



# URBANGAIA

Deliverable D7  
**Governance  
analysis  
Framework**







URBANGAIA

Funded by:



Research  
Council of  
Lithuania



Partners:



Financed by the European Union under the BiodivERsA3 Program

Project number: BiodivERsA3-20015-143

Project acronym: UrbanGaia

Project full title: Managing urban Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure to increase city resilience

Start of the project: 01 March 2017

Duration: 36 months

Project coordinator: Centro de Estudos de Recursos Naturais, Ambiente e Sociedade (CERNAS)

Project website <http://www.urbangaia.eu>

Deliverable title: Framework governance analysis

Deliverable n°: D7

Nature of the deliverable: Report

Dissemination level: Public

WP: Governance analysis of the case studies

Lead beneficiary: Instituut Natuur- en Bosonderzoek (INBO)

Citation: EU BiodivERsA3 UrbanGaia Project Deliverable 7, Leone M, Jacobs S (2019): Governance assessment Framework

The contents of this deliverable do not necessarily reflect the official opinions of the European Commission or other institutions of the European Union.

## Index

Introduction.....	1
Method.....	1
Data analysis.....	2





# Introduction

UrbanGaia developed a framework for a governance performance analysis to evaluate the planning and implementation of Urban Green-Blue Infrastructure (U-GBI).

Multifunctionality and connectivity are core characteristics of U-GBI and is often defined as contributing to a wide range of ecological, socio-cultural and economic benefits such as supporting biodiversity, adaptation to climate change, increased possibilities for recreation and improved public health. To realize multifunctional U-GBI that responds to the local needs, environmental justice is an (just as) important characteristic of U-GBI in order to achieve desired social and environmental synergies. Within this framework we focus specifically on procedural justice; the inclusion of all relevant user-groups within the U-GBI planning process. Thus, to reach multifunctional and just U-GBI, these characteristics should be considered during its

planning, in order to create U-GBI's that responds to the local goals and needs and to create broad public and political support. For an area-based and integrated U-GBI project, a collaborative governance style is the most fitting approach. This means stakeholders should collaborate in a network, in which government, market and civil actors can be involved. This should be done through deliberative processes are participatory processes in which stakeholders are given the opportunity to discuss and agree on a shared vision and approach through consultation and negotiations. Deliberative processes promote the legitimacy and the fairness (environmental justice) of solutions in spatial projects, provided they are inclusive. The UrbanGaia governance analysis framework aims to assess how a U-GBI planning process contributed to the multifunctional and procedural characteristics.

# Method

The framework is designed to evaluate one planning process of a U-GBI location. The assessment will be done through interviews with experts/people that were involved during this planning process. To get a complete picture of the process, multiple experts/people from different sectors should be included so that multiple points of view are recorded. For one planning process, it is recommended to interview a minimum of 6 people involved. Based on a literature search the following 3 dimensions and 11 themes were included in the governance assessment:

- Capacity to understand the complexity of the issues and local context
  - Understanding the area's assets, opportunities and threats
  - Information gathering for informed decision making
  - Anticipation of the future
- Capacity to achieve engagement, collaboration and coherence
  - Mobilizing representative partners across sectors
  - Social inclusion (of inhabitants)
  - Establishing a common pathway
- Capacity to design and implement (innovative) multifunctional solutions
  - Enabling factors (this description might change)
  - Green-grey integration
  - Contribution to multiple policy objectives
  - Policy-instruments to support implementation
  - Mobilizing (external) support

Each theme consists of one or multiple questions and can be found in the D2.3 excel document. Participants are asked to first give an open answer and then score the questions during an interview. The data will be entered in the D2.3 excel document. During the interview the scores can be filled in. The interview will be recorded (with consent of the participant) and after the interview the open answers will be added to the excel document.

Each question starts with “to what extent...”, enabling the participants to score the questions. The interview aimed to assess to what extent each aspect of the themes was considered, done, applied, etc. After the qualitative answer, the participants could give the following scores:

- 5 – To full extent considered/applied/...  
(depending on the question)
- 4 – To high extent ...
- 3 – To medium extent ...
- 2 – To low extent ...
- 1 – To no extent ...

As the assessment is based on a generic list of questions, designed to be applied for multiple case studies, not every question may be as relevant. E.g. a question about green-grey integration might not be as relevant if the case study is an urban forest with little to no grey infrastructure.

## Data analysis

All the data come together in an excel document (see Table 1 for the base structure of the table applied to all the cases). For each question the weighted average score was calculated and the average relevancy of the question and entered in the document. Also, for each question a summary was made of all the qualitative answer the participants gave

Also, reaching multifunctionality is not a goal in itself, it should respond to the local needs. E.g. including the economic dimension may not be as relevant in each project area. Therefore, participants were asked to score the relevance of the question for their case study, using the following score:

- 2 – Relevant
- 1 – Somewhat relevant
- 0 – Not relevant

As each participant may have had a different role in the process, or may have participated less than others, the participant may not be able to give an answer to all questions.

Therefore, we asked the participants to score their confidence in their answer and score. In the analysis the average score of each question was weighted according to the expressed confidence and quality of the answer (answers with doubt received a score of 1 by the researcher). The following score is used:

- 2 – High confidence
- 1 – Somewhat confident
- 0 – Low confidence (with low confidence the participant didn't score the variable and the relevance, and was not used to calculate the average).

and added to the document. The summary reflected the weighted average score and the average relevancy and give an answer as to why that question was given that score. Each U-GBI planning process ended up with one summarizing D2.3 excel document.



Dimension	Theme	Aspect	Question	Score 1 - 5	Relevance 0 - not rel. 1 - bit rel. 2 - relevant	Confidence 0 - Low 1 - Medium 2 - High	Open answer
Capacity to understand the complexity of the issues and local context	Understanding the area's assets, opportunities and threats	Biophysical/environmental	To what extent did the actors identify, discuss and include biophysical and environmental opportunities, issues and threats into consideration for the current planning of U-GBI?				
		Socio-cultural	To what extent did the actors identify, discuss and include socio-cultural opportunities, issues and threats into consideration for the current planning of U-GBI?				
		Economic	To what extent did the actors identify, discuss and include economic opportunities, issues and threats into consideration for the current planning of U-GBI?				
	Information gathering for informed decision making	Scientific	To what extent is scientific information related to U-GBI available, used, exchanged and produced?				
		Best practices	To what extent are best practices (e.g. guides/guidelines, manuals) being used, documented, exchanged and upscaled?				
	Anticipation of the future	Understanding of drivers influencing the future of the city	To what extent are the main issues and trends - that impact the (future of the) city and to which U-GBI can mitigate/provide an solution to - identified and discussed among actors?				
		Vision	To what extent does the municipality have a clear vision about (spatial planning in) the city and U-GBI's in the long term?				
		Scenario's	To what extent are/were possible future scenarios of the city and U-GBI's identified and do actors anticipate what they could do in these possible scenarios?				
Capacity to achieve engagement, collaboration and coherence	Mobilizing representative partners across sectors	Ecological/environmental partners (administrations, private sector, NGOs, ...)	To what extent were the involved ecological/environmental partners included and representative for their sector?				
		Socio-cultural partners (administrations, private sector, NGOs, ...)	To what extent were the involved socio-cultural partners included and representative for their sector?				
		Economic partners (administrations, private sector, NGOs, ...)	To what extent were the involved economic partners included and representative for their sector?				
	Social inclusion (inhabitants)	Level of public participation	<b>1) Get an estimation on involvement:</b> To what extent were inhabitants involved for the planning of U-GBI? - not involved - informed - consulted - advised - co-produced - grass-root initiative				
			<b>2) Then score this question:</b> To what extent was this extent of participation sufficient and beneficiary to the project?				
			To what extent were all user groups considered and included, including vulnerable groups?				
	Establishing a common pathway	Adaption to vulnerable groups	To what extent were issues related to vulnerable groups considered (e.g. gentrification, fair social division, accessibility, ...)?				
		Existence of common concerns for the area	To what extent are there clear common concerns among the involved actors for the project-area/city? If so, which ones?				
		Uniformity in the area's vision/interests of actors	To what extent did actors start with similar visions on solutions for U-GBI/the area in question, or were these highly different (or even significant conflicts)?				
		Social learning and aligning interests	To what extent could stakeholders learn from each other through interaction with each other? Did this result in improved negotiation and finding commonality?				
		Managing diversity, paradox and tensions	To what extent was it possible within the process to overcome (high) diversity in interests, tensions and paradoxes?				
		Readiness of actors to develop shared strategies	To what extent were actors open and interested in starting to develop shared strategies?				
Capacity to design and implement (innovative) multifunctional solutions	"Playing field"	Policies (administrative and/or jurisdictional boundaries)	To what extent were the policies at play enabling implementation of (innovative) U-GBI?				
		Available budgets (financial boundaries)	To what extent was the available budget enabling implementation of (innovative) U-GBI?				
	Green-grey integration	Available manpower	To what extent was the available manpower to work on the planning, design and implementation enabling implementation of (innovative) U-GBI?				
		Integration of green space/elements with (grey) infrastructure	To what extent was it possible to realize integration of green space/elements with (grey) infrastructure so that they complement each other?				
	U-GBI contributes to multiple policy objectives	Biophysical/environmental	To what extent does U-GBI in the project area contribute to biophysical/environmental policy objectives (compared to what would have been potentially possible)? (E.g. conserving biodiversity, adapting to climate change, ...)				
		Socio-cultural	To what extent does U-GBI contribute to socio-cultural policy objectives (compared to what would have been potentially possible)? (E.g. improving social cohesion, ...)				
		Economic	To what extent does U-GBI contribute to economic policy objectives (compared to what would have been potentially possible)? (E.g. supporting a green economy, ...)				
	Policy-instruments to support implementation of U-GBI	(Diversity of) policy-instruments to create/exploit U-GBI	To what extent is the availability of instruments to implement (innovative) U-GBI sufficient? (Where there missed opportunities due to (lack of/wrong choice of) policy instruments? Were all policy instruments used that were available/optional?)				
	Mobilizing (external) support	Political support	To what extent was it possible to obtain (additional) political support to realize the envisioned U-GBI?				
		Financial support	To what extent was there successful acquisition of external financial support (deals with public or private partners, sponsors, loans, ...)?				
		Social support	To what extent was it possible to mobilize society to support ... (stewardships, moral support, ...)?				