COST FP1204 Meeting Minutes

WG1 - *Environmental services of GI and UF and implications of climate change* –
Responsible: Roeland Samson

Specific aims and tasks

- Qualitative and quantitative data on the environmental services (such as climate change mitigation, water control, phytoremediation, energy saving, microclimatic improvement) provided by UF and GI will be collated

- The activities of this WG will also focus on defining the threats represented by climate change on UF

Minutes

I. Call to order

The chair (CH) and the vice-chair (VC) welcomed the participants of WG1. The CH outlined the draft agenda for WG1 and asked for feedbacks on the content for possible changes. Since there were no suggestions, it was accepted as the final agenda for WG1 meeting.

II. Appointment of rapporteur

The CH and VC called for a volunteer to record the meeting as a rapporteur. Tine Ningal from University College Dublin offered to act as rapporteur and was accepted unopposed.

III. Overall scope and aims of the WorkGroup

The CH outlined the general aims of WG1 . Briefly, they are:

- a) To collate qualitative and quantitative data on the environmental ecosystem services in order to provide a clear picture of the potential role in improving environmental quality.

- b) To focus on defining the threats represented by climate change on urban forests (UF), and how management strategies and forest planning should take into account new climatic scenarios

- c) To promote an analysis of the efficiency of different practices adopted across Europe at various scales

IV. Specific objectives

The general scope and aims in item *iii* were translated to specific objectives and these are to:

a) collate recent (qualitative and quantitative) data from national or international programs about the ecosystem services provided by green infrastructure (GI) and UF

b) compare different approaches and conditions (climatic, social, cultural, economic and urban planning) in the countries involved, in order to develop best practice guidelines for GI managers and decision makers to assist in the maximization of benefits from GI and UF.

c) define environmental and social indicators and thresholds in order to improve the environmental quality of our cities, and consequently the country and eventually the quality of life of European citizens.

d) provide scientific evidence in order to implement those best practices into legislation both at local, national and European level.

e) identify the main priorities and challenges in terms of future research on GI and UF.

V. Participants in WG1

Before the discussion, the participants in WG1 introduced themselves, their backgrounds, current activities and their expectations/interests and how they can contribute to the overall aims, scope and specific objectives of WG1. Their names and contacts are on a separate list attached.

VI. Delegation of tasks and participants

During an interactive discussion on the key aspects in WG1, the following themes were listed with the names of participants who will take the leading roles in the data collection and liaise with the coordinator.

	Themes	Group leaders
i	Carbon	Miglena Zhiyanski
ii	Water	Ursa Vilhar
iii	Energy	Henrik Sjöman
iv	Air quality	Tine Ningal, Jorge Humberto Amorim
v	Soil quality	Marijana Kapovic
vi	Biodiversity	Maria Ignatieva, Marco Moretti
vii	Phenology and pollen dynamics	Paloma Carinanos
viii	Wood and bio-energy production	Vladimir Stojanovski
ix	Food production	Lotte Fjendo Moller, Lilit Sahakyan
x	Climate change of urban trees	Silvano Fares
xi	Tree species composition and characteristics	Marco Moretti, Roeland Samson, Marie Rein Fleisch, Karoly Rédei, Henrik Sjöman, Lina Straigyte

VII. Related tasks and discussions

In addition to the delegation of tasks to participants above, other relevant issues were discussed. These include the management of urban green, questions on the reliability of data, urban environmental observatories, stakeholder input in the next meeting, consideration of bioclimatic zones when gathering data to cover all regions (to avoid under-representations), and ideas for STSM (short time scientific meetings).

Clive Davies who is a roving observer between the different workgroups suggested adopting a template to standardize the requirements for data quality on the various themes the participants are tasked to report on. The CH felt that the data should be supplied as they are for evaluation and can be standardized if needed.

The CH asked the participants about how to engage other people to coordinate and regularly update data. After some discussions, it was agreed that data sheets (templates) should be sent out to the WG members by the group leaders via the CH. This would guide the members to search for the required information to search for and supply.

The CH and VC emphasized that the participants should actively engage with other people while searching for data and involve those who have specific skills and expertise with the possibility of involving them in the COST Action programs. Names and contacts of skilled people were encouraged to be forwarded to the CH.

Tessa Hegetschweiler asked for clarification and what is covered in STSM. The VC explained that STSM is a good tool through which some work could be done for rewards and in return get data from them, particularly for PhD students and postdocs.

The VC pointed out that the next call for STSM would be in June (as informed by the Manager for STSM) and cautioned that prospecting applicants should state clearly how their data can contribute to COST Action in their applications.

The VC informed that one of the deliverable for COST Action was the creation of a website which went online today. The link is http://www.greeninurbs.com/

VIII. Deliverables from participants for the various themes

The discussion on the possible outcomes and deliverables lead to the following:

List of people, publications, projects of each country. Projects refer to other projects that are related to this (COST Action) project.

The subtask coordinators should send a list of parameters that should be reported in regard to their specific subtasks before the end of June to the CH. By mid-July, a compiled datasheet will be sent out to the WG participants. The response from these requests should be in by mid-September (Sept 15). In between, the coordinators will give feedback to the contributors.

Deliverables in brief

a) By end of June: input from subtask coordinators should be completed

b) By mid-July, send out request for information to participants based on compiled data sheet.

c) The responses should be in by mid-September (September 15)

d) -In between: feedbacks would be given to the contributors from the coordinator

Outcome after year 1 (February 2014):

a) For at least one subtask a list of people, projects, publications is added to the meta-database by each participating country, with the aim to obtain an as complete meta-database as possible.

b) Meeting in Sofia where the data-gathering procedures will be evaluated and subtasks discussed in further detail.

Outcome after the project

c) Gaps will be defined

d) Projects on particular subtasks/gaps will be submitted and/or initiated

e) Review papers are prepared and submitted

f) Management advice on GI and UF is provided

Other outputs from WG1

a) Book

b) Congress

IX. Any other business (AOB)

Questions were raised about integration with other WGs while searching for data and information as there are overlaps and collaboration. This could result in speeding up data discovery and improving the quality and diversity of datasets. Some of the suggestions taken on board are:

- Integration with other WGs – for collaboration and improve access to data and information.

- Keynote speaker (representative for WG1) for Sofia – VC cautioned that the keynote speaker must be someone who will talk in support of the activities of COST Action and stimulates discussion.

- Sofia: conference with poster and one key-note oral presentation and local stakeholders?

- Based on observation from other workgroups, Clive Davies suggested Thematic subgroups in WG1: splitting up for 40-50 min, and report back to the WG which was taken note for next meeting.

Some remarks made during the discussion to be taken into account are:

a) Issues relating to uncertainties about data availability (for instance, differences in scale, content, completeness etc.) across Europe.

b) Breaking up the subtasks (with smaller sub WG meetings)

c) Collaboration/cooperation/interconnection/integration with other WGs. This may be necessary because certain themes can cross different interests where collaborative effort might provide an environment for mutual benefits. These are could lie in for example:

       i. Background information for cities of interest (GI, UF, climate, traffic, demography etc.)

      ii. Safety in UF in relation to physical structure of the UF and in relation to tree characteristics.

     iii. Compilation of databases on trees and their characteristics in relation to the defined subtasks, but also in relation to social aspects (nice flowering, nice smell, no pollen problem, no problem with leaf litter……etc.).

d) An inventory of models

e) Inventory of environmental observatories

f) Inventory of practices/diseases

g) Distribution over bioclimatic zones

h) Uncertainty of data reliability (especially when coming from different sources)

i) STSM in relation to objectives (gap analysis needed)

j) Output: tree species selector (that would require interaction with other workgroups)

WG2 - *Social/Cultural services of GI and UF –*
Responsible: Cecil C. Konijnendijk (since January 2014: Liz O'Brien)

Specific aims and tasks

- Qualitative and quantitative data on the social or cultural services (such as aesthetic, spiritual, recreational and education services) provided by UF and GI will be collated

- This WG will also consider evidence on the social distribution of ecosystem service provision from GI and UF to better understand how a more equitable distribution of benefits can be achieved and maintained.

Minutes

1. Welcome by the chair
Prof. Cecil Konijnendijk van den Bosch welcomed the participants and introduced the instrument of COST actions as well as the aims of Action FP1204.

Tasks for this first meeting were:
- Introduction and getting to know each other
- Overall aims and ambitions: what do we want to achieve as a WG?
- Workplan for 2013 – and tasks and responsibilities

Prof. Konijnendijk van den Bosch reminded the participants of the aims and results for the WG2, as defined in the Action proposal.

- Qualitative and quantitative data on the social or cultural services (such as aesthetic, spiritual, recreational and education services) provided by UF & GI will be compiled & disseminated
- Consider evidence on the social distribution of ES provision by GI & UF to better understand how a more equitable distribution of benefits can be achieved and maintained.

2. Approval of the agenda
The agenda was approved without any changes.

3. Appointment of rapporteur
Rik De Vreese agreed to report to the plenary of this meeting.

4. Brainstorm session - socio-cultural services
Prof. Konijnendijk van den Bosch introduced key terms and concepts such as Green Infrastructure, Urban Forestry and socio-cultural ecosystem services.

In a short brainstorm session, the participants brought forward ecosystem services they considered to be socio-cultural services:

house prices /aesthetics / recreation / health / education & learning / psychological restoration / biocultural identity / community centre / spiritual / healing /historical identity / genus loci - Sense of Place / heritage / tourism / social cohesion / inspiration / creativity / freedom / fun / public participation / biocultural diversity / city branding /sensuary stimulation /biodiversity / experiencing – perceiving / environmental quality – pollution / job opportunities / sustainability / cost efficiency / economic regeneration / pollution mitigation / enhancement of city resilience / gentrification / healthy cities / sociocultural contexts / hunting / fear

5. Introduction of participants, their expertise and expectations towards WG2
Participants introduced themselves, their background and expertise, as well as what they were expecting from their participation in WG2 of this COST-Action. The number of 'i's after the statement denotes the number of times it was mentioned:

- Joint research - joint publications iiiiiiiiii
- research networking iiiiiii
- influence research agenda i
- comparing social contexts i
- develop terminology i
- finding new ideas & stimulus for research i
- participation in project ii
- knowledge transfer (to students) iiii
- bringing results on the ground - practical applications iii
- pass UF locally - promote field of UF iiii

- job opportunity i
- collection of good practices - how, where and why/better manage & design greenspaces iiiiii
(sociocultural & biophysical contexts)
- learn & grasp good knowledge ii
- improve research i
- environmental education i
- involve more young researchers/foresters in topic i
- mission to spread the knowledge ii
- keep myself updated i
- conceptualisation of social and cultural services - compare between countries ii
- identify and collect indicators (comparative data sets) iii
- valuation of ES (quant/eco/qual) ii
- dissemination of ESS in cities - raise awareness i
- transdisciplinarity - create mutual language i
- exchange of ideas i
- connecting social & biological ecosystems i
- SES of UF i
- how we will manage the action? i
- bring in the urban component in MEA i
- link to urban development i

6. Brainstorm for workplan

The participants suggested topics and activities to be carried out by WG2 during the duration of the Action:

- examples of UF/GI inventories => social distribution of ES -> combining census & green data
    eg England survey of (urban) green spaces
    -> how many countries collect these data? What's going on in terms of sociocultural data
- What's going on in our disciplines?
    Country profiles by Bulgaria meeting
- Link environmental & social aspects
- Different users have different perceptions
- Impacts of increased use on forests -> how are different countries dealing with it?
    resilience: how to preserve our resources?
- Disservices? See Lyytimaki & Sipilä 2009
    Fear
    Safety (anti-social behavior, abuse, dogs, car traffic)
    E.g. Study in Helsinki - Finns and immigrants
- Ask people: what is it? How to preserve? -> Bottom-up approach
- NEW COST-action: role of socio-cultural ES in cultural reservation & development through tourism
    additional funding for strategic workshops, bringing two COST-actions together
- focus on forest characteristics ~ ES perception
    mechanism: how to come from forest characteristics to perception
- types of engagement (view from the window -> co-management), behavior
- identifying the gaps as start for new research
- Survey by WG4 on people's preferences regarding urban forests?

still to be set

comparison of legislation, governance & institutions

existing legislations

- *Tourism: gap for knowledge on people's preference on forest, nature & landscape*

importance of local context

- *Need for bad practices -> learning from mistakes*
- *accessibility of GI/UF -> case studies across Europe*
- *tourism as motor for conservation of landscape/ raising awareness for landscape preservation*
- *proposal text: linking to climate change (tourism/recreational use)*
- *Interventions/programs: training - volunteering (collection data, management) - programs for engaging people (tree planting, …) -> engage people who are usually not engaged*
- *WHO: developing urban health indicator (incl. access to urban green - applying GIS) -> enlarging "health impact assessments" -> how much could urban green impact on urban health & cost-efficiency calculations*

information collected on motives for using green spaces? Social inequality in using GI -> Not collected at the moment

- *Effect of looking landscape ("Benefits of looking at landscapes" UFUG 2009???)*
- *Looking at effects of GI on children (learning & education, health, development)*
- *Place attachment/Sense of place -> need for comparing benefits*
- *Issue of scale: ~ other WGs*

The suggestions were subsequently clustered into 4 topic groups:

1. Links between forest/landscape characteristics, people's perceptions of nature/landscape & socio-cultural services

- link with user type
- link with valuation
- link with type of engagement
- link with place attachment/sense of place

2. Surveys/state of the art (perhaps in par with WG4)

- country profiles (including green & sociocultural surveys available; interventional programmes)
- grey literature (e.g. airport exit survey in IRL)
- comparison of institutions, legislation & governance
  - ➔ Identifying gaps in knowledge
    - ▪ publication
    - ▪ project application

3. Include disservices & bad practices (or good practice gone wrong)

Learning from mistakes; compiling examples

4. Linking tourism and green infrastructure/ urban forests

Topic group 1. Linking GI characteristics with perceptions & socio-cultural ESS (led by Marcel Hunziker & Arne Arnberger)

(1)- Forest inventories include forest characteristics

(2)- Appreciation surveys for forests

(1) & (2) -> What forest characteristics do we have to take into account for the perception of the forest

-> What forest do we care? Forests, forest edges, tree dominated urban areas

What kind of services do we consider -> Task for WG to define what we want to care about.

Methods:
- literature analysis (incl. national/grey literature -> forest inventories, literature on forest characteristics on attitudes & behavior)
- inventories: do they also collect data on socio-cultural dimension of forest
- Services:

- Deliverable by Sofia-meeting: database template / test of database by sub-workgroup members

Topic group 2. Listing Surveys & Assessments (led by Liz O'Brien)
- gather information on qualitative & quantitative data available on socio-cultural ES -> populating spreadsheet from own research
- focusing on past, ongoing and future projects (aim for collaboration)
- including GI definition

- Deliverable by Sofia-meeting: Populated spreadsheet & work plan for further collaboration

Topic group 3. Abuse & disservices - Learning from good practice going wrong (led by Andrej Verlic)
- literature review for evidence
- emailing practitioners - providing bad practice

what did you want to do?

what went wrong?

why did it went wrong?

What would you do differently?
- inappropriate use - non-included groups - management with wrong outcomes
- make use of STSM for collecting information (after questionnaire by e-mail) & optionally additional focus groups

- Deliverable by Sofia-meeting: questionnaire sent to practitioners (EFUF mailing list)

Topic group 4. Role of GI in Tourism (led by Theano Terkenli)
- understanding GI by users & public
- aim: study of perceptions between various stakeholders in various EU cities
(1) perceptions

How do we conceptualize landscape/green space?

How do people understand GI? How do people use these spaces? How do people like to use them?
Bring in other factors why people perceive ES the way they do it.
(2) stakeholders

tourists

tourism entrepreneurs

       locals

       local authorities

(3) European cities

       develop STSM -> doing surveys in different countries

       critical points: # participants, # questionnaires, # case studies, translation

- Deliverable by Sofia-meeting: draft questionnaire & setup of study; expanding # countries

For all topic group (leaders)

Workplan to Cecil by 1 June 2013

- Aim of the work
- Expected deliverable(s)
- Activities and time plan
- Who is doing what?

7. Messages/questions to other WGs

Need for integrated questionnaire and concerted consultation of experts, practitioners and other stakeholders

Use STSMs for collecting data (TG3 & TG4) and expanding sample

8. Any other business

- The Action's website is now at running www.greeninurbs.com
- The European Commission has recently issued its Green Infrastructure communication: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/ecosystems/index_en.htm

WG3 - *Governance of UF in a GI approach* –
Responsible: Silvija Kraiter Ostoic

Subgroup 1 – *Physical Resources* (Mariagrazia Agrimi)
Subgroup 2 – *Collaborative Processes* (Silvija Kraiter Ostoic)
Subgroup 3 – *Policy Governance* (Natalie Gulsrud)

Specific aims and tasks

- How the governance should be improved in order to maximize environmental and social benefits

- Comparison of governance in different countries and cities

- Costs and benefits of the different practices used in both planning and managing UF

- Development of indicators to be implemented in local, national or international regulations (roadmap for policy makers)

Subgroup 1 – *Physical Resources*

The general aim of the sub-WG "Physical Resources" is to provide an overview on the present (and perspective) knowledge on the Urban Forests (intended as physical resources) according to Green Infrastructure approach in Europe.

The tentative work-plan of the sub working group for the next 4 months (up to Sofia meeting) can be traced according the following steps:

A - (June-July 2013) Harmonisation and exchange of ideas with WG1 in order to create a common overview of the UPF resources in selected case study areas/cities
B - (June-July 2013) Discourses on the requirements to provide a Europewide survey on UPF physical resources

B.i. Focus on Urban periurban forest resources at national level Driving Questions:
      1. Which countries have forest inventory including urban forest?
      2. Is there any "special definition" for urban forest in the national forest inventories?
      3. Which types of forest/tree cover (those including UPF) are considered in the inventory at national level?
      4. For which components of the urban forest resource (street trees, parks, woodlands) are data on quantity and characteristics collected at national level (e.g. as part of National Forest Inventories)
      5. Is there any other nationwide classification/inventory including "Urban and Periurban Forests"? (tentative Italy with the ISPRA Report on the Quality of Urban Environment) and/or are there specific inventories on "urban and periurban forest" (e.g. Turkish Urban Forests)?

B.ii. Focus (general pattern and examples) on Urban Forest types Driving Questions:

> 6. Which categories/types/term significances are in use according to different national/local experiences?
>
> 7. Which are the indicators about Urban Forest in a Green Infrastructure oriented approach (e.g. Case of Slovenja: Size, Species Composition, Biomass, Age, Ownership, Forest Functions, Health conditions, Naturalness, Management, Forest infrastructure).

B.iii. Focus (general pattern and examples) on U.F. Data extension and availability Driving Questions:

> 8. Are the data collected, analysed and used on a regular and nationwide basis?
>
> 9. Are the data analysed or just collected, but not used?
>
> 10. How the data are published (Type of publication (Scientific, Official reports, Yearbook of Statistics, etc,), Language, Frequency of publication)

C - (july-september 2013) Preparation of a Survey according to the above mentioned driving questions and distribution among the MC & WG members in early autumn (e.g. first part of september), so we can have some preliminary results for the meeting in Sofia, October 2-3.

Subgroup 2 – *Collaborative Processes*

Task:

From the notes on the poster, develop a task and work-plan for integrating in WG3

Poster had a good many notes, all describing significant aspects of collaborative (or hindrances for collaborative) processes

We first discussed strategies for using them, e.g. what kind of a framework we would need to discuss/understand collaboration and governance in context of UG and GI.

Proved a hard task initially – felt we needed more information about real cases to move along

So we decided, until next meeting:

We all will assemble one – many cases from our own country or from our own situation/experience that relate to collaboration and UA/GI

- will pick examples that are 'interesting' (strategic sampling)
- will give short description (2-3 pages max)of main characteristics of case(s) based upon a basic setup (see below)
- will circulate our cases between eachother so we all can get to know all cases before we meet next

Further, we felt there at this time is no need to appoint responsible person, until next meeting we work all-together

Set-up:

- purpose/objectives of collaboration
- power-relation (who 'owned' process; who called the issues, set agenda…)
- who collaborated (actors/stakeholders; inclusion criteria; practical in connection to…)
- timeframe (short, medium, long-term or continuous process; planning, decision-making, implementation, maintenance or what aspects were included;
- aspects of learning (how was learning embedded in process; strategies for using learned experience to improve process)
- positive or negative aspects regarding outcomes and/or process
- other issues we deem relevant (Gaps identified…, special results…, etc. etc.)

This set-up, the case-descriptions etc. will also be distributed to whole WG (maybe even whole action) so that anyone who would like to contribute may get a chance to join in.

At next meeting:

Work together in group with case-material

Aim: make decision if usable for journal paper on collaborative process in a UF/GI setting

Agree on main structure for a paper (e. g. theories and design-framework)

Decide if we now need responsible person (first-author)

Until end of year two

Elaborate paper, find journal, submit paper

Year 3

On basis of journal paper, decide how to move further to elaborate into book-chapter ('down in detail', 'wider in scope or data', 'lift to higher level')

Year 4

Chapter ready

Subgroup 3 – *Policy Governance*

I.   Summary of current challenges facing UFUG policy and governance in G.I.
1. Governance
    o There is a lack of coordination and communication in UFUG policy and governance
    o There is a lack of cross-cutting thinking
    o There is a lack of coordination between scale and governance
2. Resources
    o There is a lack of tools
        ▪ Learning processes
        ▪ Legislative framework

- Instruments and ideas
- Political capital for urban trees
- Funding
  - How can policy and governance provide solutions to these conflicts?
3. Policy for whom and by whom?
    - How do we tap into the inherent value of trees and green spaces in our policies and account for the diverse users?
    - How do we internalize externalities and profit from some of our challenges?
    - How do we encourage more collaborative processes
      - We need guidelines to facilitate collaborative governance
      - We need a framework for collaborative processes
      - We need to understand various types of governance and makes inventories of these types of governance
4. Context matters
    - How do we legislate participation?
    - Understand the rules of the game

II. Work plan for next steps leading up to Sofia and beyond

Participants in sub-group policy and governance and their deliverables for Sofia:

- Natalie Gulsrud: outline policy contexts/flavours of governance
- Renate Spaeth: overview of UFUG policies and governance in Nordrhein Westfalen
- Alan Simpson: UK perspective
- Bruno Maric: case study on scales of governance
- Andreas Bernasconi: 3 most important instruments
- David Pearlmutter: audit: taxonomy of envirotools and links
- Riikka Paloniemi: Master table for comparative governance practices

Process:

1. Audit
   a. Create catalogue of UFUG planning and management policies and tools
      i. Local, regional, national
      ii. Short-term and long-term political timeframes
      iii. Costs and benefits of policies and tools
   b. Identify language used: quantitative, qualitative
2. Identify the gaps
   a. SWOT of existing UFUG policies and governance approaches
   b. Governance levels and coordination
   c. Which policy tools are missing and why?
   d. Which funding sources and mechanisms are missing and why?
3. Next steps and vision(s)
   a. Indicators and guidelines
   b. Raising the political capital of UFUG in GI
   c. Raising the value of a tree

Approach:

- Pragmatic: we want results
- Envisioning where we want to be in 2040
- Use STMS to gather data

Timeline:

- October 2013: Master table with preliminary catalogue of UFUG planning and management policies and tools filled in
- Spring 2014: Audit continued
- Fall 2014: Audit finalized /Identifying gaps begins
- Spring 2015: Identifying gaps
- Fall 2015: Identifying gaps finalized / Next steps begins
- Spring 2016: Next steps finalized
- Fall 2016: Book chapter and guidelines