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1 Project context

Urban Green Spaces (UGS) provide various environmental, social and economic benefits to cities and their population. UGS have a basic role in making residential and working environments more livable places, improving environmental performance (e.g. filtering pollutants and CO₂ from air) and in climate resilience.

However, because of the ongoing (sub)urbanisation processes, (semi-)natural environment and all types of green spaces are increasingly getting under pressure, which leads to fragmentation of ecosystem networks contributing to biodiversity loss.

As green spaces and their thoughtful development and management enables us tackling a series of harmful environmental impacts and climate change related risks there is a common demand for better functioning operational models for Urban Green Space governance.

The Urban Green Belts (UGB) project’s main objective is to improve planning, management and decision-making capacities of the public sector related to urban green spaces, thus creating integrated sustainable UGS planning and management systems.

The common challenges of weak, non-integrated UGS management in CE FUAs call for smart solutions that will be co-created and tested in the project. Following a comparative situation analysis partners will jointly elaborate innovative methods and tools aiming at sustainable UGS management focusing on:

1. Green Infrastructure as a smart tool for providing ecological, economic & social benefits through natural solutions which local decision-makers are generally not aware of. Therefore, a GIS-based spatial planning decision support tool will be elaborated for assessing and evaluating existing green spaces, facilitating the application of the GI approach in strategic planning.

2. Community involvement into planning and implementation processes are rarely applied yet in the region, though are crucial for ensuring social & economic sustainability of UGS management. Smart techniques for awareness raising and activation of civil society organizations and citizens through community building will be elaborated.

3. Multi-stakeholder governance is an inevitable but underexploited tool for effectively managing UGS. Smart solutions promoting cooperation of different governance levels, sectors and internally across various departments of authorities will be developed, as well as a training curriculum for municipalities on application of integrated UGS planning and management in the context of multi-stakeholder governance.

These solutions, methods and tools will be compiled into three UGB Smart Models that will be tested through Pilot actions during the project:

- Model 1: GIS-based solutions
- Model 2: Community involvement
- Model 3: Multi-stakeholder governance

The relationship among these elements is shown on Figure 1.
Figure 1: Connection among the Framework, the UGB Smart Models and the Pilot actions

The owchart of the development process of the UGB Smart Models is shown on Figure 2. In line with this, as a rst step, a draft model will be developed which then will be tested through Pilot Actions. The nalized model will be an integral part of the Smart UGS Governance Manual, that is one of the major outputs of the project.

During the whole process FUA level Stakeholder Platform meetings and UGB Transnational meetings will support the development. Furthermore, a Transnational Synergy Workshop with similar projects and initiatives will help to identify and include knowledge and experience on the topic outside the consortium.

Figure 2: Flowchart of the development of the UGB Smart Models
2 Objective

The objective of this document is to provide a Smart Model for Multi-Stakeholder Urban Green Space Governance (Model 3 under the Urban Green Belts project).

The model functions as a flexible methodology, including a range of applicable instruments to involve stakeholders into planning, developing and maintenance of urban green spaces. It provides guidance on setting-up and operating integrated multi-stakeholder frameworks and new cooperation forms.

The model will be tested by pilot actions and finalized based on the lessons learnt through carrying these out. Two pilots will be undertaken:
- one in Budapest on multi-level governance;
- and another in Prague on institutionalized forms of cooperation with involvement of non-governmental actors.

The model also serves as a tool for capacity building of public authorities that aims at more effective and sustainable urban green space management.

3 Who can use this model?

Organizations and bodies at diverse governance levels (national, regional, local, and neighborhood/community) are targeted by this model, but primarily it is aimed for local and regional public authorities, which are key players in urban green space governance.

The secondary target group include urban planners and developers, landscape planners, park and garden maintenance companies, forestry agencies, environmental organizations, allotment societies, and local community groups.

4 How to use the model?

The model can help in:
- understanding Multi-Stakeholder Governance and how it can support working in partnership;
- involving regional and local stakeholders during planning phase, in order to get their buy-in and support, ensuring long term benefits for the local community;
- developing instruments and tools targeting multi-level governance, as well as institutionalized forms of cooperation with involvement of non-governmental actors, based on the various methods described;
- implementing instruments and tools in partnership.
The model includes a range of instruments targeting enhanced UGS governance that can be applied by local or regional authorities to design customized instruments addressing local needs. The various instruments are illustrated by case examples drawn from various cities across Europe.

Section 5 of this document provides information on the scoping of the model, including a thematic scoping with the delineation of relevant sub-topics, as well as the territorial scoping of the model, placing a specific emphasis on the level of Functional Urban Areas.

Section 6 delves deeper into the theoretical background of multi-level governance (origin of the concept, definition, main characteristics, underlying principles) and of the institutionalized forms of cooperation with involvement of non-governmental actors.

Section 7 describes the methodology providing information on specific instruments for both multi-level governance and for the institutionalized forms of cooperation with involvement of non-governmental actors.
5  Scoping

5.1  Thematic scoping

The conceptual basis and the connections among the Smart Models developed under the UGB project are shown in Figure 3.

The basic starting point of decision making associated with the complex issue of urban green space development and management is the multi-stakeholder governance approach, that includes the involvement of governmental and non-governmental organizations, such as civil society, business, academia and the media.

Smart, GIS based solutions have a strong role in supporting the whole process, these are tackled in Model 1 of the UGB project.

Model 2 and Model 3 are covering separate areas of the multi-stakeholder environment. Model 2 is focusing on citizens and civil society organizations under the framework of community involvement.

Model 3 provides a flexible methodology for multi-stakeholder governance, that addresses internal and external cooperation frameworks. The model will focus on two important aspects: (Model 3.1) multi-level governance and (Model 3.2) institutionalized forms of cooperation with non-governmental actors.

Both Model 2 and Model 3 addresses numerous stakeholders. The scope of Model 2 can be differentiated from the scope of the sub-topic of Model 3 on Institutionalized forms of cooperation with non-governmental actors (Model 3.2) according to the following:

- while Model 2 focuses on bottom-up approaches, in Model 3.2 the focus is on top-down approaches;
- Model 2 focuses on work with citizens, and on consultation;
- the sub-topic on institutionalized forms of cooperation deals with arrangements that are explicitly initiated and led by public authorities based on a contractual form according to which responsibilities are delegated to the non-governmental actor(s).

The two sub-topics of Model 3 can be differentiated in line with the following:

- multi-level governance sub-topic (Model 3.1): deals with multiple governmental actors;
- institutionalized forms of cooperation sub-topic (Model 3.2): arrangements can include also only two actors; the focus is on cooperation with non-governmental actors;
- in multi-level governance, the final responsibility remains with the municipality, while in case of institutionalized cooperation the responsibility is not with the municipality any more.
Figure 3 Conceptual basis and connections of the three models under the UGB project
### 5.2 Territorial scoping

Multi-stakeholder governance concept is an approach mostly treated as a process aiming at the involvement of all relevant stakeholders, meaning those who impacted are by the planned decisions, into the decision making through a dialogue process.

Beside the multi-stakeholder characteristic effective urban green space management requires a strong multi-level approach as well. Urban green spaces are integral parts of different level public administration units, a cooperation among these governance level is essential. Within the UGB project special attention is given to the level of Functional Urban Areas.

A functional urban area (FUA) is a functional economic unit characterised by densely inhabited “urban cores” and “hinterlands” whose labour market is highly integrated with the cores. The definition originating from labour market and commuting considerations provides a spatial delimitation beyond administrative borders which is relevant for a multitude of thematic fields, such as for example transport (e.g. commuting, transport flows etc.), economic development (e.g. labour market, strategic positioning, etc.), environment (e.g. air/water quality, soil sealing, urban sprawl, etc.), social (e.g. health care, social housing etc.).

Figure 4 represents a possible connection among the public administration territorial units and the functional urban area.

The model to be developed under the UGB project will help planning and implementing such dialogue processes linking various territorial levels.

![Relation between FUA and different public administration territorial units](image)

---

6 Theoretical background

6.1 Multi-level governance

Multi-level governance is a relatively newly emerged governance theory. It has its origins in the early 1990s and in Europe it is basically connected to the formulation of the European Union through the processes ended in the signing of the Maastricht Treaty.

The term, multi-level governance, was originally developed by the EU’s Committee of the Regions (CoR) in 2009. It outlines the European Commission’s aim to ‘build Europe in partnership’ and have an inclusive European decision-making process

In line with the White Paper on multi-level governance ‘the shift from a resource-based to a knowledge-based European society necessitates a corresponding change in modes of governance, which should focus in the future on a more crosscutting holistic and inclusive approach resulting in more targeted Community strategies and the introduction of coordinated and integrated common policies’. The main idea behind multi-level governance was the importance of cooperation among the different government levels in a unique formulation, such as the European Union. That clearly vertical cooperation (from supranational to local level) was soon enlarged with a horizontal approach, first tackling the cooperation among bodies at the same governance level, e.g. municipalities. The concept was quickly spreading during the 1990’s and started to be applied in processes tackling complex issues, involving several stakeholders horizontally and directly.

Although it is hard to draw a distinct border line between multi-stakeholder and multi-level governance approaches the most important differentiating factor is that multi-level governance is focusing on governmental organizations (government bodies and authorities) while multi-stakeholder approaches has a focus on non-governmental organizations (civil society, business, academia) discussing subjects with governmental organizations.

In the Handbook for Multilevel Urban Governance in Europe, multi-level governance is defined “as an arrangement for making binding decisions that engages a multiplicity of politically independent but otherwise interdependent actors – private and public – at different levels of territorial aggregation in more-or-less continuous negotiation/deliberation/implementation, and that does not assign exclusively policy competence or assert a stable hierarchy of political authority to any levels”. Multi-level governance is a dynamic process, which helps to increase joint ownership and implementation

A central element to the concept of multi-level governance, is the recognition that delivering policies, actions and strategies, is more effective in collaboration. Accordingly, in its simplest form, multi-level governance means working together across different levels of government, to deliver policies more effectively.

---

Five principles are identified in the White Paper on European Governance that form the basis of good governance:

- **openness**: attaching more importance to transparency and communication in decision-making;
- **participation**: ensuring participation of all relevant actors;
- **accountability**: clarifying the role of each party in the decision-making process; each actor involved should assume responsibility for the role given to them;
- **effectiveness**: decisions need to be taken at the appropriate level and time, and deliver what is needed;
- **coherence**: ensuring coherence between diverse actions.

The application of multi-level governance directly contributes to the effective implementation and enhancement of these principles.

In multi-level governance, an integrated approach is applied that ensures the effectiveness of policy development. It involves a vertical dimension, which assists better coordination and cooperation between the different tiers of government, as well as a horizontal dimension, which brings about a coherent implementation of various sectoral policies.

The application of the multi-stakeholder governance approach can contribute to multiple benefits. In line with the guide of the Coopenergy project on multi-level governance⁴, through these benefits authorities can:

- ensure coherence among local, regional and national policies;
- develop clear and consistent visions reflecting local realities and strategic needs;
- establish more favorable financing mechanisms (partnership including a range of actors can create more secure and stable conditions to attract funds and investments);
- ensure effective communication that is harmonized between stakeholders;
- establish consistent monitoring and reporting practices;
- share expertise, skills and knowledge;
- pool resources, skills and techniques;
- agree on clear roles and relationships, creating better ownership for actions.

In the field of urban green space management multi-level governance incorporates diverse sectoral policies (such as employment, education, environment, culture, spatial policy, social policy) into UGS governance at diverse governance levels (neighborhood/district, city, city-region, region, and state) to achieve a holistic territorial policy approach.

6.2 Institutionalized forms of cooperation with involvement of non-governmental actors

A growing number of local authorities across Europe invest efforts into re-establishing power relations with non-governmental actors, developing collaborative forms of governance aiming at improved management and maintenance of urban green space. Collaborative arrangements allow for more flexible, decentralized and networked governance structures and create opportunities for the integration of non-governmental actors, businesses, networks and citizens.

Forms of such cooperation can differ in the level of involvement of the public authority. The spectrum includes grassroots endorsed by municipalities; co-governance (partnership between an authority and non-governmental actors, with power shared evenly between partners); and municipality driven initiatives.
7 Methodology

The methodology includes a range of applicable instruments to involve stakeholders into planning, developing and maintenance of urban green spaces. It provides guidance on setting-up and operating integrated multi-stakeholder frameworks and new cooperation forms.

For each instrument detailed under the methodology, specific challenges associated with certain elements of UGS governance are addressed, as well as potential solutions and approaches to be applied, and for illustration also practical examples are provided.

The methodology provides information on specific instruments for both multi-level governance and for the institutionalized forms of cooperation with involvement of non-governmental actors.

7.1 Instruments for implementing multi-level governance

The model applies an extended approach of multi-level governance. It focuses on the following elements:

- cooperation with external stakeholders on a vertical level: this means the classical multi-level approach, cooperation with higher and if relevant lower level governmental bodies, from international to local level;
- cooperation with external stakeholders on a horizontal level: this part has two elements, on one hand cooperation with external governmental bodies on the same governance level (e.g. competent authorities). On the other hand, it includes cooperation with similar governmental organizations on the same level, in our case with other municipalities, especially within the Functional Urban Area;
- cooperation with internal stakeholders: in the relation of urban green space management this refers to cooperation within the municipality with other departments, offices, municipal companies.

The instruments supporting multi-level governance detailed in the model can be grouped into the following categories:

- instruments promoting participation of diverse actors;
- instruments promoting territorial cooperation;
- instruments promoting integrated local actions

For planning and running a multi-level governance process well trained human capacity is needed. The methodology includes also a training curriculum that is elaborated to train the relevant staff for these tasks. (Annex)
7.1.1 Local Strategic Partnerships

**Challenge:**

Lack of joint working at local level can be one of the key reasons for insufficient progress made in delivering sustainable regeneration of a local area, or improved public services that meet the needs of local people. A combination of organizations, and the community, working cooperatively has a greater chance of success.\(^5\)

**Description of the instrument:**

In urban green space governance, the establishment of a common vision, effective collaboration among various actors and a coherent action can be ensured through the establishment of local strategic partnerships. Such partnerships are initiated in most of the cases by governmental bodies.

Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) bring together representatives from the public, private, community and voluntary sectors in the areas of local authorities to address local problems, allocate funding, and discuss strategies and initiatives\(^6\). They aim to encourage joint working within a local community, preventing to work in silos (i.e. when people, teams or companies who are working towards the same objective, and often in close vicinity, are not sharing information that leads to wasted time and cost, and missed opportunities). As in the majority of the cases, the initiators of such partnerships are governmental bodies and authorities, these have instrumental role in driving the process. Vertical and horizontal cooperation of various governmental bodies is key factor for the success of such partnerships.

The main objective of an LSP is to set out the vision of an area, to integrate existing plans and initiatives, to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy and coordinate and drive the delivery of local services leading to improved outcomes for citizens. Benefits of a local strategic partnership include increased opportunities for joint provision of services, the ability to attract external funding and increased influence over the policies and structures of partner organizations.\(^5\) Typically, LSPs tend to focus on the regeneration and renewal of local areas and on improving the local quality of life.

**Aspects to consider:**

First a systematic assessment need to be undertaken in order to identify and prioritize stakeholders to be included in a local strategic partnership. During the initial analysis all the potential stakeholder groups linked to the topic in question need to be addressed. *Box 1* presents a list of various potential stakeholder categories to be taken into consideration.

---

Potential stakeholder categories:

- government departments
- government agencies
- municipal associations
- relevant municipalities (in case of a horizontal partnership)
- relevant municipal companies
- professional groups and their representative bodies
- public institutions (e.g. schools, hospitals)
- civil society organizations
- community groups
- utilities
- private companies
- research organizations
- landowners and land managers
- special-interest/lobby groups
- media

**Box 1  Potential stakeholder categories, Local Strategic Partnerships**

Building on this initial identification of stakeholders a number of strategic actors need to be selected for further engagement in the local strategic partnership. **Box 2 outlines a number of guiding questions that might be helpful in the selection process.**

**LSPs: Guiding questions for stakeholder identification**

- Who can substantially contribute to creation of the common vision?
- Who will be affected by the foreseen activities?
- Who can endorse the integration of existing plans and initiatives?
- Will the impacts be local, regional or national?
- Who has the power to influence the process?
- Who are the supporters and opponents?
- Who can facilitate or impede the process through their participation, non-participation or opposition?
- Are there specific relationships between various stakeholders that need to be addressed?
- Who can contribute with financial or technical resources towards the work?
- Are there stakeholder groups whose voices or interest in the issue may not be heard?
- Who will be responsible for implementing the foreseen activities?


**Box 2  Local Strategic Partnerships: Guiding questions for stakeholder identification**
The initiator of the partnership needs to decide on the level of engagement of the selected stakeholders in the joint work. Different levels of engagement to be considered in case of a local strategic partnership can include the following:

- **Consult**: a consultation process in which selected actors are asked to provide basic inputs or feedback; the process does not provide an ongoing opportunity for input.
- **Involve**: the governmental body (the initiator) is the decision-maker and there is no expectation of building consensus; multiple opportunities are provided for inputs.
- **Collaborate**: stakeholders are directly engaged in decision-making; an explicit attempt to find consensus solutions; the governmental body (the initiator) is still the ultimate decision-maker.

The structure of an LSP is flexible to a great degree, based strongly on the level of engagement, and is adapted to the needs of at the local level. This flexibility can lead to diverse arrangements, both in terms of who is represented and how the work is organized. Local strategic partnerships though, typically have a board including senior officers from public sector and elected members, as well as representatives from the private and community and voluntary sectors.

The LSPs can use a variety of different tools and techniques, such as forums for debate, common decision-making mechanisms; facilitations of community strategic planning; performance management systems; mechanisms for monitoring and reporting progress.

### Case: Local Strategic Partnerships in England

Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) exist in nearly all local authority areas in England. They bring together representatives from the public, voluntary, community and private sectors to address local problems, allocate funding, and discuss strategies and initiatives. About one third of these LSPs are in areas that currently receive Neighbourhood Renewal Funding (NRF), that is made available to the most deprived authorities. Some of these partnerships date back to local initiatives in the early 1990s, others have been set up later. Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) were introduced as a result of the Local Government Act 2000. In some local authority areas they have made great strides towards improving the local quality of life. Local Strategic Partnerships have a critical role in further developing coherent service provision and sustainable communities.

The support for the establishment of LSPs addressed issues with a lack of joint working at local level leading to lack of progress in delivering sustainable economic, social and physical regeneration, or improved public services.

LSPs are non-statutory, non-executive organisations in England. Partnerships are typically funded through public service budgets, partners' contributions and central government grants. The policy areas addressed by LSPs include economy, social and environmental well-being, community development, labour market and social inclusion.

Source: https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/37728868.pdf
7.1.2 Local action teams

**Challenge:**

In the context of urban green space governance, a challenge that is repeatedly occurring is, how to successfully and effectively design and implement local initiatives integrating relevant views, knowledge and expertise.

**Description of the instrument:**

While local strategic partnerships, as detailed above, are defining the broader vision for a local area, together with strategic directions and priorities, Local Action Teams are focusing instead on specific concrete projects or initiatives.

The Local Action Teams (LAT) are created to define effective community-led projects, aiming to adopt a proactive multi-agency approach. Such targeted working groups can be composed of elected people, practitioners and community organizers who are able to activate different stakeholders around sustainable local action plans. In practice, the LATs are small teams of local experts from different organizations.

The Local Action Teams are less formal and more practical forms of cooperation compared to Local Strategic Partnerships. In larger frameworks, several Local Action Teams can be formed simultaneously, each of which addresses specific local issues, while complementing each other. One or several LAT can be established under a broader Local Strategic Partnership.

**Aspects to consider:**

First, as in the case of establishing a local strategic partnership, a systematic assessment need to be undertaken in order to identify and prioritize stakeholders to be included in a local action team. Box 1 under section 7.1.1 presents a list of various potential stakeholder categories to be taken into consideration. Building on this initial identification of stakeholders, a number of strategic actors need to be selected to act as members of a local action team. It needs to be born in mind that local action teams are smaller working groups than local strategic partnerships, focusing on more specific issues or initiatives, and thus covering only a couple of thematic areas. Therefore, the selection process is more targeted and the diversity of actors will be smaller than in the case of local strategic partnerships. In case there is already a local strategic partnership in place, members for a targeted local action team can be chosen from the actors of the broader partnership. Box 3 outlines a number of guiding questions that might be helpful in the selection process.

---

Local Action Teams: Guiding questions for stakeholder identification

- Who can substantially contribute to development of the initiative/project?
- Who has specific expertise associated with the initiative/project?
- Will the impacts be local, regional or national?
- Who has the power to influence the process?
- Who can facilitate or impede the process through their participation, non-participation or opposition?
- Who can contribute with financial or technical resources towards the work?
- Who will be responsible for implementing the foreseen activities?


Box 3 Local Action Teams: Guiding questions for stakeholder identification

Local Action Teams can be organized based on a vertical approach, assisting better coordination and cooperation between the different tiers of government, or can support horizontal cooperation integrating actors from a range of relevant, or can be established combining both approaches (vertical and horizontal).
Case: Local Action Groups (LAG Patavino) in Padua Province

The LAG PATAVINO is a limited liability consortium composed of private (80%) and public (20%) shareholders. LAG Patavino includes 23 municipalities of the south-west area of the province of Padua with a population of 125,214 inhabitants. The main goals are to support local economy and agricultural products, and to enhance natural and cultural assets through rural development projects. The purpose of the creation of Local Action Groups is to start creating common projects through the coordination of ideas and actions, instead of supporting individual initiatives. The participation of different actors increases the exchange of ideas and information to create common and economically beneficial initiatives for the territory.

Core of the GAL’s activity is to support the realization of the measures contained in the Local Development Program 2007-2013.

LAG Patavino is managed both by public and private agencies that include among other the Padua Provincial Council, Padua Industry, Crafts and Agriculture Commerce Chamber, the regional board of the Euganei Hills Regional Park, farmers’ associations, associations of craftsmen, local traders’ associations, and the Antonveneta bank. The work of the LAG Patavino is organized in team work through the establishment of Permanent Consultation Tables addressing various sectors or issues: the Institutional Table gathers the representatives of all the Municipalities of the considered territory; the Economics Table includes actors dealing with agriculture; the Financial Table gathers all credit institutions, the Tourism Table includes agencies, consortia and the University of Padua. The work performed by the Consultation Tables has been essential for the definition of the 2007-2013 Local Development Program and it is essential when the strategies are turned into concrete actions.

In total 255 projects have been financed by LAG Patavino with European funds (mostly LEADER Programme) with a total investment of EUR 17,226,135.87 of which EUR 11,368,248.15 was received as grants.

Source: http://www.galpatavino.it/eng/about-us.html
**Case: SITxell – A Territorial Information System for the Network of Open Areas in the province of Barcelona**

The Barcelona Provincial Council has been drawing up since 2001 a territorial information system, SITxell (acronym in Catalan for Territorial Information System for the Network of Open Areas in the province of Barcelona), which contains a categorization and assessment of non-urban land based on the analysis of its ecological and socio-economic characteristics. SITxell is a cartographic and alphanumeric database which helps with the study, analysis, evaluation and planning of the open areas in the province of Barcelona.

From a technological point of view, SITxell is a system structured through different layers of geographical information and intended to study and evaluate the open areas of the province. On a political level, SITxell is a tool intended to influence land planning processes, on both local and regional scales, by providing accurate and reliable socio-economic and ecological information and criteria for plans and projects developed by the competent authorities.

The general objectives of SITxell are: to provide accurate, reliable and useful knowledge about the ecological and socioeconomic values of natural areas to assist land use policies; to use a multidisciplinary analysis tool to support spatial land planning and other specific land use decisions; and to make decision-makers and land use planners at different political and territorial levels aware of the need for an integrated approach to land use planning and management.

The success of SITxell have been based on the strength and usefulness of the information, applicable in land use planning at different scales, as well as on strong partnerships with various levels of government, universities, research centres and private sector.

Under the territorial information system information is gathered about natural areas and farmland under different headings, among others habitats and flora, fauna, hydrology and geology, socioeconomics, landscape ecology and ecosystem services.

To ensure the quality and accuracy, SITxell has been based on the close collaboration of a wide range of actors, including municipal and county councils, departments of the Government of Catalonia and Barcelona's metropolitan institutions, scientific and technical institutions, university departments, research centres, specialized private consultants, as well as civil society organizations.

7.1.3 Urban Green Space Strategy and Local Action Plans

**Challenge:**

In the absence of a targeted strategy, decisions on urban green space development and maintenance are taken in an ad-hoc, unharmonized manner. This can lead to inefficient use of resources, conflicting interests, inadequate development and management of urban green spaces. Even if there is a strategy in place, the lack of detailed action plans can bring about situations in which the steps necessary for implementation are not determined, responsibilities and sources are not properly allocated.

**Description of the instruments:**

An Urban Green Space Strategy confronts the present situation of green spaces (status including problems, conflicts, potentials and needs) with the future collective vision and goals. Strategies are required to address a variety of development objectives. They must be able to effectively defend these objectives against other urban development and planning goals and the aspirations of other governmental actors.

The purposes of green space strategy are:

- to safeguard the future of green spaces;
- to improve the quality of urban areas;
- to make urban areas more attractive and thereby attract more resources; and
- to enhance the well-being of local people.\(^8\)

An action plan can be defined as a sequence of steps that must be taken, or activities that must be performed well, for a strategy to succeed\(^9\). Action plans have a number of essential components:

- definition of targeted goals,
- identification of appropriate actions,
- prioritization of actions,
- definition of responsibilities,
- allocation of resources,
- setting a timeframe,
- identifying potential risks and mitigation measures,
- developing procedures to monitor progress,
- developing indicators for evaluation.

---

\(^8\) GreenKeys (2008) A guide for urban green quality
\(^9\) http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/action-plan.html
Action plans in general can focus on a certain topic (e.g. one element of urban green space like parks, urban forest etc.) or certain geographical areas (e.g. green spaces in a certain district or a smaller area for revitalization etc.).

Aspects to consider:

Green space strategies can be elaborated by local strategic partnerships, in order to help to increase joint ownership and implementation and to apply a more crosscutting holistic and inclusive approach.

Local action plans, in an ideal case, are closely linked to green space strategies and are developed according to the principles of multi-level governance. This means that all relevant stakeholders are directly involved in the elaboration of these strategic documents. Vertical and horizontal cooperation is essential and can be ensured by the establishment and proper involvement of a Local Action Team.

Case: Green Space Strategy and Action Plans of North Hertfordshire District Council

The North Hertfordshire District Council (NHDC) in England has adopted a Green Space Management Strategy for North Hertfordshire for 2017-2021, as well as several specific action plans linked to it. The overall objective of the strategy is to provide a sustainable, strategic approach for the future management of green space. More specific objectives among others are to highlight the value and role of parks and green spaces in meeting corporate and community needs; to provide a framework to work in partnership with key stakeholders along with volunteers to deliver improvements and external funding opportunities to green space; and to provide clear policies that prioritise essential green space investment requirements for the next four years.

The development of the strategy was building on the findings of a Citizen Panel Exercise, in which residents' use of parks and open spaces and the main purpose of their park visits was analysed.

The strategy has set three priorities for the forthcoming four years: to provide an attractive and safe environment for residents; to promote sustainable growth; and to ensure the delivery of cost-effective and necessary services. The document also outlined the key funding sources for the 2017-2021 period.

A set of five specific Green Space Action Plans were linked to the broader Green Space Strategy. The five action plans focus on churchyards and cemeteries; allotments; green space; outdoor play provision; and outdoor sports facilities. The action plans also provide an investment programme that provide information on the earmarked amounts for planned activities.

7.1.4 Territorial pacts

**Challenge:**

Insufficient cooperation between different levels of government leads to unsynchronized objectives, goals regarding urban green space development and conflicting decisions on available resources.

**Description of the instrument:**

A territorial pact is a multi-level agreement between local, regional, and national government organizations, according to which they commit to coordinating and synchronizing their policy agendas in order to focus their actions and financial resources.\(^\text{10}\)

The territorial pact is a means of bringing together all the resources present at the local level and directing them towards the realization of shared development objectives.\(^\text{11}\)

The aim of these pacts is to maintain and coordinate various development projects in a territory (a province, city or a large neighborhood) and to put them into an integrated framework, based on bargaining. In a territorial pact, the partners define a set of development goals for the territory; select projects according to these goals; and agree on measures which could facilitate and support their realization.\(^\text{12}\)

**Aspects to consider:**

The process of concluding a territorial pact is based on consensus-making and a process of bargaining. This entails that such solutions need to be sought that are beneficial for all parties who may advocate different priorities.

The scope of the territorial pacts can vary widely in terms of:

- the tiers of administration involved (local, regional, national, European);
- the nature of the partnership (vertical or horizontal);
- the type of remit (setting guidelines or delivering);
- the area of action (very broad or specific);
- the sectors involved (examples include: delivering services for citizens or for enterprises; and promoting administrative simplification);
- the duration of the agreement (temporary or permanent);
- funding (European, national, local or private; no funding).\(^\text{13}\)

---

\(^\text{10}\) Committee of the Regions (2011) Territorial Pacts: Making the most of Europe 2020 through partnership.


\(^\text{13}\) Committee of the Regions (2011) Territorial Pacts: Making the most of Europe 2020 through partnership.
Case: Green Siena Territorial Pact

The Green Siena Territorial Pact was initiated by the Province of Siena in Italy. The objective of the territorial pact is to increase the employment and investments in agriculture and farm tourism with the aim to integrate high-quality agriculture building on typical, local products, environmental protection and tourism. A specific objective is to promote a development path for agriculture that ensures a balance between the use and the protection of natural resources. In addition to the Provincial Administration of Siena, the initiative was supported by 20 municipalities in the Province of Siena, one municipality in the Province of Florence, the Chamber of Commerce of Siena, representatives of the bank and credit sector, representatives of the trade union worker associations and of the professional entrepreneurial unions. The signers of the pact agree to respect its principles as well as a number of commitments associated with the areas of agriculture, environment and tourism.

Sources: OECD Territorial Reviews: Siena, Italy 2002;  
http://green.terresiena.it/en/project/pact-for-sustainability
7.2 Instruments for institutionalized forms of cooperation with involvement of non-governmental actors

Arrangements listed under this section are explicitly initiated and led by public authorities based on a contractual form according to which responsibilities are delegated to the non-governmental actor(s).

Forms of such cooperation can differ in the level of involvement of the public authority. The spectrum includes grassroots endorsed by municipalities; co-governance (partnership between an authority and non-governmental actors, with power shared evenly between partners); and municipality driven initiatives.

In case of such forms of institutionalized cooperation the responsibility does not remain with the municipality any more, as it is delegated to the contracted parties.

Instruments detailed under this section target different type of urban green spaces:

- Business Improvement Districts: larger areas, neighbourhood within a municipal territory;
- Green barters: mostly neglected urban green spaces or derelict areas;
- Green space adoption and Grant programs: smaller pieces of green spaces, such street trees, hedges, street green and green verges, neighbourhood greens, roundabouts and abandoned areas;

Aspects to consider:

Instruments for institutionalized forms of cooperation with involvement of non-governmental actors are typically applied when local authorities are lacking sufficient economic and human resources for properly maintaining and developing urban green space. The selection of an appropriate instrument mostly depends on the type and size of the green space in the focus or the type of the resource that is lacking.

- Business Improvement Districts are appropriate tools to maintain green space in larger areas, or whole neighbourhoods, when additional funds are needed to be secured for such a purpose.
- Green barters can help in securing funds for the maintenance of neglected urban green spaces.
- Green space adoption can ensure additional economic and human resources for properly maintaining and developing smaller pieces of green spaces.
- In contrast, instead of focusing on lacking economic resources, grant programs can effectively address lacking human resources needed for proper maintenance and development of smaller pieces of green spaces.
7.2.1 Business improvement districts

Challenge:

Often local authorities are lacking sufficient resources for developing urban green space or even for properly maintaining existing green space in larger areas, neighbourhood within the municipal territory.

Description of the instrument:

Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) are fast becoming popular globally – there are thousands throughout the world, including 1400 in the US and growing numbers in Europe (e.g. in UK and Germany), South Africa and Canada.

A business improvement district (BID) is an independent, business-owned and led company, which seeks to improve a defined location for commercial activity. Within this location businesses are required to pay an additional tax or levy in order to fund projects within the district's boundaries. The BID funded primarily through this levy can also draw on other public and private funding streams.

BIDs are typically created by an election process. If a majority of firms in an area vote to join the BID, then all are compelled to by law. Members pay a levy, collected with their business rates, which helps fund collective projects that benefit the whole area. The BID is renewed every four or five years with a fresh election. BIDs primarily provide services that councils lacking sufficient resources have cut.\(^{14}\)

A BID is tool for directly involving local businesses in local activities and allow the business community and local authorities to work together to improve the local trading environment. Various services can be provided through a Business Improvement District, the only requirement is that it should be something that is in addition to services provided by local authorities. Improvements may include among others urban green space management, extra safety, cleansing and environmental measures. A BID can be set up by the local authority, a business rate payer or a person or company whose purpose is to develop the area. Usually Business Improvement Districts charge a levy rate of between 1% and 4% of rateable value. Once the term for operation is completed the BID will automatically cease. If the Business Improvement District Company wants to continue its activities it must hold a new election. A BID is managed by a Business Improvement District body. This is often a private company but can be a partnership with the local authority. Most Business Improvement District bodies are not-for-profit companies.\(^{15}\)

In England and Wales, BIDs were introduced through legislation (the Local Government Act 2003) and subsequent regulations in 2004\(^{16}\). In Germany a number of Federal States introduced specific legal framework to create BIDs.


\(^{15}\) [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/business-improvement-districts](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/business-improvement-districts)

The existence of a national or regional legislative framework however is not a prerequisite for the formation of a BID. In Serbia as part of the country’s 2002 local government reform programme, and financed by USAID, a couple of cities was supported to form Business Improvement Districts.

Under the programme Valjevo and Zrenjanin were chosen for the formation of BIDs. With no past experience in downtown or town centre management, and thus no existing norms or practices, the Business Improvement Districts could be established relatively quickly. Later in 2003 it was decided by national and local officials and local businesses that a third Serbian BID would be established in the city of Kruševac, and a fourth one in Nis.\(^\text{17}\)

Case: Better Bankside, a business-led green space management in London

Better Bankside is a non-profit Business Improvement District (BID) scheme established in 2005, covering the area between Blackfriars and London Bridges, and south to Southwark Street in the Bankside district of London. BIDs are independent, business-owned and led companies, which seek to improve a given location for commercial activity. Better Bankside is run by its members, more than 620 companies operating in the BID area, which pay an annual levy.

The legislation allowing the creation of Business Improvement Districts was approved in UK by the parliament in September 2004. Better Bankside was one of the first BIDs to be established in the UK, approved in a ballot held in 2005. Later on Better Bankside has been approved in two subsequent ballots held in 2010 and 2014. Businesses that fell within the Business Improvement District area and for which total rateable values of their business premises reach a certain threshold (GBP 17,500) are eligible for voting. Based on the approvals, the BID is funded by a compulsory levy on all eligible businesses within the boundaries it has set. Levy income is supplemented by a range of non-levy sources (including voluntary subscriptions from non-levy paying businesses, voluntary contributions to corporate social responsibility, and grants from various sources).

The services of Better Bankside are additional to those provided by the local authority and other actors. Better Bankside has a core programme which includes cleaning, greening and safety.

Launched in 2007, Bankside Urban Forest is a long-term partnership project run under the Better Bankside initiative, which aims to improve and regenerate the network of public spaces including streets, pavements, squares and parks in the Bankside area.

The strategy introduces elements associated with green infrastructure and resilience of the city, but it also has strong social and economic aspects. The project is not literally aiming at turning the area into a forest, even though it does create opportunities for greening, using trees, planted walls, and other means.

The project encourages investment in streets and other public spaces; promotes greater exploration, footfall and cycling across the area; and helps to improve the local connections between green spaces, amenities and where people live and work. Bankside Urban Forest intends to make connections between people and places in Bankside.

Source: http://www.betterbankside.co.uk/
7.2.2 Green barters

**Challenge:**
A general problem for local authorities is the lack of sufficient resources for developing or properly maintaining certain neglected urban green spaces.

**Description of the instrument:**
Green barters are maintenance or development obligations for businesses in exchange for a formalised right to use the values of space for business profits. In such schemes, a kind of bartering is developed between municipalities and businesses in which businesses are allowed to profit in a certain way of the services delivered by urban green and in return, these businesses invest in the enhancement of maintenance of specific urban green space. Green barters can vary from a short-term business deal to longer lasting and more complex partnerships.\(^{18}\)

**Case: Public-private participation for green space rehabilitation in Lodz**

In Lodz, Poland a public-private partnership played a significant role in the rehabilitation of a park area bordering a construction site. Lisciasta Park Residence with seven buildings with 158 apartments is a new residential area in the northern part of Lodz, built in 2009–2013. This residential area is bordered in the south and east by a park with a small river and several reservoirs. A large amount of construction waste overgrown by vegetation was lying deposited in the wilder parts of the park that had been left there from the nearby housing estates built decades ago.

The developer company, Budomal started the construction of the complex in 2009. In 2013, at the time of the sales of the second batch of apartments, the company proposed that it would clean up and rehabilitate the adjacent green space, partly as a compensation for the trees that had to be removed because of the construction activities, and partly to develop the neighbourhood of the residences. The size of the contaminated area that needed rehabilitation was approximately 600 m\(^2\). The offer was taken up by the municipality and a short-term public-private partnership was established between the City Office and the developer to rehabilitate part of the park adjacent to the residential area. Under this temporary arrangement the land is still publicly owned and after rehabilitation its everyday management has been taken over by the City Office.


### 7.2.3 Green space adoption

**Challenge:**

Often local authorities are lacking sufficient economic and human resources for properly maintaining and developing smaller pieces of green spaces, such street trees, hedges, street green and green verges, neighbourhood greens, roundabouts and abandoned areas.

**Description of the instrument:**

Under a scheme targeting green space adoption businesses sign contracts with the municipality for a certain period according to which they are developing and maintaining smaller pieces of green spaces and are in return entitled to place their ‘business cards’ on them. Additionally, the scheme can be supported by economic incentives such as tax reduction or exemption. Through this arrangement the public expenses targeting green space maintenance can be substantially reduced and at the same time local businesses get a unique opportunity to promote their activities.

**Case: Adopted green spaces in Oradea**

The municipality of Oradea, Romania, launched an initiative that allowed some smaller green spaces to be ‘adopted’ by private companies. In line with the program businesses sign contracts with the municipality for a year (the contracts can be extended). The contracted companies also become exempt from fees that they should normally pay after using public spaces for private purposes.

The demand for such green space development has increased significantly. Because of the limited number of green spaces on offer, currently the companies are queuing for acquiring new places. By May 2015, altogether 56 pieces of green space were ‘adopted’, out of which 18 are roundabouts.


### 7.2.4 Grant programs

**Challenge:**

Often local authorities are lacking sufficient human resources for properly maintaining and developing smaller pieces of green spaces, such street trees, hedges, street green and green verges, neighbourhood greens, roundabouts and abandoned areas.
**Description of the instrument:**

Under grant programs the funding provided by the municipality obligates the grant awardees to meet certain objectives, and adhere to some specific funding requirements. Grant can support community groups, civil society organizations, individuals and businesses for taking on responsibility for green space maintenance (or in specific cases development).

**Case: Maintenance contracts in Utrecht**

In the 1980s maintenance contracts were introduced by Utrecht municipality, which allowed citizens to maintain a particular part of public green space in its present shape. In this new system changing needs and wishes of the residents became integrated in the contracts, and even in municipal procedures. As a consequence the design and maintenance of green space was increasingly adapted to the residents' wishes.

The municipal Department of Public Works had several reasons for developing this contract model. Firstly, the economic recession in the 1980s forced the Utrecht authorities to cut spending on the maintenance of public green space. Secondly, the municipality also wanted to avoid the use of herbicides and to rely instead on costlier manual weeding. Thirdly, at that time the idea of engaging citizens in policy and management became popular in the Netherlands.

At the same time several groups of local residents were developing proposals for public green space elements they would like to manage themselves, although this need conflicted with municipal bureaucracy.

Against this backdrop, the idea was raised to let citizens maintain elements of public green space themselves. According to the concept if local residents wanted to preserve the more expensive, labour-intensive green space elements in their neighbourhood, they would have to maintain them themselves. After the initiative had been launched the municipal authorities became much more supportive of citizens’ initiatives and there is room for discussion and negotiation.

In economic terms, the scheme functions as a grant program. In the various districts of Utrecht separate ‘liveability’ budgets are made available to finance garden renovations on the basis of written estimates provided by the self-managers, as well as to subsidise self-management associations. The district bureau also provides credit notes for the self-managers, with which the latter can go to a gardening centre and buy tubers and bulbs.

A wide range of objects are being managed, by residents including roadside verges, conservation areas, a monastery garden, a common backyard and even ‘non-green’ public areas like playgrounds. By 2002 the number of contracts has increased to approximately 600 for the eight older districts of Utrecht.
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