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The session was aimed at developing the first framework for WP T3.2 activity regarding implementation of EU policies at local level. Partners and participants were confronted with a real case scenario to discuss and share governance processes and issues related to the implementation of the main strategic EU documents. The real case scenario has been built according to an online questionnaire submitted to PP's who were asked to propose their most relevant planning issues related to peri-urban spaces. Results of the session will be included in WP T3 proceedings and will offer insights on different PP's planning structures and on possible ways to better implement strategic documents into operative planning instruments and governance processes. The goal of the session was to collect elements to build a framework to analyse local policies implementation and collect the most critical aspects in policies implementation.

- "Pointed recommendations targeted at local/regional decision makers": All PP's offered effective insights on issues found in implementing EU policies giving material to build targeted recommendations.
- The session helped to identify the correct 'scale of analysis' related to the outputs as to make them either not too specific nor too general.
- "project's common understanding of the potentials, threats and values of periurban landscapes and GI": The PP's shared experiences on the basis of a real-case scenario that helped to focus on building a common understanding of the structure of peri-urban landscapes.
- The workshop helped to better define the structure and needs from the PP's regarding the final Output of WP T3
- Issues have been raised especially related to the missing of a common framework to identify peri-urban landscapes and to set GI policies across Alpine area.
- Most of partners identified missing links between among different governance bodies therefore suggesting for WP T3 output to be targeted to different stakeholders and not only policy-makers.

Issues in comparing very site specific governance and policy-making structures have been raised.

Los_Dama! PPS:

MUC: Franziska Drasdo, Matthias Lampert, Linda Mertelmeyer, Sylvia Pintarits
TUM: Rieke Hansen, Martina Van Lierop
GAM: Guillaume Tournaire
UGA: Aurore Meyfroidt, Emmanuel Roux
TRENT: Alessandro Betta, Angela Taufer
UIRS: Sergeja Praper, Barbara Golicnik Marusic
SIR: Philipp Vesely, Manuela Bruckler
VIE: Christina Stockinger
PIEM: Sarah Braccio, Francesca La Greca, Maria Quarta
EKUT: Corinna Jenal
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1. Aims, expected results and programme

Further to the first workshop held in Ljubljana in November 2017, this governance Workshop in Zürich contributes as a second step to Activity A.T3.2 Fostering good governance for valorizing periurban landscapes and open spaces on local and regional level, while fostering exchange of best practices between Project Partners. Building on the outputs of the first workshop, this one follows the same working methods of knowledge coproduction thanks to working groups. Yet instead of distributing groups by stakeholder’s types, focus was put upon the importance of planning systems within landscape and GI related projects implementation. Therefore, participants were distributed according to their respective planning systems (as described in the PAPs) to test the necessity of a paradigm shift from planning to project thinking. The content was built upon findings of the first workshop which emphasized the role of planning systems in “good governance”, the importance of processes, and fostered the creation of clusters of PP’s with similar governance schemes.

This workshop held in Zürich is targeted towards action configurations and aims at revealing convergences and divergences between planning systems at both horizontal level (between sectors) and vertical level (between scales). The intention was to gather input to better address the linkages between strategic and operational planning as well as to question the adaptation of instruments and strategies to complex GI projects.

In order to take advantage of this workshop dedicated to “good governance” strategies at local level, PPs were asked to be self-reflective by sending to the workshop’s leads a list of three issues regarding multifunctionality and three others related to decision-making processes in periurban areas (including a 5-line description for each) encountered during the conception/implementation of landscape and open spaces-related projects and/or policies at local levels (also within LOS DAMA!). The results of this “Call for issues” are enclosed to this report.
Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speakers / Facilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.15</td>
<td>Introduction of the workshop: presentation of rules, fictive case and related questions</td>
<td>Alessandro Betta/Aurore Meyfroidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>Workshop Part 1: Sharing multifunctionality policies (work in 2 groups)</td>
<td>Alessandro Betta: facilitator group 1/Aurore Meyfroidt: facilitator group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying governance challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responding to results of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>Workshop Part 2: Instruments for decision-making (work in 2 groups)</td>
<td>Alessandro Betta: facilitator group 1/Aurore Meyfroidt: facilitator group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying already implemented or missing instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responding to results of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>Wrap up and discussion</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Workshop

2.1 Introduction
Initially designed at providing elements to build the fictive case scenario, the “call for issues” couldn’t reach this aim, because of a low response rate (4 out of 7) and of misunderstandings of the instructions (only one out of the two questions addressed, or missing issues). Furthermore, some issues remained too general (for instance impact of GI on climate change, or opposition “strong” / “weak” actors). However, some issues were common to PPs as the necessity to raise awareness among administration and decision-makers, and the structural conflicts between productive (mainly agricultural) and recreational uses, which could be addressed by the two proposed topics.

Indeed, to gear a reflection towards action concerning policies and processes at regional and local levels, two themes were chosen to gather best practices and feedback from the daily practices of PPs, regarding both users and decision-makers:

1) Multifunctionality of GI and open spaces
2) Decision-making processes in periurban areas

A more detailed descriptive of both themes is enclosed within the workshop description.
2.2 Process and contents

Session participants were divided into two groups with six to eight participants according to their respective planning systems. Since we wanted to test the hypothesis that planning types strongly influence the way local and regional policies address multifunctionality and decision-making in periurban areas, we put together Project Partners from federal countries with a decentralized planning system (Austria, Germany, Switzerland, so MUC, VIE, SIR and Zürich as observer) while Partners with a centralized planning system (France, Italy, Slovenia) were clustered (TRENT, PIEM, GAM and UIRS) together. Using brainstorming methods, Project partners wrote their items/ideas directly on paperboards before presenting their outcomes to the other group. Before starting, a short introduction and guidelines were provided. Further to a descriptive of the fictive case and of the session organization, the presentation was projected with a series of questions to help partners to brainstorm upon both topics.

3. Main results and open questions
### 3.1. Multifunctionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Planning/sectoral instruments (available or missing): current situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Federal (Austria, Germany, Switzerland)</td>
<td>Influence of EU sectoral policies (Natura 2000, Water Framework Directive, air pollution) EU policies framed within local regulations through compensatory planning instruments. Some critical aspects have been found in assessing the quality of ecosystem or social services gained through these measures. Not always balancing quantity of areas means high quality of services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gap landscape / spatial planning: how to balance stakes?</td>
<td>Planning instruments are still sectoral and fragmented. Landscape planning instruments generally limited to strategic vision or guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GI as a concept: still not clearly defined which makes it difficult to implement into practice. Very different approaches to GI = Need for a “GI Chief” to coordinate actions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scaling gap regional/local level; regional strategies not very specific → added value of LOS_DAMA! To close this gap</td>
<td>Still missing regulation or planning policies on recreative uses of open spaces or green areas. Focus on limiting certain uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loose coordination between city and surrounding communities</td>
<td>Missing powerful and structured instruments to foster and improve cooperation between different local actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Centralized (France, Italy,</td>
<td>Issues in putting policy instruments</td>
<td>Planning documents (regional plan, urban plan, and sectoral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Existing Sectoral and Specific Instruments That 'Bypass' Administrative Framework. For Example “River Contracts” in Italy. Such Instruments Are Still Not Well Established and Not Iterative So with Limited Effects and Scope.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Need for more standardization of project-specific instruments and common framework on GI</td>
<td>Planning Instruments Are Very Dependent from Policy Guidelines and Strategical Instruments. Such Instruments Are Strongly Related with Political Will. Strong Bond with Political Will Is Not Always a Positive Aspect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Complicated to Define Local Projects When Involving Different Territorial Levels</td>
<td>Policy Instruments Are Not Intertwined with Administrative Structures and Instruments. Issues in Horizontal Governance (Policy vs Administration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Territorial Coordination Between Municipalities and Between Departments of Municipalities</td>
<td>Knowledge of System → Sharing Knowledge, Tools and Objectives to Get Comprehensive Approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Convergences between both groups:
- Balance of stakes/interests and political will
- Missing coordination between metropolises and communities
- Key role of regional scale

Divergences between both groups:
- Holistic approach (group A) / more classical approach (group B)
- Focus on uses (group A) / governance processes (group B)

First results of the workshop will be further analyzed in accordance with the results from PAPs and toolbox that are being developed by other PPs.

### 3.2. Decision-making in periurban areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Planning/sectoral instruments (available or missing) : current situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Focus upon ways to work cross-sectoral/cross-departmental</td>
<td>Development of working groups to close gap between political decisions and technical GI aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong role of stakeholders between working level and head of department</td>
<td>Steering groups within LOS_DAMA! as new format for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants (workshops with facilitator)

Special arrangements for specific projects but uneasy to decide who should be included within the project or not + focus on the project and not beyond (limited impact towards certain stakeholders)

Sometimes weak and not clearly defined relations between political and technical level on GI topics

Development of working groups to close gap between political decisions and technical GI aspects

Governance instruments on GI are still not very developed and able to offer strong frameworks

Development of more 'informal' instruments to work in between policy and planning instruments (eg. River contracts,...)

Contributing to create a peri-urban and GI 'culture' to foster implementation of more targeted policies and to effectively implement good governance systems

Convergences between both groups:

⇒ Both groups highlighted the need for more transversal working habits across departments.
⇒ Lack of governance instruments more than lack of policy instruments
⇒ Lack of clear definitions of GI and peri-urban in EU and planning documents

Divergences between both groups:

⇒ Group B (FR, IT, SLO) highlighted stronger barriers in cross-sectoral cooperation between departments

3.3. Insights for other WPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Perspectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Find synergies with toolbox development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide support to pilot activities implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Next steps, TODOs

Ahead of the Vienna meeting, findings of this second workshop will be reflected in connexion with the toolbox development. Thus, a co-workshop WPT1/WPT3 would enable to better frame draft governance tools identified in Zürich. A second workshop is foreseen during Wien PPs meeting to build upon the results of toolbox and PAPs. In cooperation with the other working groups policy instruments, issues and findings will be analyzed and discussed to set final output results.
### Appendices

**Results of the “Call for issues”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **MUC** | **Multifunctionality and diversity of uses:**
| | • Mutually competing uses |
| | • liability issues |
| | • dominance of attitudes geared to one's own interests (concern to lose options for action and to have additional costs) |
| | **Decision-making in peri-urban areas:**
| | • 'strong' versus 'weak' actors (concern to be exploited by others) |
| | • dominance of attitudes geared to one's own interests (concern to lose options for action and to have additional costs) |
| | Derived questions:
| | How do you reach (unwilling) key players? |
| | How can you get people enthusiastic about open space topics? |
| | How to promote the synergy effects of working together for all parties/participants? |
| | How do you get a defensive and fractious group constructive and cooperative? |
| | How to exclude political opposites and prejudice? |
| | How to promote the benefits for all parties/participants? |
| **GAM** | **Multifunctionality and diversity of uses**
| | • Strong pressure of urban development on flat lands with a shift between political objectives and reality |
| | • Uses conflicts especially between private owners (inhab., farmers) and users (leisure or sport activities) |
| | **Decision-making in periurban areas:**
| | • combining diversity of stakeholders involved and systemic approach of green infrastructure. |
| | • Difficulties to involve inhabitants and/or users in natural areas management due to a lack of appropriation, |
| | • Still a second-level issue in urban development projects |
| **VIE** | **Multifunctionality and diversity of uses:**
| | • Land mobilization for realising green infrastructure isn't as easy as mobilization of land for private residential |

---
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• lack of money
• conflicts between agricultural use of land and an increased number of people seeking recreation.

Decision-making in peri-urban areas:
• no standardized formats for a common planning process in periurban region.
• Only small parts of the land are owned by the public sector.

PIEM

Multifunctionality and diversity of uses:
• How to evaluate the impact of GI on Climate Change and how to measure it
• How to demonstrate to policy makers and stakeholders that GI generate sustainable economic development
• Awareness of benefits from public administrations and local communities

Decision-making in periurban areas:
• fragmentation of competence between structures and public authorities

TRENT

Multifunctionality and diversity of uses:
• How to involve private owners in multifunctional landscape projects without direct expropriation of land
• difficulties in involving large number of stakeholders in an effective way
• communicate the higher economic and ecology effectiveness of a multifunctional landscape

Decision-making in peri-urban areas:
• lack of ‘conflicts management’ instruments
• lack of established cooperation between different departments

Presentation of the fictive case study

Redevelopment project on a mixed-use peri-urban site.
Part of the site is currently used as agricultural land (orchard and fruit trees) and part is a former industrial brownfield (low soil pollution).
The area is almost entirely private property; an agreement has been reached between municipality and investors; part of the plot will be given to the municipality in exchange of pollutants recovery expenses. Strategic urban planning instruments foreseen for the area a mixed public use destination with a multi-functional public park and spaces for an innovative hub (spaces for start-up, hi-tech crafts, ...).

These two functions have strong support from provincial / regional government through existing strategic development plans.

The public park will be located nearby the agricultural fields and will be a multi-functional green area that will combine recreational spaces, communitarian orchards and specific areas for water retention to manage possible floods.

A gravel road crossing the agricultural area will have to be transformed in a cycling path to connect the park with an already existing cycling path which is part of the Euro-Velo network.

Nearby the area there is an important river which banks should be recovered to be integrated in the park project to form part of the regional GI network. The project of the area should also be able to mitigate the existent nearby highway and railway which will be redeveloped and expanded within EU TEN-T corridors framework.

Workshop structure

An hypothetical case study on a peri-urban space will be the starting point of WP T3 activities related to local policies that will be developed by TRENT in cooperation with UGA and UIRS.

In Zurich workshop participants will be divided into two different groups, based on their "planning culture":

- **GROUP 1**: Austria / Germany → Federal countries, decentralized planning system
- **GROUP 2**: Italy / France / Slovenia → centralized planning system

Objective of the workshop is to understand how experts from different European metropolitan regions deal with common shared planning issues.

In order to reach this goal, moderators will explain to the groups what kind of project they, as a group, need to tackle.

Every group will deal with two different main themes regarding the same issue in two sessions of 40 minutes each.

The first one is related to question “How to increase connectivity?”. Our aim here is to understand how to enhance the interdependence between peri-urban and urban areas (and vice-versa), as well as understand how to improve the attractiveness of parts of the city that are usually considered as ‘extractive’ ones, with limited or non-existent connection with local markets or citizens (e.g. intensive agriculture usually outstrip local economic activities). Moreover, the aim of this part of the workshop is to relate GI framework to specific PPs territories in order to compare and relate them (which is usually an overlooked topic).

As an example of a key topic related to local policies we would like to figure out how could work correlations between agriculture and recreation. Agriculture means production of outcomes (products, services, etc.) to the town; recreation, in these terms, means people that go away from towns, virtually in peri-urban areas. We are referring to the Agrileisure, that is the locus of rural and urban social change, where activities such as farm-based agritourism, home-based hobby farming, rural/urban farmers markets an community-supported agriculture take shape.
Moreover, this is meant to comprehend which tools and policies the participants will bring into play, especially referring to their particular national/regional/local regulations and common-practices. In doing so, they will need to consider any of the possible dilemma that could emerge in answering to a realistic case study.

The second theme concerns the application of policies that could be effective, both regarding planning instruments, that financial matters.

We are seeking for answer to the following questions:

- **What kind of planning/financial instruments will they put forward?**
- **How different experts manage to deal with...**
- **Will there be convergences between participants of the same group? And between participants from different groups?**
- **Will come to light a best-practice that could be shared among LOS_DAMA! partners in order to deal with the previously explained issues?**

Both groups will deal with one theme at a time. Within each group there will be a moderator with the task of supporting and steering the “flow of consciousness” of every member. In each group there will also be a ‘secretary’ that will take notes to be presented in the final collective moment. To do this, it could be possible to use the group creativity technique known as “Brainstorming” (by which efforts are made to find a conclusion for a specific problem by gathering a list of ideas spontaneously contributed by its members). Here, four easy rules should be followed:

- **Go for quantity;**
- **Withhold criticism;**
- **Welcome wild ideas;**
- **Combine and improve ideas.**

It could be useful to encourage group’s members to provide ideas that might lead to a solution, not applying analytical judgment as to the feasibility of it. Only during the end of this preliminary phase, judgments from other members will be applied.

**Paperboard results**
Collect state of art between
cities. What is very specific, what policies
can be shared?

VIE, MUC, SBB

EU relevance: Natura 2000, water directive.
noise / air pollution
landscape plan/spatial plan, main focus balancing
of interests, shades
VIE, MUC, local/city scale
VIE, MUC, regional strategies
SBB regional strategies
not very specific

VIE, MUC regional level
mixed

VIE no regional plan/concept
VIE regional level

SBB, regional level

VIE, MUC, SBB regional level

BE, Erfurt/Reutlingen
"network integration"

SBB, city level declaration
- city & surrounding key areas,

interconnected
Instruments - GI

e.g. Ausgleichsregelung - does not normally ensure high quality sites

GI not one clearly cut instrument
many different ministries, approaches dealing
with different aspects of GI

1. need a different way of dealing
with GI implementation be more
credible? A GI chif? many GI states

Def: regulations for human use

SME concepts: important but not easy to handle

Guide: measures can be based on their
- site
- open area concept - city and surrounding

I: how to coordinate diff autonomy municipalities
with regard to I
FRIT Policy framing/instrument

Issue is implementation condition

Need of manual protocols for correct implementation.

Very complex to develop local project due to

Lack of standardized coordination
between municipalities.

Q - Knowledge of the system:

- Sharing your knowledge/why
  /tools

- Comprehensive analysis.
How do you work cross-sector/cross-departmental?

MUC: decisions; city council
  - different aspects of GI, pop-up - department responsible is setting up a working group
  - develops the proposal for the city council decision. Strong role of chairing department, sending draft for comments
  - city council decision or discussion & changes

CH/2U: many steps before going to council

VIE: urban development: commission of city council for strategic projects
  - steering group LD -> new formal participants
    - workshops, working with facilitator, heads of units,
    - also from districts & neigh. comm.

SBG: special arrangements for specific projects
  - who has to be included - sensitive, has to be checked
  - focus project, not beyond; difficult to involve other sectors / reluctance
MUC: more complex process
VIE: final plan to others — resistance!
MUC: difficult; different power of sectors

open question — are working groups really delivering integrated, holistic solutions, concepts, ...

CT: think of involving implementation units before final stage