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Aims of WG2 and Task Groups

- **Gather qualitative and quantitative data** on the social or cultural services provided by UF and GI
- Consider evidence on the **social distribution** of ecosystem services

- Task Group 1: Physical and social characteristics of GI
- Task Group 2: Socio-cultural benefits of GI
- Task Group 3: Role of GI in tourism
- Task Group 4: Good practice going awry
Task Group 1: Physical and social characteristics

Conceptual model

Supply (physical) factors

- Ecosystem (characterised by size, type, facilities, biodiversity, etc.)
- Cultural services offered by ecosystem (supply)

Demand (social) factors

- Population (comprised of individuals with varying socio-demographic backgrounds, needs, preferences, values, etc.)
- Demand for cultural ecosystem services

Use of cultural ecosystem services provided (behaviour, length of stay, activity, visit frequency, etc.)

Benefits generated by use of these cultural services (enjoyment, health, etc.)

Use and benefits

Literature review of 40 studies in 13 European countries
Main findings

• Most common methods:
  – On-site questionnaires combined with visual on-site recording of elements
  – Off-site questionnaires combined with GIS data
  – Links provided by statistical tools or by overlaying different thematic maps
Main findings

- Demand and supply influenced use and benefits but was sometimes contradictory e.g. the presence of vegetation promoting feelings of privacy but also sometimes concerns about safety.

- Studies focused on recreation and aesthetic services rather than spiritual, inspirational or educational.

- Infrastructure had an effect on visitor preferences, activities and visitor numbers.

- Use of greenspace associated with several benefits especially restorativeness, general health and wellbeing.
5.2 Conceptual framework for cultural ecosystem services

The conceptual framework for CES is summarised in Figure 5.1. This framework represents an elaboration and development of what the UK NEA (2011) described as an 'environmental settings' based approach to cultural ecosystem services, and draws on the work of Fish and Church (2013). In general terms the approach articulated in the UK NEA highlighted that cultural goods and benefits associated with ecosystems arise from interactions between people and the natural environment. Put another way, an environmental settings approach emphasised a place, locality, landscape or seascape-based perspective to cultural ecosystem services (Church et al. 2011). Although these terms have their own distinct traditions and meanings, from the perspective of ecosystem assessment, the broad aims of a settings-based perspective is to explore the idea of culture in a geographical context. In Figure 1 the different components that make up the relationship between culture and ecosystems are represented graphically.
Socio-cultural benefits

- Literature review - Benefits identified from 56 studies in 15 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching category</th>
<th>Wellbeing benefits of cultural ecosystem services - i.e. benefits from interactions between environmental spaces and practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High level category</th>
<th>Capabilities</th>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Identities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to nature and benefits of different types of urban CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Symbolic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Supporting infrastructure and management

The following were identified as important:
- Amenities e.g. benches, trails, facilities suitable for the disabled (5)
- Accessibility to sites (1)
- Adequate maintenance and care of sites (1)
50 interviews undertaken in 16 cities in 8 different countries

The questionnaire survey aimed at assessing and interpreting tourists’ a) perceptions, b) attachments/preferences, and c) practices/behaviors vis-à-vis urban GI in the cities of their destinations.

Most interviews were with foreign tourists; very few domestic tourists

Domestic tourists tend to use GI more than foreign tourists

Younger tourists tend to represent the highest percentages of total interviewees
Task Group 3: Results

- Significant connection of GI with cultural points of attraction (connectivity of the natural with the cultural). Thus, natural attractions become cultural attractions and vice-versa.
- Tourists visiting Northern and Central European cities showed more interest in UGI than those visiting Southern European cities.
- Use of UGI was for walking, photography, picnicking, jogging, relaxing, socialising.
- Types of UGI visited included parks, urban forest, green corridors, gardens, lawns.
Task Group 4: Good practice going awry

- One learns best from one’s mistakes - yet, mishaps are hardly ever recorded.
- Learning from such experience is essential for decision-makers, practitioners, users and researchers.

- A questionnaire filled in by 20 ‘experts’ (policymakers, decision-makers, researchers and practitioners -10 countries. Examples include:
  - Using trees that increase sensitization to pollen, because the developers did not have a database of the potential allergenicity of different species used in urban green areas to serve as a tool for planning and design for all decision-makers involved in this issue, both public and private.
  - Natural elements were not robust enough e.g. to survive the play pressure (intensity of use of the area by the children).
  - Greening project either did not start or the care of the established green space stopped due to the lack of funding, unrealistic time-plan for using funds, bureaucracy.
Task Group 4: Good practice going awry

Steps to take to avoid mishaps

**STRATEGY**
- fulfil the purpose
- literature review
- check similar projects
- check legislation conflicts
- do SWOT analysis
- involve and communicate
  - know the users
- check species ecology

**IMPLEMENTATION**
- include project designer
- hire well-trained professionals
  - maintenance
  - educate locals
- build place attachment
- celebrate success with locals
  - regular on-site events
- zero tolerance for vandalism and littering

**FOLLOW-UP**
- staff regularly present
- monitor
- adapt
- do research
- build a brand
- learn from mistakes
- do a back-to-back project
- share your experience
Outputs from WG2 – Papers + Book chapters

Journal Papers:
3. Tourism paper in development

Book chapters:
2. Terkenli, T. S., Bell, S., Zivojinovic, I., Tomicevic-Dubljevic, J., Panagopoulos, T., Straupe, I., Toskovic, O., Kristianova, K., Straigyte, L., O’Brien, L. Recreational use of urban green infrastructure: the tourists' perspective’
3. Carrus, G., Dadvand, P., Sanesi, G. The role and value of urban forests and green infrastructure in promoting human health and wellbeing’