

COST Action FP1204

Environmental Services of GI and UF & Implications of Climate

Meeting Minutes, Lausanne – 2–3 June 2014

MINUTES OF WORKING GROUP 1

Chairman: Roeland Samson

Minutes taken by Gregorio Sgrigna and assisted by Roeland Samson

During the third meeting of the COST Action Greeninurbs the status of the work and progress so far was presented by the leaders and delegates of each sub-WG together with planned next steps.

The main objectives of WG1:

- **Qualitative and quantitative data** on the **environmental ecosystem services (envESS)** (such as climate change mitigation, water control, phytoremediation, energy saving, microclimate improvement) provided by UF and GI will be collated
- The activities of this WG will focus on defining the threats represented by **climate change** on UF
- The focus is Urban Trees, as main component of Urban Forests.

The aims of the Lausanne meeting were:

Concentrate our activities on two parallel objectives:

- a) Writing a **concept paper** (literature work, state-of-the-art, gap analysis, formulation of advices) on the envESS provided by GI and UF in urban environment and scenarios related to climate changes.
- b) **Redefining the data collection sheet for each envESS** trying to optimizing and simplifying the list for a realistic and pragmatic data collection.

A - As already planned during the Sofia meeting, the process for achieving the concept paper was refined. Each sub – WG worked at the list of indicators for the collection of the metadata which will be the base for the opinion paper.

The paper aims at identifying the most representative indicators and to verify for each country which ones are available or not. The idea it is to describe the actual knowledge about the urban environment and their mutual relations with environmental compartments. The 'opinion' paper will highlight the common metadata available across European cities and the eventual lacks of important information which needs to be collected in urban environments.

The paper will provide a position / review on the following key issues:

- Indicators of each envES

- The role of the structure and management of GI and the city on each envES
- Species dependency and relationship with each envES
- The role of models on the determination of each envES
- The role of society and geography on each envES
- Climate change impacts on each envES

And will conclude by discussing the following points:

- Priority envESS and UF character will depend on local situation,
- Need for species selector
- Complicated story because interaction with social aspects
- Economic and environmental impacts
- Need for data collection

The next timing and agreements were achieved regarding the concept paper:

- September, 29-30. Extraordinary meeting in Belgium (city to be confirmed): a paper draft will be presented by WG1 volunteers.

B - The **original 11 envESS** have been pooled in **5 groups** of services (during the Sofia meeting), which were rearranged during the Lausanne meeting in **3 main groups**. The former Air (1.) and Climate (4.) groups were merged and all the issues concerning 'resilience' (formerly indicated as 'protection') (5.) and water were considered as key crossing cutting themes over the various groups:

- 1. Air** (CO₂, air quality, pollen, noise) and **Climate** – Leader: Roeland Samson / Silvano Fares
- 2. Biodiversity** (all taxonomic groups) – Leader: Marco Moretti
- 3. Delivery of goods** (food, wood, bioenergy, litter) – Leader: Vladimir Stojanovski & Abhi Tiwary

The following agreements were achieved for the meta-data collection:

- Data storage: data will be stored in simple excel tables at the COST-website, that will be accessible to the COST member;
- Richard Tavares will design the data collection sheets; and
- Invite for next meeting an expert in meta-data analysis for a key note.

It was decided to organize a **Common European sampling campaign**

Aim: Overall estimation of urban air quality by biomonitoring in contrasting urban environments in cities distributed all over Europe

All participating countries are invited to collect leaves from urban trees for one or more representative cities.

Tree species to be sampled: London plane tree (*Platanus* sp.).
Locations: Park trees, Street trees.
Analysis: on sampled leaves the quality and quantity of deposited PM will be estimated, by direct

observation through SEM analysis (Scanning Electron Microscope) and SIRM analysis (Saturation Isothermal Remanent Magnetisation, indicating the deposited magnetisable fraction on the leaves). **Measurements objectives:** to obtain insight on the deposited particle dimensions, elemental composition of particles (SEM); traffic-derived PM leaf deposition (SIRM).

MINUTES OF WORKING GROUP 2

TASK GROUPS 1, 2 and 3 FROM LAUSANNE MEETING (minutes by Liz O'Brien, Mercedes Sanchez, Theano S. Terkenli, Andrej Verlic, Sylvie Nail)

Lausanne meeting 2-3rd June 2014

MINUTES FOR TASK GROUP 1: SOCIO-CULTURAL BENEFITS AND LINKS TO PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Broad points from discussion on Day 1

- Liz to lead TG1 group and Arne to be vice chair
- The original TG1 created at the Milan meeting was particularly interested in the linkages between physical characteristics of GI/UF and social data and TG2 (formed in Milan) focused on socio-cultural benefits of GI/UF with where possible any identification of physical characteristics. These two groups have now formed together into one group called Task Group 1.
- What are our objectives – linked to five questions in Sjerp's paper, linked to original objectives of TG1 and TG2? See plenary slides from Lausanne meeting.
- What level of detail should we capture in the spreadsheet? – linked to our capacity to input data, if we want to produce a credible paper then we need useful detail.
- Discussion about particular column headings in the spreadsheet, these have been highlighted on the spreadsheet and debated with a final set agreed – see below.
- Outputs – Two journal review papers and a book chapter in Cost Book.
- Some people are finding it difficult to see how their example might fit into the spreadsheet e.g. not a single study but a programme with a number of sub-projects, or a national study that covers urban but also rural GI or has an urban component, or the specific focus is not on GI or UF but broader. (GI and UF very broad concepts).

Points of agreement after discussion on Day 2 in Lausanne

- There are difficulties to identify correctly the three types of studies included in Column B (these are the letters of columns from the spreadsheet prior to the Lausanne meeting, further columns have been added so lettering will have changed in the new version). We discussed types of studies that might be missing i.e. social value mapping, social distribution focused studies.
 - o Agreement to include putting in question mark if it was a non A,B or C study or adding in a description of the study type for later categorisation.
- The papers or the studies should have been undertaken in the last 10 years or five years (Column G). But there is relevant information from other Cost Actions that could be interesting, or information from other Cost Actions that might have been captured and we do not want to capture it again.
 - o Agreement was to see what is relevant for each country that is contributing i.e. examples can go back – no time limit.
- Column K add in sub research questions or keep to main research question.
 - o Agreement to keep to main question/s.
- Column M Study area, do we need to add in the name of a site? If it says just local study or a study of 5 local states do we name them?
 - o Agreement to state national, regional, local only and not name sites.

- Column N type of activity. Does a descriptor of type of activity add anything if it cannot be explicitly linked to a benefit or physical characteristic.
 - o Agreement was to keep descriptor for now.
- Column U method of social data gathering.
 - o Agreement- We need to add in more detail e.g. was the sample random, snowball, stratified, on-site confined to days of the week etc.
- Social distribution (of benefits/services) is not captured and that is a key aim of WG2. How to capture?
 - o Have added in a new column to cover this.
- Economic aspects/values of benefits – suggestion by Nerys Jones of convening a meeting in 2014 which will include leaders from each working group.

New columns added

Column B – Full citation in original language

Column N – Social distribution/spatial distribution

Column W – Sampling method

General discussion

- We need to work on the definition of what is the result that we are looking for? We need to decide if we prefer scientific paper/s or book chapter/s. TG1 prefer scientific paper and TG2 said that it is more probably one book chapter and possibly a paper. The paper/s will be review paper/s. We need to select the information to focus on. For example one paper could be centred on the benefits and analyze the information available for the different countries.
- Some ideas for a collective paper: forest characteristics are more relevant for different countries (by meta-analysis methodology for example).
- We are analysing the most relevant studies in the different countries. It is not important that the language is local. Some people translate the information to English or there may be an English summary.
- Some liked the idea that we can include the maximum information possible and then we will analyse and select the information for a paper later.
- We want some rich detail for some columns such as results but for others we want clear options so that we can use excel to pull out relevant examples e.g. all surveys, all qualitative methods etc.
- Do we include national surveys as these may cover both rural and urban areas – try to pull out the urban elements of the study?

TOURISM TASK GROUP 2

Questionnaire Survey Research Design

Minutes by Task Group Leader: Theano S. Terkenli

Selection of Case Studies: Nordic countries vs. Mediterranean Countries. Interest has been expressed by 6 partners, the following:

1. Estonia—executed by Estonia (Simon Bell)
2. Finland—executed by Finland (Lisa Tyrvaïnen)
3. Latvia—executed by Greece, Inga Traube
4. Portugal—executed by Latvia (Thomas Panagopoulos)
5. Italy—executed by Italy (Elena Berte? Thomas Panagopoulos?)
6. Greece—executed by Portugal (Theano S. Terkenli)

Late interest was also expressed by Serbia (Nevena Vasiljevic), the role of which will be further investigated , right after the meeting, in the immediate time period of the next month.

Standardization of research sampling: in each country one large-size city and one middle-size city (maximum 50 + 50 questionnaires=100).

Criteria of selection of cities: 1. Distance between them (small)

2. Tourism destinations (urban tourism)

3. Population ratio: approximately 1/10 (?)

Means of carrying out research:

- a) Voluntary basis (3 or 4)
- b) STSMs (2 or 3)
- c) SPSS analysis—STSMs or voluntarily (student practical training)

Questionnaire survey implementation—at the end of tourists' stay.

Place: port of tourist exit from country (airport, port, train station, other): ratios of interview location to be determined on the basis of significance of port of exit/entry in each case study, based on tourist arrival statistics)= 1st level of interviewee stratification. Supplementary interviews to be held, if necessary in hotels, outside museums, archeological sites, etc.

Sampling process:purposive sampling, random sampling procedure (to be determined on occasion). Further levels of stratification: effort to stratify, at least by sex and age (+other biographical factors?)

Data analysis: SPSS analysis. Data compiled and delivered to data analyst in excel sheet or WORD format document. Decodification of open-ended questions to be done by the group, via skype, led by Greek team. Funded either in conjunction with data collection or separately—by STSMs or voluntarily (student practical training).

Outcomes—results: explorative study, indicative trends only.

- 1) Research paper—journal publication (compilation of all 6 case study results), publication in Urban Forestry & Urban Greening (interest already declared). Perhaps also individual/ country-level research articles.
- 2) Book chapter on Tourism and GI/ UF
- 3) Policy/management guidelines to municipalities involved in survey and relevant ministries.

Timelines:

- a) Application for STSMs + allocation of case study surveys, June-July 2014
- b) Survey implementation –completed by COST Action meeting in Israel (10/2014)
- c) Data analysis—subsequently, completed by Nice meeting (6/2015)
- d) Article and book chapter writing (by the end of 2015)
- e) Development of guidelines, by the end of the COST Action, in collaboration with other relevant COST Action IS1204 (TObeWELL).
- f) Development of concept and other sorts of papers, by the end of the COST Action, in collaboration with the above COST Action.

OBJECTIVES

1. Development and implementation of cross-cultural questionnaire survey; analysis of data and drawing of results; compilation of report
2. Publication of one joint research article, on the basis of the compilation of all questionnaire survey results + possible publication of country-level research articles
3. Contribution of one chapter to COST Action book
4. Development of urban tourism policy and GI/UF management guidelines for municipalities involved in survey and relevant ministries
5. Linking our COST Action research and its outcomes with those of other relevant COST Actions

PROGRESS AT LAUSANNE

Please, see minutes above

ACTIVITIES FOR NEXT YEAR 2014-15

- A) Application for STSMs + allocation of case study surveys, June-July 2014
- B) Survey implementation –completed by COST Action meeting in Israel (10/2014)
- C) Data analysis—subsequently, completed by Nice meeting (6/2015)
- D) Article and book chapter writing (by the end of 2015)

PLANNED OUTPUTS AND TIMESCALES

1. Application for STSMs + allocation of case study surveys, June-July 2014
2. Survey implementation –completed by COST Action meeting in Israel (10/2014)
3. Data analysis—subsequently, completed by Nice meeting (6/2015)
4. Article and book chapter writing (by the end of 2015)

5. Development of guidelines, by the end of the COST Action, in collaboration with other relevant COST Action IS1204 (TObeWELL).
6. Development of concept and other sorts of papers, by the end of the COST Action, in collaboration with the above COST Action.

PLANNED MEETING—NONE, besides the COST Action planned meetings

TASK GROUP 3: LEARNING FROM PRACTICE THAT GOES WRONG

Objectives

- Learning from bad experiences, mistakes, mishaps and unexpected consequences to provide insights for practitioners, policy makers and researchers

Progress at Lausanne meeting

- We analysed the two rounds of survey
- 11 countries returned 17 answers: Italy (3), Spain (1), Poland (1), Greece (2), Turkey (2), Hungary (1), Netherland (2), Ireland (1), Romania (1), UK (1), Serbia (1)
- Designed the structure of chapter/guidelines
- We have identified people / practitioners attending EFUF
- Is it possible to use the STSM instrument to analyse the stories?
- Who have been working on the topic: Senka Mutabdžija, Sylvie Nail, Clive Davies and Andrej Verlič

Actions for next year 2014/15

To analyse the Q; dependent on the quantity of received Q – either STSM or TG3

Planned outputs and timescale

Open access, links on GreenInUrbs website
Short communication / professional journals paper
Storyboard? Video? COST covered cost?
a summary of the work and results in COST FP1204 book sub-chapter; boxes

MINUTES OF WORKING GROUP 3

Draft Agenda

1. Discussing progress and achievement to date, based on the tables and manuscripts received so far [Monday 15.30 – 18.00]
2. Combining the work so far and commencing the analysis of the specific country descriptions [Tuesday 08.30 – 10.30 & 11.00 – 13.00]
3. Beginning the writing of the first article output, to be continued in the sub-group meeting held later in the year before the next full meeting at the end of October, and agreeing the agenda for the next meeting [Tuesday 14.30 – 16.30]

Whole Group Meeting (Alan Simson)

- The Lausanne meeting started off with a Whole Group Session that discussed the advances made since the last meeting, and the general direction to be taken at this meeting.
- It was acknowledged that many case studies had been submitted, and the question asked as to whether there was a need for further material to be gathered before the process of analysis commenced. It was agreed that there was currently plenty of material to work with, although if additional good case studies were discovered, they should be submitted, especially where there had been good intentions, but they had not been delivered, for whatever reason.
- It was agreed that the dissemination of information from the WG should be forthcoming as soon as possible. It was generally agreed that a book might not be the best means of communicating such information, as books take a long time to be produced, and much of the information can be out of date by the time publication takes place. Thus scientific papers, other papers and tightly-focussed policy briefs were the favoured means of communication.
- More should be made of the COST Action web site, in terms of uploading information, current thinking, matters for discussion, etc.
- It was agreed that advantage should be taken of the offer from COST to set up small, focussed meetings to pursue matters of publication. These meetings would take place before the next full meeting of the COST Action at the end of October 2014, and report to that meeting.
- The question of whether and where matters concerning the economic aspects of GI should be considered was considered. It was agreed that there was a good deal of information available on this already, but that this was not always straightforward or easy to apply and thus there might be

a need for the development of a straightforward evaluation tool. It was agreed that this topic should be included in the remit of the Collaborative Process Sub-Group.

- The issue of the human health aspects of GI and their role in governance were also discussed, and it was agreed that this subject area could be covered by the Policies Sub-Group. Case studies would be helpful.
- In terms of EU projects that are currently underway, the progress and agenda of the FP7 *Green Surge* project should be noted, and the benefits it might bring to the COST FP 1204 agenda [www.greensurge.eu]
- It was noted that legislation concerning governance can vary appreciably at National level, Regional level and Local/City level across Europe, and that European research can differ from that from the USA. Governance at the Local level can be fraught with difficulties in terms of scale, context and partnership working. Emerging European features such as Smart Town Centres, Resource Smart Corridors, etc. offer scope for better partnership working and effective local governance. Again, good case studies that seem to work are required.
- Useful papers circulated by Anders Busse Nielsen during the session:

Elander, I, Alm, E L, Malbert, B & Sandström, U, [2005] *Biodiversity in Urban Governance and Planning : Examples from Swedish Cities*, in *Planning Theory & Practice*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp.283-301.

Gant, R, Robinson, G, & Fazal, S, [2011] *Land-use change in the 'edgelands' : policies and pressures in London's rural-urban fringe*, in *Land Use Policy* 28, pp. 266-279. Elsevier.

Sandström, U, [2002] *Green Infrastructure Planning in Urban Sweden*, in *Planning, Practice & Research*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 373-385.

Minutes of WG 3 Sub-Group: Policies (Alan Simson)

- National Policy Statements have been received from Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Israel, Serbia, Switzerland, Slovenia and the UK. There may be others stuck in the ether somewhere, due to e-mail issues, but this will be sorted. I was noted that it would be useful to have more from North-Western Europe, but there was sufficient to undertake appropriate analysis.
- All Statements were studied by way of a SWOT Analysis to assess commonalities, differences, style of language, what policies were missing, etc., as detailed below:

	Strengths	Weaknesses
Opportunities	<p><i>Generally speaking, looking optimistic, being in most cases on agenda</i> <i>Various phases of the implementation process > possibilities for development</i></p> <p>GI covers the whole country, understanding of it; need to be paid attention across the country, and differentiation within a country</p> <p>Cities have strategies in many contexts</p> <p>Possibilities for interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral communication; recognising the skills of people to work to support GI</p> <p>Academics working interdisciplinary in multi-scale, cross-sectoral and cross-administrative context</p> <p>Need for tools for open dialogue; time & experiences about educational & practical contexts to facilitate processes</p> <p>Need for common language: terms and references to discuss together: strong initiatives</p> <p>Recognising which actors have economic interests for better green infrastructure (insurance companies)</p> <p>Recognising which actors have non-economic (in short time scale) but urgent needs (and long time scale economic interest) for better green infrastructure (e.g., children: public transport money for bicycle routes of school kids)</p> <p>Recognising the actors in relevant positions to help in building better green infrastructure</p> <p>Image building: Advertising and “educating” people to appreciate and</p>	<p><i>Generally speaking, differences, meaning different thinks, due to history & cultural contexts</i></p> <p>GI is a new concept; not seriously and explicitly referred to in national documents except: GI strategies in UK</p> <p>Urban forests concept has a limited role in many national contexts – in particular in the countries with lots of forests except: UK</p> <p>No GI strategy for country level; even though GI covers the whole country</p> <p>Green infrastructure is not limited to municipal level; need to cross the borders</p> <p>Limitations in dialogue: economists and ecologists in too extreme positions</p> <p>Not enough strong common language: terms and references to discuss together valuing made by people – imperfect methods how people to value things; externalities of normal economic system</p> <p>Ecosystem service approach emphasize monetary values not cultural ones – a huge change from previous practices</p> <p>A will to emphasis and focus on one’s own expertise > limited issues & possibilities for cross boundary communication</p>

	<p>build better GI (using artists, for example, beside professionals)</p> <p>Effective usage of current learning platforms etc;</p> <p>Funding projects across the sectors; feeling ownership of the outcome</p> <p>Ecosystem service approach as valuing (difficult things), including cultural values more strongly there</p>	
Threats/ Limitations	<p>Putting monetary value for green infrastructure: how you value un-monetary elements, how do people value</p>	<p>Mismatch between administrative scales: between advisory, strategic level large scale master planning & small scale local level planning</p> <p>Currently the municipal & disciplinary (such as forestry and planning sector) borders are not crossed</p> <p>Limited agenda setting</p>

- Issues arising - what policies are missing?
 - Those encouraging better communication, eg. multi-level, cross-sectoral and trans-disciplinary, including art, media, etc.
 - Integrative policies
 - The development of a common language
- The issues raised by the SWOT analysis were fully discussed, and it was agreed that each member of the Sub-Group should prioritize the emerging agenda and circulate their thoughts to all members before the next meeting.
- The need for good case studies / updates was again emphasized to amplify some of the issues raised in the national statements.
- The parameters of the proposed paper were discussed, and it was decided that a traditional ‘scientific’ paper was probably not appropriate in terms of gaining maximum coverage and communicating with the right audiences. Thus aiming the manuscript / policy statement? at an internationally recognized but less-scientific journal would be investigated.

- Alan Simson agreed to start the ball rolling with the draft script [corresponding author], and other members would contribute to the emerging paper [co-authors].
- The Small Sub-Group meeting will attend to:
 - **objectives:** proceeding with the manuscript
 - how to include the information from the outcomes of the SWOT analysis & case study descriptions into the manuscript – annex, concise tables, etc.?
 - various opportunities
 - **describing** (*selected ?*) **country** by country (illustration from various countries) or
 - **typology** (national vs regional ; integration) or
 - **rising issues** based on the policies, using topics > countries as examples
 - *manifestation of the GI policies*
 - *beginning from EU policies*
 - ascertaining what is happening in each country? what is happening on the ground or pointing out certain similarities
 - using the COST web site to full advantage by adding country descriptions, case studies, tables, etc.
 - **expected outcomes:**
 - decision about which journal to approach
 - way to present: countries; typology; issues
 - a draft of the manuscript, word count, etc.
 - final draft by full COST meeting in October
 - **date & venue:** September (18th – 19th September?) in Copenhagen
 - **tentative list of people:**
 - Natalie Gulsrud
 - Alan Simson
 - David Pearlmutter
 - Silvija Krajter Ostoić
 - Riikka Paloniemi / Maija Faehnle
 - **available budget:** 2500 €
- The aim is to submit the manuscript by the end of 2014.

Minutes of WG 3 Sub-Group: Collaborative processes (Nerys Jones)

- The subgroup discussed **the quality of the collected case studies**. In total 33 case studies from 13 countries were collected.
- However, some case studies were eliminated in the process of evaluation resulting in **15 examples from 7 countries**. It was observed that **UK bias** exists due to 7 UK case studies. In the same time there are no case studies from Germany, Netherlands, Belgium, France or Italy and there is reasonable spread of case studies from East Europe. Discussion revolved around whether we should continue collecting case studies to achieve better geographical representation. It was agreed that Renate Späth will submit some German examples and Rikka one or more Finnish

examples. Clive Davies in his role of external assessor expressed an opinion that UK bias should be overcome somehow. Nerys Jones pointed out that based on the results of the previous COST action E12 partnerships are generally better developed in NW European countries (UK, Ireland, Iceland, Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark) which have much less established forest and which have made efforts to plant new woodland. However, apart from UK, case studies from these countries are missing. It was agreed to **continue collecting case studies** in the timeframe of this COST action and to make a use of the GreenInUrbs website to disseminate information on these case studies. Furthermore, it was observed from current examples that many of the eastern European case studies reflect the fact that partnership working was not really practised until fairly recently (the last 25 years or so) and the partnerships are often less complex, often involving a municipality and one or two other bodies which makes an interesting point for the paper.

- It was agreed to organize **a full day small group meeting in Skopje** (Macedonia) on **3-4 September** tentatively for the purpose of finalizing the paper based on collected case studies. The approximate budget is 2500 EUR.

Minutes of WG 3 Sub-Group: Physical resources (Anders Busse Nielsen)

- The content of the questionnaire was discussed during the meeting
- It was agreed to circulate the questionnaire to subgroup members and after revision to send it with the cover letter to EEA, EFI and the chair of the COST FP1001 for comments and support.
- It was agreed that the questionnaire will be released in July 2014.
- It was agreed to have a day-and-a-half small group meeting in Bari in September with the purpose of
 - Developing of a spreadsheet for responses submitted from the NFI questionnaire
 - Testing the spreadsheet and initial analysis of the responses submitted from the NFI survey
 - Briefing of methodology for feasibility study on extraction of data on urban forests from current NFI in Slovenia, Italy, Lithuania, Sweden and Denmark
 - Finalizing of questionnaire on urban forest resources at regional /case study level.