineation

- **Cases need to have a ‘physical component’: they have to be part of an arrangement which is physically bound to one or more specific sites. This site-bound arrangement is the ‘case’**.
- **Cases need to involve the management of green space by non-government actors. This involvement in management needs to be significant. Although this is hard to exactly define, this should mean that a large part of management (but not necessarily most) is done by non-government actors.**
- **Cases need to consider permanent green spaces.**

We feel that cases are all initiated by non-governmental actors and that it is most fruitful to explicitly focus on bottom-up initiatives (but we could perhaps leave some room for collaborative efforts).

**Cases**

*Amsterdam*: De Ruige Hof is a society with around 1200 members and 60 regular volunteers managing 13 hectares of spontaneously developed ‘historical’ nature in two areas in/around the city of Amsterdam.

*Edinburgh*: Duddingston Field Group – A community managing 2.5 ha of greenspace, including an apple and plum orchard, to engage in ecological habitat restoration and to provide a high amenity recreational space for the community.

*Milan*: [case description to be included]

*Berlin*: Lichtenrader Volkspark – a community managed park of approx. 5 ha since the early 1980s, mostly financed by donations and park association memberships and realised by voluntary work, every Saturday up to 25 volunteers meet for maintenance work.

**Cluster-Specific Research Questions**

- **What is the long-term perspective for community managed green spaces?**
  Do they develop into new institutions? Does the relationship with local governments change over time and does this influence the relationship with neighbourhood actors/citizens? How are these relationships managed/maintained?

- **Has the local identity or culture of people in this community influenced the green space associated with this initiative? If so, how?**
  Have the activities of the group influenced experiences, learning and/or behaviour of local people? If so, how?

- **Has the initiative been made possible due to state retrenchment from providing socio-environmental public services? If so, does the community group aim to restore the provision of such services? What strategy does the community group take to deliver this?**
Cluster D: Public-private partnerships for green space and ESS development

Initiatives in cluster D are projects that were implemented in coalition between the public and private actors by resulting mutual benefits for both parties.

Delineation

We do not consider simple outsourcing as a topic for Cluster D as this case the private sphere only implements the projects acting as a “hand” of the public actor but does not apply the co-governance approach in practice, however complex outsourcing schemes, that provide space for decision for both parties may subject to this cluster. An initiative in cluster D is either a specific project which was implemented in private (business)-public partnership or a regular practice on PPP which is based on written documents, legal regulations. If a practice is the object of analysis then 1-2 exact projects of the practice are to be closely investigated as well.

Cases

Aarhus: Aarhus City Council in cooperation with the state is implementing a long term forestation strategy in order to protect springs of drinking water and provide healthy environment for the residents. Besides public and University actors private farmers and other business actors participated in the project in different ways:

- by buying and planting trees in the target area and in their own sites,
- by land-swap schemes,
- by using the planted area for environment friendly business activities (e.g. tourism, recreation, farming),
- by co-operating with a contractor on the possibilities to shape, maintain and develop the forest.

Lodz: Sokolowka case study, where the developer of a new residential estate transformed a nearby public riverside area into a park which was meant to serve as a recreational space for the estate’s inhabitants while remaining freely accessible to the general public.

Oradea: Based on a local government decree business actors have the opportunity to develop and maintain certain green spaces (like roundabouts and smaller parks) for a certain period of time (like 3 years) and they are entitled to put their “name cards” into the spaces in return.

In addition to these three cases Cluster D gets additional information on already analysed PPP cases from the UK and Portugal. These cases will not be fully valuable case studies, but the cases (based on already available written materials) can serve as a background to understand a wider scope of PPP solutions throughout Europe.

Cluster-Specific Research Questions

- What is the scope of decision making public and private partners have in PPP type of collaborations? How flexible the PPP contracts are?
How green values and business values mix up in motivating business actors to enter into PPP contracts? Are there any common characteristics of business actors (differentiating them from other business actors) that are more likely to enter into PP contracts regarding green spaces?

What are the mechanisms that ensure the balance between public and private interests (e.g. compensations, swap contracts, marketing)?

What are the mechanisms throughout which the public actors can control and evaluate the results of PPP contracts?

How individual PPP projects contribute to the institutionalisation of private and public relations on policy level?

Cluster E: Electronic governance in UGI

The focus of this cluster is on stakeholder involvement in green infrastructure governance in a digital era. We are searching for examples of GI governance where the use of communication technologies works for the benefit of broad stakeholder involvement or in other ways facilitate participation processes.

The outcome of this cluster should be 1) a comprehensive overview of cases where e-governance tools, as for example PGIS, apps for mobile phones, interactive web sites or web-based platforms serves for the benefit of stakeholders involvement, communication, building of network, project development, etc. and 2) in-depth case studies from three GS cities analyzing dynamics, outreach, possibilities and barriers for e-governance.

The two parts of Cluster E:

An inventory of GI e-governance cases
For the inventory, we are looking for cases where electronic tools benefit the process of involving a variety of stakeholders to participate in planning, development and/or management of urban green infrastructure. The aim of the inventory is give an overview of the spectrum of European e-governance.

In-depth study of cases
Suggestions: Helsinki, Almada and Linz – suggestions are welcome. For the case studies, processes of the above will be described in-depth from beginning to end/current state (product).

Definition of E-governance for cluster E

E-governance shows in many forms and on different scales. Broadly speaking, e-governance is the interface between public sector, local community and private firms. The aim of e-governance is to improve information and service delivery, encourage citizen participation in the decision-making process and to make government/governance more accountable, transparent and effective (Unesco, 2011).
The initiatives and scale of the use of e-governance tools can vary. Initiatives where e-tools are used can arise from bottom-up or top-down initiated processes or in collaborations in-between. *Actors* can be government, private firms, NGOs, institutions (i.e. a university) and social society at different levels and intensity at different times throughout the processes. The rules, dynamics and behaviors that are established through (or partly through) the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) are of interest for the research of this cluster.

Cluster E has a particular focus on the *participatory* aspects of using internet-based communication tools for protecting and developing the urban green infrastructure in a participatory manner.

**Features of E-governance**
- Facilitate direct public participation and dynamic interaction between stakeholders
- Focus on networking and interaction among stakeholders
- Facilitation of citizens/stakeholders engagement
- Enhancement of social inclusion (targeting new stakeholders)
- Stakeholders can obtain knowledge and give input to the process throughout the process i.e. on their interest in environmental problems, protection and engagement in the development of urban green

**Examples**

**Cases**
*Helsinki*
E-tools have been used to involve citizens in the identification of green spaces that are of importance to them. A soft GIS tool has been used to involve residents in mapping green space values. This tool has reached out to a large and broad group of residents. About 4700 people from Helsinki contributed to the last survey.