

**The Interreg IVB
North Sea Region
Programme**

*Investing in the future by working together
for a sustainable and competitive region*



European Union
European Regional Development Fund

Model agreements in place- keeping of open spaces

Findings from peer review and way forward

Dr Marcia Pereira & Dr Harry Smith

HCU | Hafencity Universität
Hamburg



**City of
Göteborg**



Structure

Model agreements definition

MP4 context

Peer review

Model agreements

Example

General Findings & Report

Way Forward

Model Agreements

Model agreements for place-keeping are understood in a broad way - not necessarily only as legal written documents signed by a number of parties – they may range from **formal** documents to **tacit** arrangements.

Model Agreements

MP4 Project Objectives

- Assess **existing transnational experiences** with place-keeping – literature review & case studies
- **Produce model agreements** for sustainable partnerships and develop innovations in place-keeping
- **Implement, promote and test place-keeping models** transnationally
- **Monitor and evaluate** socio-economic impacts
- Develop **place-keeping policies** and ‘mainstream’ best practice

Peer Review

- Academic pairings
- Partner meetings
- Conferences - GreenWork(s)! & Hamburg
- Learning Labs

Model Agreements

- Emmen Revisited
- Flemish Land Agency – VLM
- Gothenburg models
- Hamburg Steilshoop & BID
- Sheffield Firth Park

Flemish Land Agency VLM

VLM: part of the pool of organisations working within the Environment, Nature and Energy policy area of the Flemish Government . Responsible for the organisation and management of open space as well as for shaping rural policy within the rural and peri-urban areas in Flanders.

Partnerships: some of the main stakeholders are the Agency for Nature and Forestry, Regional Landscape organisations as well as farmers and municipalities.

Four models:

Land Consolidation projects - improvement of farming through consolidation of land parcels;

Land Development projects

Land Development for Nature projects:

development/conservation of natural areas (within limitations in rural areas)

Agro-environmental management agreements: with farmers , allowing organisation of environmental & landscaping measures (EU agreement programme pillar 21).



VLM Model – Land Development Projects

Development of open spaces for recreation, landscape, agriculture, environmental issues, etc.

Purpose of PK: general maintenance e.g. grass/tree cutting, mowing verges, etc

Actors		Place-Making	Place-Keeping (management plan)	Monitoring	Redress
VLM		Sets up Steering Committee; leads plan preparation; provides subsidies	Responsible for maintenance first 2-3 years (often sub-contracted to RL). Agreement w/ landowners next 20 years.	Visits owners 2-3 years later. Monitors via Maintenance Filling Card . Often subcontracts monitoring	Execution of management plan not legally enforceable.
Ministry Env.Nat.Energy	initiates →	Provides capital investment			
Provincial Gov.			State sector agencies take ownership of infrastructure management/maintenance from VLM. Voluntary agreement for maintenance subsidy. Organised w/other organisations(e.g.NGOs, farmers, RL) via contract.		
Municipality					
Other state sector agents					
Regional Landscape	requires ↑		Provides maintenance via contract (w/ private&public org.) - also education, training, liaison w/volunteers.		
Private landowners, farmers		Provide land & capital investment if measureso on their prorperties.	Provide land & capital investment if measureso on their properties.		Maybe required to pay back capital investments subsidies if PK responsibilities not met

VLM MA

SWOT summary

strengths	weaknesses
Clear accountability Environmental benefits Long-term management Capital investment Several partners: richness	Capital investment
opportunities	threats
Public subsidies trigger private investments Attitude change among farmers	Competition for land

Overall Findings

General

- Not many answers provided to the actual questions being asked! Quite a few raised further questions.
- **Agreements** between stakeholders (type of stakeholder, nature and scope of agreement) are **very context-specific**, depending on national/local socio-cultural milieus, policy environments, economic climate and specific project type and conditions.
- Peer review identified some limitations in transnational transferability of MAs due to specificity of context (above)

Overall Findings

General

- Peer review also raised lots of **new questions**, some of which are interesting in themselves but go **beyond the scope** of the peer review – some raising interesting political issues!
- However, some general principles could be drawn, based on **strengths and weaknesses of the peer reviewed models**, to be considered when developing stakeholder agreements – some are generic, and others are divided into agreements with **community** stakeholders and agreements with **private** stakeholders.

Overall Findings

General

- **Involvement of stakeholders** other than the local authority in place-keeping agreements tends to **require a change in culture & in perception of responsibility**, which may be aided by **awareness-raising, education, witnessing of benefits**, etc.
- **Differences between ownership of land and responsibilities over place-keeping** need to be identified and clearly established. In addition, agreements may be facilitated if **legal responsibility** and **practical responsibility** are also clearly separated.

Overall Findings

General

- The **clarity of the terms of place-keeping agreements** is a strength of any agreement between stakeholders.
- **Early engagement** of prospective stakeholders is essential to achieve a jointly defined agreement (purpose, scope, etc) and to gain stakeholders' commitment – but not always easy or possible.
- Both formal & informal agreements have pros & cons: informal easier to implement but difficult to monitor & ensure delivery.

Overall Findings

General

- Both formal & informal agreements have pros & cons:
 - **informal** easier to implement but difficult to monitor & ensure delivery;
 - **formal** require more effort and may be less inviting, but easier to monitor and ensure delivery.
 - In some cases there is potential in **starting with informal solution and evolve to a formal structure.**

Overall Findings Community

- Agreements with community stakeholders:
 - **Successful** models tend to have **support from public sector**.
 - **Voluntary nature** of community involvement can encourage **higher participation**, but **no guarantee of continuity**.
 - **Flexibility and creativity** are essential to cope with changing political & economic contexts.

Overall Findings

Private Sector

- Agreements with private sector stakeholders:
 - **Involvement** of private sector is dependent on these seeing an **economic benefit** in their participation.
 - A **balance** needs to be struck between what private sector would expect to be provided through their **contributions to taxes**, and what may be provided “additionally” through their direct engagement in **place-keeping agreements**

Overall Findings

Private Sector

- Private sector stakeholders may get more readily involved in place-keeping agreements if these are conceptualised as affecting **a group or collective of private stakeholders** rather than individual stakeholders (who may otherwise see themselves as “victms”).

MA Report

Proposed structure:

- I. Introduction (why, how it fits into MP4)
- II. Methodology (how)
- III. Summaries (tables, SWOT analysis, suggestions for improvement, relevance to others)
- IV. Lessons learned (general findings)
- V. Conclusion

Way Forward

- Opportunity to improve models on place of origin
- Opportunity to test transferability of relevant aspects from model agreements to other pilots

How best to do this?

Thank You

MP4 HWU Team:

Dr Harry Smith h.c.smith@sbe.hw.ac.uk

Dr Marcia Pereira m.pereira@hw.ac.uk

Prof Glen Bramley

Dr Caroline Brown

Dr Scott Fernie

Marilyn Higgins

Dr Alicia Montarzino