



MP4 WP2

Model Agreements for Place-Keeping of Open Spaces

Final Report
Draft

August 2011

M. Pereira & H. Smith
School of the Built Environment
Heriot-Watt University

Contents

MODEL AGREEMENTS FOR PLACE KEEPING OF OPEN SPACES.....	1
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. METHODOLOGY	2
3. MODEL AGREEMENTS FOCUSED ON PRIVATE STAKEHOLDERS.....	3
3.1 FLANDERS LAND AGENCY (VLM) MODEL.....	3
3.1.1 Summary	3
3.1.2 Key recommendations for improvement.....	4
3.2 THE CITY OF GOTHENBURG MODELS.....	5
3.2.1 Summary	5
3.2.2 Key recommendations for improvement.....	6
3.3 THE CITY OF HAMBURG BID MODEL.....	6
3.3.1 Summary	6
3.3.2 Key recommendations for improvement.....	8
3.4 THE STEILSHOOP NID MODEL	8
3.4.1 Summary	8
3.4.2 Key recommendations for improvement.....	9
3.5 COMPARATIVE SWOT	9
4. MODEL AGREEEMENTS FOCUSED ON COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS.....	10
4.1 EMMEN REVISITED MODEL AGREEMENT	10
4.1.1 Summary	10
4.1.2 Recommendations for improvement.....	12
4.2 SHEFFIELD “FRIENDS OF FIRTH PARK” MODEL AGREEMENT.....	12
4.2.1 Summary	12
4.2.2 Recommendations for improvement.....	13
5. TRANSNATIONAL LESSONS LEARNED	14

5.1	General findings	14
5.2	Findings regarding private sector involvement	15
5.3	Findings regarding community involvement	16
6.	CONCLUSION	16
7.	APPENDIX – MODEL AGREEMENTS SUMMARY TABLES	18
7.1	VLM LAND CONSOLIDATION PROJECTS MODEL	19
7.2	VLM LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS MODEL	21
7.3	LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR NATURE PROJECTS MODEL	23
7.4	VLM AGRO-ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS MODEL	25
7.5	GOTHENBURG STRATEGIC PARK PROGRAMME & LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY MODEL	27
7.6	GOTHENBURG MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS MODEL	29
7.7	GOTHENBURG SAFE BEAUTIFUL CITY (SBC) MODEL	31
7.8	HAMBURG BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) MODEL	33
7.9	HAMBURG STEILSHOOP NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (NID) MODEL	35
7.10	EMMEN REVISITED MODEL	37
7.11	SHEFFIELD FRIENDS OF FIRTH PARK MODEL	39

MODEL AGREEMENTS FOR PLACE KEEPING OF OPEN SPACES


DRAFT REPORT

Heriot-Watt University - Marcia Pereira & Harry Smith

1. INTRODUCTION

Place-keeping is understood as the long-term management and maintenance of a space in a sustainable way, guaranteeing its lasting social, environmental and economic qualities and benefits. In order to promote place-keeping the long-term involvement of several stakeholders in several stages - planning, design, construction, management and maintenance - is needed. The organisation of the involvement of these stakeholders in the place-keeping process is done formally or informally via **agreements**.

This report presents and discusses a summary of analyses, evaluation, comparison and peer-reviewed discussions of **model agreements** used by MP4 partners in the place-keeping activities they undertake in partnership with other stakeholders. These are referred to as 'model agreements' because they provide particular examples or 'models' to learn from and from which it may be possible to adapt approaches and techniques to different contexts. This is therefore intended as a practical tool to allow practitioners easily to understand the key elements of the model agreements used by other partners, allowing comparison with other types of model agreement and presenting findings from the peer review of these.

The following model agreement analyses have been carried out: Flanders Land Agency (VLM), 4 types of agreement, completed by Heriot-Watt University (HWU); Gemeente Emmen/Emmen Revisited, completed by HWU; Hamburg Steilshoop NID and Hamburg BID – both completed by HafenCity University (HCU); City of Gothenburg, 3 types of agreement, completed by University of Copenhagen (UoC); Friends of Firth Park, Sheffield, completed by University of Sheffield (UoS). Full individual reports were produced on each of the studied model agreements covering: (a) **organisational context** for the model agreements; (b) **types of projects/activities** where the model agreements are applied; (c) a systematic presentation of the **model agreements** to allow cross-comparison; (d) **evaluation**, including a brief overview of key ideas and mental models influencing the model agreements, and a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis based on stakeholder perceptions; and (e) appendices describing some aspects of the **socio-cultural context** and providing further **detail on relevant organisations**. These individual reports (available at  the MP4 project website) allowed a good understanding of the contexts in which these agreements take place as well as of the challenges and successes they experience.

The full analyses of the model agreements were peer-reviewed in different opportunities in groups internal to MP4 and by external stakeholders, face-to-face and online, as detailed in the next section. The peer review as well as the whole process helped identify relevant transnational lessons. The aims of the peer review are (a) to offer each partner a transnational constructive critique of their own model agreements, as well as of other partners' model agreements, so that they may identify areas for potential improvement in their practice both within and beyond the life of the MP4 project (see relevant parts in sections 3 and 4 of this report); (b) to extract key lessons that should be considered when developing a place-keeping agreement among diverse stakeholders (see section

5 in this report); and (c) to provide a compilation of ‘discussed’ models that can serve as the basis for promotion of good practice and policy-influencing (see appendices to this report and separate individual model agreement analysis reports).

2. METHODOLOGY

In order to collect information for the individual analysis of models, semi-structured face-to-face interviews were carried out with representatives of practitioner partners as well as with key stakeholders involved in partnerships with them, from community representatives to members of government organisations. Analysis of documents and observation when visiting partners complemented the methods employed in data collection. Academic partners worked together with their practitioner partners on the analysis of the practitioner organisations’ models, working within a common framework. A common questionnaire was used for the semi-structured interviews and a SWOT analysis was made of each model agreement. The SWOT analysis is a widely used method which allows the evaluation of internal and external factors regarding a project or organisation, examining its characteristics and identifying its “strengths” and “weaknesses” as well as looking at external elements which could benefit (“opportunities”) or bring difficulties (“threats”) to the project or organisation.

A peer review of these model agreement analyses then took place through face-to-face discussions (with MP4 partners and stakeholders beyond MP4) and online learning labs (with MP4 partners) as follows:

- Workshop on model agreements entitled ‘Model agreements in place-keeping of open spaces: examples from MP4’ at the Green work(s)! international conference held in Bruges 12 & 13 October 2010. At this workshop the draft model agreements from VLM, Gemeente Emmen/Emmen Revisited, Hamburg Steilshoop, City of Gothenburg, and Sheffield were presented by HWU, and discussed following a structure based on a SWOT analysis of the models and lessons for and from the respective contexts of the participants. Seven participants took part in this workshop, these being mostly MP4 partner representatives.
- Two workshops on model agreements entitled ‘Private stakeholders in place-keeping’ and ‘Community involvement in place-keeping’ at the MP4 mid-term conference ‘Place Matters!’ held in Hamburg 9 & 10 December 2010. At these workshops all the model agreements listed in the introduction above were presented, each within the workshop that was most relevant to the type of stakeholder engagement within the respective model agreement. HWU, in agreement with the other partners and with the conference organisers, promoted and coordinated the preparation and (if possible) presentation of each model agreement by ‘pairings’ of practitioners and academics, so as to foster collaboration between these. Discussion again focused on SWOT analysis of each model, reflection on lessons from the models for participants’ own contexts, and suggestions that may be helpful to improve the existing models. Approximately 22 participants took part in each of these workshops. HWU wrote up the discussions from these workshops, which were then uploaded on the MP4 website as part of the proceedings from the mid-term conference.
- Online learning labs - Each of the above model agreement analyses were posted online as the basis for a separate discussion thread within an online learning lab on model agreement

analyses, which HWU ran from 23 February to 25 March 2011. This generated a total of 38 responses, in which most of the MP4 partner organisations participated.



The models **analysed** can be divided into two groups, according to their stronger focus on a type of stakeholders – private or community based – as we can see in the next sections. A summary of each model agreement and its SWOT analysis are presented next as well as recommendations for improvement.

3. MODEL AGREEMENTS FOCUSED ON PRIVATE STAKEHOLDERS

Four of the analysed models were considered to be more focused on ‘private stakeholders’, although not exclusively.

3.1 FLANDERS LAND AGENCY (VLM) MODEL

3.1.1 Summary

The **Flanders Land Agency (VLM)** in Belgium is part of the pool of organisations working within the Environment, Nature and Energy policy area of the Flemish Government. **They** are responsible for organisation and management of open space as well as for shaping rural policy within the rural and peri-urban areas in Flanders. In **their partnerships** **they** work mainly with the Agency for Nature and Forestry, Regional Landscape organisations, municipalities and farmers. **They** presently work with **four models**:

- **Land Consolidation projects** - improvement of farming through consolidation of land parcels, currently including landscape development, nature conservation, recreation, heritage conservation and village restoration (see Table 1 in Appendix).
- **Land Development projects** - development of open spaces (occasionally within urbanised areas) for recreation, landscape, agriculture, environmental issues, etc. In these projects partners are encouraged to execute and finance parts of the project and they can receive subsidies, depending on the measures and partners involved (see Table 2 in Appendix).
- **Land Development for Nature projects**: development/conservation of natural areas (within limitations in rural areas). (See Table 3 in Appendix).
- **Agro-environmental management agreements**: with farmers, allowing organisation of environmental & landscaping measures (EU Agro-Environmental Regulation). (See Table 4 in Appendix)



Table 1: VLM models SWOT

SWOT analysis	
strengths	weaknesses
Several partners: the involvement of several partners provides richness and flexibility.	VLM is not responsible for long-term management.
Agri-environment agreements - partners'	Participation of farmers in the maintenance of areas

<p>freedom to join these agreements promotes a more positive attitude than when they are forced to join projects.</p> <p>On the other hand, compulsory actions within land consolidation and land development for nature can result in a “quick change in land use”.</p> <p>Municipalities have an advisory role in the early decision-making, but VLM is independent from local politics.</p>	<p>used for Land Development for Nature projects are linked to the continuous provision of EU subsidies, as these are related to the area of land farmers work on.</p> <p>There are many organisations involved and they all have different organisational approaches (<i>“every organisation has their view of coordination and they think they do it best (...) therefore, the need for an umbrella organisation”.</i>).</p> <p>Partners’ freedom to join agri-environment agreements also means that developments are slow.</p> <p>Pricing policy: the same “price” is paid for the whole area despite different “values” for nature preservation.</p>
opportunities	threats
<p>Several partners bring new opportunities for different types of cooperation.</p> <p>Beginning of change in farmers’ view of natural environment.</p> <p>EU funds – e.g. agri-environment agreements Some farmers use these agreements to promote their products as a marketing strategy (good connection between ecology+nature+marketing strategy) – help promote attitude change as well as understanding of the environmental agencies work.</p>	<p>High competition for land.</p> <p>Farmers’ view of natural environment as competition.</p> <p>VLM position in between farmers and “green” environmentalists, who do not believe in the use of farmers as a tool to promote sustainability.</p> <p>Financial difficulties faced by smaller farmers.</p> <p>Funding availability – funds for agri-environmental agreements are secured only until 2013.</p> <p>Reduction of funds due to economic crisis</p> <p><i>“If EU funds were to become no longer available, Land Development for Nature Projects would need to go to tender, which might push out the small farmer, with consequent loss of the social aspects of the projects.”</i></p> <p>The growth in the number of Regional Landscape organisations may be a threat due to the absence of matching growth in overall funding for these.</p> <p>The involvement of many partners can make the coordination of approaches more difficult.</p> <p>Competition in land management with other environmental organisations such as NGOs (eg. Natuurpunt - a large environmental Belgian NGO).</p>

3.1.2 Key recommendations for improvement

Having to deal with scarcity of land, VLM and their partners have been quite successful in negotiating with farmers and local administrations, improving biodiversity and promoting an increasing awareness of environmental issues. The complexity of partnerships seems to be the source of both their strength and weakness. The cooperation with many partners is the strength of

the existing models and brings many opportunities. However, it brings also organisational problems, which need to be tackled. There is a view that improved coordination amongst partner organisations would be beneficial. Some see the need for an umbrella organisation that would be key in facilitating this coordination.

3.2 THE CITY OF GOTHENBURG MODELS

3.2.1 Summary

In the **City of Gothenburg** three important components of the city planning setup for place-making and place-keeping of parks and open spaces, which supplement each other and deliver a strong and consistent planning setup, were analysed:

- The **strategic park programme & long-term management strategy** provide a levelled and uniform approach to city district development and long-term management. The programme includes a set of strategies, analysis and principles that are delivered on the ground through park district plans. (See Table 5 in Appendix)
- **Maintenance agreements with public and private partners:** provision of regular maintenance services through a 50/50 split between in-house staff and external service providers. In order to provide high value maintenance and management in some areas the City transfers maintenance responsibilities to private or other public parties via these agreements. (See Table 6 in Appendix)
- The **'safe beautiful city' (SBC) partnership** is a municipal-led partnership for innovative solutions on specific place-making and place-keeping challenges. It involves various constellations of public and private finance and actors in a range of projects that improve the parks and open spaces in Gothenburg. Projects include both re-developments of plazas, attitude change and environmental learning as well as innovation of new litter bins. (See Table 7 in Appendix)

Table 2: Gothenburg models SWOT



SWOT analysis	
strengths	weaknesses
<p>Coordination is located at several administrative levels and units, but coherent action is still maintained through a strong strategic framework.</p> <p>Available tools for consistent assessment of social use and value of parks and open spaces (Sociotope maps).</p> <p>Deliberative processes are internalized as routines within and between administrative units and other public organizations.</p>	<p>Cultural outlook may be a barrier for engaging partners across organisational boundaries and establishing partnerships e.g. a strong reliance on council-led approaches.</p> <p>Focus on a pre-defined set of social use values and identities may create continuance and consistency, but also conformity in future developments.</p> <p>Micro management of maintenance agreements may take up excessive time and depends mainly on the quality of personal judgment.</p> <p>SBC is mainly working with internal partners within the technical department. Outsiders may have some difficulties in proposing and participating in projects within the partnership.</p> <p>SBC has a strong financial incentive mechanism for internal and external partners to engage and deliver</p>

	project.
opportunities	threats
<p>Within limits, frameworks can be adapted in a flexible approach tailored for local needs and requirements (maintenance agreements, Safe Beautiful City).</p> <p>New projects dealing with ad hoc problems and cross cutting issues can be initiated quickly and in collaboration with relevant partners. This provides Gothenburg with a high degree of flexibility in priorities and resource allocation (Safe Beautiful City).</p>	<p>Lack of funding at local level (for elaboration of district park plans) may impede the scope for involvement and engagement.</p> <p>SBC is dependent on annual funding decisions and political goodwill.</p> <p>SBC is informal in its structure and therefore inherently dependent on the quality and history of network and personal relations. Collaborative skills are critical.</p>

3.2.2 Key recommendations for improvement

Traditionally, the Swedish administrative culture is based on an authority-driven approach with a focus on local community and solidarity. This influences the types of models which are in use, despite a recent move towards more private involvement. The partnership “safe beautiful city”, for example, relied heavily on collaboration between formally independent partners. The outlook for mutual benefits and a status as trust-worthy were key motivators for partners’ engagement in specific projects. Limitations due to uncertain budgets or lack of internal resources could be seen as a barrier for engagement. It is possible to say that maintenance agreements were effective in **organizing** transfer of maintenance operations to profit or non-profit organisations and associations. Effectiveness of these agreements, however, should not be measured in terms of the percentage of the allocated budgets for maintenance or savings, but must be measured as their ability to improve values such as individual and community involvement and ease the management of maintenance operations. If proven that these traditional community values can be maintained and improved despite the innovation of the shared maintenance, this model could be further explored and developed by local administrations to overcome their limitations, always working within the overall strategic framework.

3.3 THE CITY OF HAMBURG BID MODEL

3.3.1 Summary

The **Business Improvement District (BID)** formal model agreements in Hamburg are based on a legislation developed since 2005. On the basis of this legislation ten BID projects were implemented in Hamburg until December 2010, two of which are already running their second term. Several more BIDs are in preparation in Hamburg, but not included in this analysis. The existing **Hamburg BID legislation** is applied through private area-based initiatives from proprietors who want to jointly improve the area around their properties. In this respect the activities regarding place-making and place-keeping are of relevance in most of the running BIDs in Hamburg to varying extents. To implement a formally designated BID proprietors have to **contract** a BID Manager to hand in a formal application to the public administration (District Councils). Only after the approval from the public authority can the BID start to work and collect the BID levy from all affected proprietors in the area. Responsible for the implementation is the BID Management Body – contractors for services,

construction works etc. carry out the work on the ground. Key BID activities in which stakeholders are involved and which include model agreements for place-keeping are:

- **Improved street cleaning and waste disposal in BID areas:** additionally to the public standard, BIDs can deliver extra cleaning and maintenance services.
- **Facility Management for open space:** some BIDs contract a dedicated facility management for all services in and around the open space, e.g. planting, cleaning, customer services.
- **Place-making through redesign of open spaces:** some BIDs realise a redesign of privately and publicly owned open spaces paid by the BID levy from the proprietors (not in the focus of this analysis). In practice there is a range from minor improvements regarding street furniture to a complete redesign of pavements, squares etc.

The evaluation showed that the need for secure funding and central coordination of activities are key issues in BID models.

Table 3: Hamburg BID model SWOT

SWOT analysis	
strengths	weaknesses
<p>Policy support and legislation</p> <p>Focus on land-owners</p> <p>Legal compulsion to pay the levy for all proprietors affected by the activities – no free-riding of passive proprietors possible</p> <p>Additional private funding available for activities to improve the area – additional to public services</p> <p>High degree of obligation and long-term activities of private stakeholders</p> <p>Direct benefit of investments</p> <p>Creation of quality that is above the average public standard</p>	<p>No compulsion for private stakeholders to co-operate – only to finance activities</p> <p>No influence on private property against the proprietor's wishes</p> <p>Possible hidden costs for public sector (e.g. management beyond the BID-lifespan)</p> <p>Lack of wider public consultation – especially the local community is not obligatorily involved</p> <p>Public standard of place-keeping is not defined – difficulties to clarify which activities are “additional” to those offered by public services</p> <p>Model is especially attractive for wealthier areas, i.e. the higher the property values the higher the possible BID levy</p>
opportunities	threats
<p>Evolvement of a joint public-private responsibility for the area</p> <p>Private investments might activate public and community activities</p> <p>Proprietors have a stronger voice and can influence public decisions and activities</p> <p>Coordinated joint area-based action is possible instead of fragmented and uncoordinated activities</p> <p>Private investors are more concerned in “keeping the value” of the place in a long-term – this logic is different from public sector action</p>	<p>Danger of further city-wide segregation</p> <p>Danger of exclusive developments (“gated communities without fences”)</p> <p>Danger of problems relocation to other areas outside a BID</p> <p>Danger of a decrease in public standards regarding service delivery in place-keeping</p> <p>Declining public investments in open spaces</p> <p>Long-term management not guaranteed due to the limited lifespan of each BID (5 years)</p>

3.3.2 Key recommendations for improvement

Place-keeping in a **BID** area is resourced from different origins, with standard resources for place-keeping in all locations coming from a) each proprietor for the maintenance of their own property and b) from the public sanitation department and the District Council for the maintenance of the public properties (e.g. streets, squares, parks, pavements). The advantage of the BID model is to lever extra resources for place-keeping through the BID levy from all proprietors in the affected area. This model is relevant as it works as a funding mechanism for additional place-keeping activities that go beyond the public standard. However, available resources depend on the location of the BID and local plot values – the poorer or more deprived an area the less a BID levy can fund. The application of this model, therefore, should be well supervised and coordinated by the local authorities, working within overall strategic plans, to avoid the generation of an unfair and unbalanced development within cities. The involvement and development of local communities is also seen as an important aspect which needs to be further considered in BIDs, as well as the avoidance of a sense of “privatisation” of public spaces.

3.4 THE STEILSHOOP NID MODEL

3.4.1 Summary

The **Steilshoop model (Neighbourhood Improvement District - NID)**, also in Hamburg, is an example of an informal model agreement used by the sanitation department Hamburg (*Stadtreinigung Hamburg - SRH*), some larger housing companies (GAGFAH GROUP, SAGA GWG, *Schiffszimmerer Genossenschaft*) and the District Council of Hamburg Wandsbek regarding place-keeping activities in partnership of these stakeholders in the housing estate Steilshoop in Hamburg. The partnership focuses on joint cleaning and maintenance activities in the most prominent open space of the estate: the central pedestrian zone. These efforts are a first result of the initiative to implement a Neighbourhood Improvement District (NID) in Steilshoop with the cooperation of proprietors and the public sector. The key activity stakeholders are involved with and which includes a place-keeping model agreement is the **coordination of cleaning in the central pedestrian zone**: improvement of street cleaning and maintenance of the western and central parts of the central pedestrian zone in the housing estate covering both publicly owned and privately owned open space. The pedestrian zone is the most prominent open space in the estate. The main actors involved in the agreement are housing companies, the district council, the sanitation department, and the NID Steering Committee.

Table 4: Hamburg Steilshoop NID model SWOT



SWOT analysis	
strengths	weaknesses
Clear and simple model	Informal models are based and dependent on voluntary action
Easy and fast to realise	Depending on individuals and their motivation
Almost no extra costs for most of the partners (apart from investing time to start the process and to	Depending on personal continuity

coordinate activities) Personal identification of responsible place-keeping individuals on the ground Easy to transfer to other areas	No options for formal redress to force stakeholders to keep their agreed responsibilities
opportunities	threats
Established and improved communication between stakeholders might improve further place-keeping activities (and other area based activities) in the neighbourhood Enlargement of action to the whole pedestrian zone on the basis of practical experience Visible results might convince sceptical stakeholders	Further funding of the “Kümmerer” is not guaranteed yet beyond 2010 when SRH is not able to solely fund this anymore Changes of personal might lead to discontinuity and decrease of efforts

3.4.2 Key recommendations for improvement

The **Steilshoop NID** model is a more or less informal model for more efficient place-keeping through improved coordination of joint activities in a larger open space with heterogeneous ownership and as such it is relatively efficient despite the initial difficulties in communication (managing expectations), legislation barriers, and risk of fragmented views of the space. It can relatively easily be transferred to other areas as the “basic solution” doesn’t require extra costs (apart from the time for communication and coordination invested) or specific legal or funding mechanisms. The employment of a place-keeping coordinator (Kümmerer) seems to be quite successful and important for the success of the model, despite implying additional costs and ideally requiring joint funding. Therefore, the model could be improved by the firm adoption of a PK coordinator and the establishment of a collection of funds from partners to support this. Again, like the BID model the application of the NID model would benefit from wider participation and supervision by the local authority to guarantee a balanced city development and avoid the feeling of “privatisation” of public spaces.

3.5 COMPARATIVE SWOT

During the Hamburg Conference Workshop on ‘Private stakeholders in place-keeping’ a useful **comparative SWOT** between VLM, Gothenburg Safe Beautiful City and the Hamburg BID model was generated:



Table 5: Comparative SWOT between VLM, SBC and the BID models

	VLM	Safe Beautiful City	BID (Hamburg)
Strengths	Clear accountability in delivery of public goods	Attitude change	Clear policy
	Environmental benefits	Public money available flexibly 'pot'	Economic activity



	Long-term management	Need for constant success	Direct benefit of investment
Weaknesses	Capital investment	Uncertain funding, only annual budgets	Hidden costs
		Design led by proprietors	Applicability only in wealthy areas
		No private investment in place-keeping	Public consultation lacking
			What is public standard? What is 'on top'?
Opportunities	Public subsidies trigger private investments / Public stimulation	Education	Private investments activate 'public' & community action (post BID)
	Attitude change among 'farmers'	Building collaboration	
Threats	Competition for land	Dependency on people involved	Lack of wider participation
		Informality	Declining public investment
			Long-term management
			Transfer' of process to other areas
			Managing out democracy / 'branding'
			Displacement of uses, people...

4. MODEL AGREEMENTS FOCUSED ON COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS

4.1 EMMEN REVISITED MODEL



4.1.1 Summary

In **Emmen** a joint-venture organisation between Emmen Municipality and the Housing Corporations operating within the municipality - **Emmen Revisited (ER)** - **work** with a very specific approach. **ER** aims to improve the social & living environment in urban districts and villages within the Municipality of Emmen. It seeks to achieve this through brokering collaboration among the municipality, housing corporations, and local residential groups; receiving input from the social affairs unit as well as other organisations involved in the urban regeneration programmes and

projects, such as the police, water board, (health) care organisations, etc. acts as a facilitator in the production of regeneration programmes, helping establish and run two levels of resident groups in each locality where the process is implemented (village or district): (a) a District Team (5 to 7 people representing residents and relevant public bodies), which meets every 4 weeks and has a continuous role in overseeing the process and implementation of regeneration programmes within its district; and (b) a District Platform (20-25 people), which is formed as a local consultation body when preparing programmes, and consists of professionals and volunteers including residents with an interest in the development of the area and representatives from the police, schools, etc. Responsibility for delivery of each of the components of the regeneration programmes defined through the ER process rests with the relevant participating agency, and implementation of the programme is monitored by the District Team. The key agencies involved in ER (Municipality, Housing Corporations and other bodies) take on place-keeping roles according to their legally established responsibilities and their funding streams and capacities. This model is an example of a strongly participatory process in decision-making for place-making, in which the local community is given an effective platform for discussing and defining its priorities. The structure and role of ER – facilitatory, democratic and non-hierarchical – appears to be an important factor in the success of the process. The experience with shared responsibilities in long-term place-keeping of open spaces beyond those established legally for public bodies is still limited however, due to both funding arrangements and the prevailing expectations. There is an intention to explore the scope for the ER process to include wider sharing of place-keeping responsibilities during the course of the MP4 project.

Table 6: Emmen Revisited SWOT



SWOT analysis	
strengths	weaknesses
Successful cooperation based on respect and dialogue between all participants, including municipality and local residents	Shared vision, committed people, efficient process & communication have to exist together
Users' participation and knowledge of their places, helping develop a sense of ownership	It is a slow process
Attitude of committed participants (the 'right people') including both personal drive and democratic focus	Dependency on having the "right people" and "policies"
Personal communication (not using technology) with emphasis on listening to "what" was said and not "who" said, supported as well by publications (newsletters, website, special events' material)	Tendency to privilege the community. Some people (in the community) can be very dominating.
Emphasis on seeking shared goals	Involving residents can raise expectations (and budget may be insufficient to meet these), particularly when municipality professionals are not involved from the beginning
Shared vision at the highest level (Steering Group)	Communication needs to be careful: experts need to explain their views to non-experts.
ER's facilitator role, working as a trusted bridge between the community and the municipality	Adjustment of goals may be necessary
ER's encouragement of experts from the municipality to work closer with communities	Project leader should not be only a "messenger"

<p>Lack of hierarchy in ER, with programme managers being free to develop innovative methods</p> <p>Qualities of project leader: diplomat, transparent, good listener, binder</p> <p>Quality of public space achieved</p>	
opportunities	threats
<p>There is an opportunity to expand from the current operation in 12 districts to covering all 35 districts in the municipality</p> <p>Larger role for local residents and larger involvement in management</p> <p>ER is a “communication channel” between community & municipality – providing a structure with representatives in each village, who are good contact points to provide information when needed</p> <p>To increase responsibilities in place-keeping, getting more local people and professionals involved in maintenance (it needs investment in education/explanation – making people aware of what they do)</p>	<p>Growth can also be a threat to the functioning of the organisation, which could become too large</p> <p>View of experts from the municipality as the ones who bring bad messages (the “bad guys”)</p> <p>A view that experts are not necessary anymore – “the community can design themselves”</p> <p>Change in politics</p> <p>Change of actors/types of stakeholders</p>

4.1.2 Recommendations for improvement

Though **ER** is flexible and creative in its approach to seeking funding, it is recognised that resources within municipalities are limited, and that there is potential to get people more involved in ‘place-keeping’. Place-keeping, however, may be less of a priority for local residents in the Netherlands than involvement in place-making, given the prevalent expectations that government bodies take responsibility for management and maintenance of public facilities including open space. The extent to which ER has experimented with drawing on community and business resources and inputs for place-keeping is still limited and could be improved by the wider involvement of stakeholders – community, organisations such as universities and schools, other sectors of the municipality and their professionals, etc – in very early stages, also attempting to guarantee a better gender balance and involvement across different ages. The aim should be to develop their awareness and guarantee their involvement in place-keeping through organisation and/or execution of maintenance activities.

4.2 SHEFFIELD “FRIENDS OF FIRTH PARK” MODEL

4.2.1 Summary

In **Sheffield**, the “**Friends of**” model is promoted by Sheffield City Council (SCC) to engage local residents in the place-keeping of Firth Park. Firth Park is one of Sheffield oldest and most historic parks but since the late 1970’s had fallen into decline. The responsibility for place-keeping at Firth Park lies with the Parks and Countryside Section of SCC as trustees of the land. However, there is a long established tradition in Sheffield of working in partnership with ‘Friends of’ groups to deliver a













range of place-keeping activities in  and open spaces across the city, with the establishment of the **Friends of Firth Park (FoFP)**  being central to the reversal of the park's decline. FoFP  to play a key role in the ongoing place-keeping of the park, as  a forum for stakeholder discussion about parks management,  for changes and resources as well as  work with stakeholders, SCC in particular, to deliver a range of improvements projects, events and activities, and helping to informally monitor parks management. Despite FoFP having  own constitution that governs  activities there is no formal place-keeping agreement between SCC and FoFP. The capacity and willingness of FoFP volunteers to take on roles and responsibilities and the capacity of SCC to support them are essential. There are clear benefits to both partners in particular enabling FoFP to deliver its aims for the park (which largely concur with those of SCC) and enabling SCC to access additional funding streams via FoFP as well as deliver wider green space strategies. Moreover, the success of the model at Firth Park is entirely reliant on the experience, skills and dedication of FoFP members and the model has not always transferred well to open spaces which do not have existing strong community interest and in deprived areas of the city. 

Table 7: Sheffield Friends of Firth Park SWOT

SWOT analysis	
strengths	weaknesses
<p>Gives a voice to local people and strengthens local ownership and responsibility.</p> <p>Provides local knowledge for SCC and route into local consultation.</p> <p>Provides access to funding SCC cannot reach.</p> <p>Added legitimacy to SCC work and good publicity to support funding bids and Green Flag award.</p> <p>Helps deliver strategies, both for the park itself and wider Council strategies.</p> <p>On the ground monitoring in place – group can report on problems and lobby local councillors to get things done.</p>	<p>SCC limited resources to support model.</p> <p>Dependant on skills and resources of group, may be reliant on SCC (or others') expertise.</p> <p>Membership voluntary, individuals may leave at any time.</p> <p>Informality of model may lead to lack of clarity group's role/scope of actions.</p> <p>Dependant on good working relationship between individuals. .</p> <p>'Friends of' may not be a representative group.</p> <p>May be selective of management actions they are involved in.</p> <p>Reliant on external funding.</p>
opportunities	threats
<p>Widen membership (but have tried unsuccessfully in the past)</p> <p>Training for members.</p> <p>Amalgamate with other Park based/interest groups.</p>	<p>Key members leaving.</p> <p>SCC and 'Friends of groups' priorities differ.</p> <p>Internal conflict, differing priorities between members.</p> <p>Reduced SCC resources – not able to support group or undertake management and maintenance.</p>

4.2.2 Recommendations for improvement

The success of the collaboration between the **Friends of Firth Park** and Sheffield City Council seems to be subject to some key points. First of all, the  success of the 'Friends of' model in general appears  to vary across Sheffield and to be largely dependant on the skills, knowledge and resources of the  local community, as well as the type of green or open space itself. Parks that are already well used,

that are at the heart of a community (location, use) and that have valued natural or cultural heritage are more likely to generate a strong 'Friends of' group. Similarly parks in the more affluent areas of Sheffield may benefit from 'Friends of' groups with greater capacity, whose membership of professionals may boast skills, networks and confidence not so readily found in less affluent areas. Secondly, the capacity of both FoFP and SCC and the viability of FoFP are ongoing issues. Thirdly, the 'Friends of' organisations are also often criticised for not being representative of the local community, which in the case of Firth Park has high ethnic diversity. Almost all FoFP members are older, white, retired females and it has been difficult to engage young members. The range of activities they are engaged in has changed over the years partly due to some of this work, such as litter picks, being undertaken by the park's grounds men, but partly because of the age group of key members. Finally, there is a reliance on volunteers, which means there is no long-term involvement guarantee as well as no formal redress.

Despite the difficulties the "Friends of" model can be quite successful and it has shown to be a good assistance in the development of open spaces in the City of Sheffield. The City has supported and encouraged these groups and should continue to do so. On both sides there are difficulties to be overcome, particularly in times of economic crises. Strategies to encourage the involvement of a wider representation of local communities (different age groups, gender, ethnicity, etc) need to be sought as well as creative solutions to overcome the economic crises effects. Finally, the past success of this model has shown that it can be quite effective when supported and taken within an overall well coordinated city planning strategy. The City administration, however, needs to have a strong role in supporting the development of capacity, knowledge and skills, encouraging wider involvement, as well as helping to overcome any negative effect or disadvantage caused by the open space location.



5. TRANSNATIONAL LESSONS LEARNED

From all the discussions which took place online and at Emmen, GreenWorks and Hamburg, some overall findings were identified.

5.1 General findings

- **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 model agreements due to **specificity** of context. These limitations in turn suggest that there are limitations to the scope and success of a 'best practice' approach. A potentially more successful approach would be the adaptation of key lessons from elsewhere to particular contexts, based on appropriate contextual analysis of practices in both their place of origin and the place where they are to be adapted.
- Peer review also raised many **new questions**, some of which are interesting in themselves but go **beyond the scope** of the peer review. Examples include e.g. the relative power of

different stakeholders, the principles behind public funding of farming practices, etc. some of these 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 (presented in this section), and others are divided into agreements with **private** stakeholders and agreements with **community** stakeholders (see sections 5.2 and 5.3).
- **Involvement of stakeholders** other than the local authority in place-keeping agreements tends to **require a change in culture and 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. E.g. public land may belong to the state, but responsibilities for the management and maintenance of such land may be taken on by other stakeholders. In addition, agreements may be facilitated if **legal** responsibility and **practical** responsibility are also clearly separated. Following on with the example of state-owned land, this may by law define the public sector (e.g. the municipality) as legally responsible, but specific practical management and maintenance responsibilities may be agreed with other stakeholders.
- The **clarity of the terms of place-keeping agreements** is a strength of any agreement between stakeholders. Lack of clarity may result in poorly maintained spaces and conflict between stakeholders.
- **Early engagement** of prospective stakeholders is essential to achieve a jointly defined agreement (purpose, scope, etc) and to gain stakeholders' commitment – but this is not always easy or possible.
- Both formal & informal agreements have pros & cons:
 - **informal agreements** are easier to implement but difficult to monitor and ensure delivery;
 - **formal agreements** require more effort and may be less inviting, but easier to monitor and ensure delivery; and
 - in some cases there is potential in **starting with an informal solution and evolve to a formal structure.**



5.2 Findings regarding private sector involvement

- **Involvement** of private sector stakeholders is dependent on these seeing an **economic benefit** in their participation.
- A **balance** needs to be struck between what the 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**.
- 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 “victims”).

5.3 Findings regarding community involvement

- **Successful** models tend to have **support from public sector**.
- The public sector is not “one entity” but as in the case of City Councils, they are composed by different departments and actors (e.g. professionals as well as politicians) with differing agendas, values and perceptions as well as with difficulties of communication and coordination. Many of these, therefore, also need to be made aware of the importance of “place-keeping”, and to be convinced that, in order to achieve effective place-keeping, this needs to be considered in different instances, from the planning process to the maintenance on the ground.
- **The voluntary nature** of community involvement can encourage **higher participation**, but is **no guarantee of continuity**. Typical problems with voluntary organisations are volunteer ‘burn out’ and the loss of knowledge and expertise when volunteers move on.
- **Flexibility and creativity** are essential to cope with changing political & economic contexts. This can be critical e.g. in a context of public sector spending cuts such as those happening across the MP4 partner countries to different degrees.

6. CONCLUSION

A series of model agreements for place-keeping of open spaces exist in different countries. The peer review reported on here has looked into some examples employed by the MP4 partner organisations, in order to explore similarities and differences between them as part of a transnational learning process.

A key conclusion is the extreme relevance of the **context** where each model is applied, as the socio-cultural environment as well as the political interests and economic situation determine national and local policies and practices. Nevertheless, **transnational lessons** can be identified: being understood in their contexts the models can provide ideas and tools, which can be freed from their local specificities (de-contextualised), re-thought and adapted to fit into the specificities of a different context (re-contextualised).

The existence of **strategic planning at relevant levels** (local, regional, national, territorial) is important as this provides the framework for the exploration of different ideas, while helping to maintain a coherent and balanced development, setting the scenario for the early discussion of “place-keeping” within a wider range of stakeholders.

The development of agreements between diverse stakeholders in order to establish place-keeping mechanisms that go beyond e.g. the traditional municipal park-keeping requires the establishment of certain levels of **awareness** of the importance of place-keeping among potential stakeholders. This needs to be developed at different levels, from the primary school student and her parents to professionals such as planners, architects and engineers to local and national/EU politicians. It is necessary to overcome preconceptions and be open to new experiences and ideas. Furthermore, **flexibility** and **creativity** are essential in the process of rethinking experiences which have taken place elsewhere and adapting them to local current needs and conditions.

Taking all the above into consideration, the analysed models can provide different contributions and inspire the development of specific contextualised model agreements. The contributions of the analysed models are varied and can be in the way they are organised (formally or informally, “friends of”, BIDs, NIDs), in the way they involve different stakeholders (public, community and/or private sectors), or in the way they explore different tools or sources of funds. However, it is important to say that there is also much to learn from the models’ weaknesses and from the reflection on how the threats to these models may be avoided.



7. APPENDIX – MODEL AGREEMENTS SUMMARY TABLES

7.1 VLM LAND CONSOLIDATION PROJECTS MODEL

VLM Model – Land Consolidation Projects Improvement of farming through re-devision and consolidation of land parcels, on the principle of cross-compensation among landowners. They currently include: landscape development & conservation, recreation, heritage conservation and village restoration.					
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 Land Development Project Committee (stops after project execution); prepares plan.	Responsible for maintenance first 2-3 years (often sub-contracted to RL). Agreement w/ farmers subsidising maintenance for further 5 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	initiate	Provides capital investment for infrastructure (specific agency providing this varies according to infrastructure)			
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 NGOs (e.g. nature & hunting associations)			Can provide maintenance via contract		
Regional Landscape			Can provide maintenance via contract (w/ private&public org.) - also education, training, liaison w/volunteers.		
Private landowners, farmers	request	Provide % of land with no compensation for infrastructure & provide capital investment if measures on their properties.	Are responsible for long-term maintenance of any improvements in their land, e.g. tree planting. Can get involved in maintenance of public space (eg mowing grass & collecting this for their animals) & have access to education/training provided by Reg.Landscape.		Maybe required to pay back capital investments subsidies if PK responsibilities not met.

7.2 VLM LAND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS MODEL

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, paths, bridges, ponds, water treatment ponds, etc.					
Actors		Place-Making	Place-Keeping (management plan)	Monitoring	Redress
VLM	<p>request</p> <p>initiate</p>	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 – it is not compulsory.
Ministry Env.Nat.Energy		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.		Maybe required to pay back capital investments subsidies if PK responsibilities not met.
Municipality					
Other state sector agents					
Regional Landscape			Provides maintenance via contract (w/ private&public org.) - also education, training, liaison w/volunteers.		
Private landowners, farmers		Provide land & capital investment if measures on their properties.	Provide land & capital investment if measures on their properties.		

7.3 LAND DEVELOPMENT FOR NATURE PROJECTS MODEL

VLM Model – Land Development for Nature Projects Development/conservation of natural areas as defined in regional plans or international protection (eg Natura 2000). Mostly large projects on public land, but can also be on private/agricultural land.					
Purpose of PK: general maintenance linked to specific nature protection measures (types of planting, etc)					
Actors		Place-Making	Place-Keeping (management plan)	Monitoring	Redress
VLM	prospection ↓ Initiates ↑ prospection	Contributes staff & equipment to production of plan and implementation of project. Secretary of project steering committee. Sometimes buys the land.	Transfers land to government or non-profit agencies, who then take on "place-keeping" responsibilities.	Has a monitoring role. Has to produce a report after 10 years.	No formal means of redress with ANB.
Ministry Env.Nat.Energy		Initiates compulsory project			
Agency for Nature & Forest ANB		Provides investment & makes decisions on project. President of steering committee. Often provides land.	Aim: 80% own land covered by manag.plan. Own land maintenance can be undertaken: (1) directly by ANB; (2) by companies contracted via tendering; (3) by farmers contracted annually. Also uses verbal agreements for small investments (pond or planting a tree), often related to enforceable projects.		In theory redress can involve claiming investment back, but does not really happen. Legislation protects continuity of new environmental conditions in nature areas, with penalties attached. In practice expensive work tends to focus on publicly owned land, with more basic work taking place on private land. In practice enforcement takes place only for water elevation projects.
Municipality			Public landowners are obliged to make management plans for woods, though this is not strict. Properties > 5 Ha are required to have a manag.plan. In large project ANB offers to prepare the man plan in exchange for part-payment. ANB also offers maintenance services to public sector landowners.		
Polder organisation					
Natuurpunt					
Private landowners, farmers			Less control over private landowners. Farmers can be contracted by ANB on annual basis for maintenance (often on land formerly owned by farmer).		Maybe required to pay back capital investment subsidies if place-keeping responsibilities not met.

7.4 VLM AGRO-ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS MODEL

VLM Model – Agro-environmental agreements

Provide payments to farmers who subscribe, on a voluntary basis, to environmental commitments. Based on EU regulation on Agriculture & Rural Development, within the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP).

Purpose of PK: adoption by farmers of environmentally friendly farming techniques and/or maintenance of landscape feature beyond legal obligations, in return for compensation for additional costs and income loss resulted from such practices: e.g. Protection of species, land parcel border management, management of small landscape elements, botanical management, erosion control, improvement of ground and surface water quality, etc.

Actors		Place-Making	Monitoring	Redress
Flemish Government		Pays compensation for additional costs and income loss resulting from application of environmentally friendly practices. Co-financed by EU Member States.		
VLM		Acts as intermediary between farmers & funding, either (a) responding to request from farmers or (b) preparing plans for specific areas they want to preserve (e.g. with impt. species fauna/flora). VLM fieldworkers help farmers find the best way to achieve their aims as well as providing relevant information.	Sometimes monitors work, mainly where there is a need for instructions & training (e.g. preserving species in lakes & ponds). VLM connects farmers to appropriate organisations that can help such as ANB.	VLM inspectors visit farmers. If they are not complying with contractual agreement annual payment is withheld.
Farmers	<div> <div>↑</div> <div>↓</div> <div>→</div> </div> <p>may initiate</p> <p>may initiate</p>	Farmers voluntarily commit themselves to adopt environmentally-friendly farming techniques for a minimum period of at least 5 years. Formal contract with Flemish Government.	Farmers have to provide information on everything they produce and report to government periodically.	

7.5 GOTHENBURG STRATEGIC PARK PROGRAMME & LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY MODEL

«Strategic Park Program (SPP)» & long-term management strategy. A strategic framework for place-making and support for place-keeping in the City of Gothenburg

Gothenburg's strategic park program consists of five strategic themes - identity, within reach, taking care of, availability, and variation. Sociotope maps are a central tool in delivering the strategy. Based on a common methodology, the program deliver local 'city district plans' For each of the city's 21 districts.

Actors		Place-Making	Place-Keeping	Monitoring	Redress
Department of parks and nature administration	Initiates →	Local district park planning processes	Responsible for provision of sociotopes and other park services in publicly owned parks and nature areas.	Receive feedback on district park plans	Re-allocation of investment / maintenance money
Department of parks and nature maintenance		Participate through meetings	Responsible for maintenance of publicly owned parks and nature areas	Through maintenance operations	Re-allocation of maintenance efforts
Public Housing Enterprises		Provide information about open spaces uses			
Schools / school children		Provide information about open space use / feedback on draft district plans.			
Local residents		Participate through meetings		Eventually complain about services levels	

7.6 GOTHENBURG MAINTENANCE AGREEMENTS MODEL

«Maintenance Agreements (MA)» for alternative approaches to organise maintenance through special agreements with private property owners, local associations and public housing companies.

Provide flexible maintenance agreements with private persons, community associations or housing companies in order to achieve ‘above the standard’ management and maintenance services. The focus is on small, but important spaces in the local community.

Actors		Place-making	Place-keeping	Monitoring	Redress
Parks and nature maintenance department	Initiates →	Existing places / up-front investments / refurbishment	Legally responsible for open spaces	Oversee maintenance agreement	Termination of agreement
Private persons		Provide information on needs	Carry out maintenance operations in publicly owned spaces		
Local community associations		Provide information on needs / undertake smaller projects (e.g. new equipment)	Carry out maintenance operations in publicly owned spaces		
Public housing companies		Provide information on needs	Carry out maintenance operations in publicly owned spaces		

7.7 GOTHENBURG SAFE BEAUTIFUL CITY (SBC) MODEL

«Safe Beautiful City (SBC)» A partnership approach for urban improvement in Gothenburg, Sweden

Purpose of SBC in Gothenburg: Improve attractiveness of public accessible spaces in Gothenburg through partnership based projects across administrative and sectorial boundaries

Actors		Place-Making	Place-Keeping	Monitoring	Redress
City of Gothenburg	Initiates →	Overall political approval / support	Legally responsible for publicly owned space.		
Technical Department		Project with partners Allocation of funding	Cross-cutting agreements for maintenance and administration of public accessible spaces	Monitors agreements	Termination of projects Withdrawal of funding.
Public Housing Enterprises		Co-finance	Co-finance Co-managing public space	Monitor agreements	Withdrawal from projects
Private business and land-owners		Co-finance	Co-finance Co-managing public space	Monitor agreements	Withdrawal from projects
Residents					
Others: Universities Schools			Education and new knowledge Attitude change		

7.8 HAMBURG BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) MODEL

Business Improvement Districts BIDs – The Hamburg experience

Private initiatives on a legislative basis for area-based improvements funded through an obligatory levy from affected proprietors in the area, including open space improvement – e.g. redesign and maintenance of publicly owned open space

Purpose of PK: Keeping the improved quality of open spaces “on top” of the public standard

Actors		Place-Making: Redesign	Place-Keeping: Maintenance+Service	Monitoring	Redress
Contractors / Service Companies	Contracted by Management Body on behalf of proprietors	Construction-Works, Refurbishment	Cleaning, Marketing, Ambassadors etc.	Contract	Contract with Management Body
BID Management Body (<i>Executing organisation</i>)	Responsible for application and implementation	Additional place-making activities “on top” of public services	Additional place-keeping activities “on top” of public services	Regular progress reports	Contract with City – and with proprietors
Active proprietors (<i>Initiators and preparer</i>) – usually Steering Committee	Initiate the process, develop the plan and choose the Management Body	Develop and agree on the Business Plan for place-making	Develop and agree on the Business Plan for place-making		
Passive proprietors (<i>Voter and payer</i>)	Have a right to vote on the BID-proposal				Right to object in the ballot
Public Sanitation Department Hamburg (SRH)			Standard maintenance of public open spaces		
District Councils Hamburg (Local Authority)	Information and counselling Formal approval of application		Standard maintenance of public open spaces		Refusal of application possible
Ministry of Urban Development and the Environment (BSU) Hamburg	Legislation, Information and support				Legislative adjustments

7.9 HAMBURG STEILSHOOP NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (NID) MODEL

Hamburg Steilshoop Model

Purpose of Place-Keeping: informal coordination of cleaning and maintenance of public and private open spaces in the central pedestrian zone of the Steilshoop estate.

Actors		Place-Keeping (management plan)	Monitoring	Redress
Public Sanitation Department Hamburg (SRH)	Initiated process with support from NID SC	Coordination & large manpower input on cleaning activities "on the ground". Payment of "Kuemmerer".	Provided regular updates to NID SC	Not formal nor informal
Housing Companies / Proprietors – private, public & cooperatives		Agreed aims and requested support (work) from their contractors and in-house services. Administrative support & funding.		
Service companies		Responsible for work on the ground, e.g. gardening and cleaning of private open space. Some work on public space on request of the contractors.		
District Council Wandsbek - management of open spaces		Followed the process and supported with information		
Ministry of Urban Development and the Environment (BSU) Hamburg	Support the process to set up a NID in Steilshoop	Funded minor physical improvements (programme "Lebenswerte Stadt" 2007-2008). Paid the Kümmerer for the first two years (2008-2009)		
Neighbourhood Improvement District (NID) Steering Committee (SC)	Supported the whole process and requested initiation of activities	Support, making available the participation of their inhouse or external service deliverers.	Informal via discussion in the NID SC & joint evaluation report for the first 18 months	

7.10 EMMEN REVISITED MODEL

“Emmen Revisited” (ER) Model – Municipality of Emmen, Netherlands

Urban renewal projects, including open space improvement – e.g. paving and landscaping – through community involvement & partnership

Purpose of Place-Keeping: focus to date mainly on place-making, currently exploring scope for extending process to place-keeping – e.g. maintenance of open spaces

Actors		Place-Making	Place-Keeping	Monitoring	Redress
Emmen Municipality			Legally responsible for public space. Formally signs up to area programme		
Emmen Revisited	Initiates →	Permanent District Team (1 from each organisation + 1-3 area volunteers) meets regularly.	Formally signs up to programme for area.	Monitors implementation & management of area programme.	District Team asks ER to intervene if place-keeping responsibilities not met
Housing Corporations			Responsible for houses & adjoining footpaths, gardens. Formally signs up to programme for area.		
Social Work					
Police					
Residents		Convenes time-limited District Platform as local consultation body for preparation of area programme (20-25 people inc. orgs. + residents).			
Other stakeholders: Province; Water Board; NGOs; private owners; businesses.			Various responsibilities for maintenance of: roads; waterways; landscape & nature; gardens & farmland; business premises.		

7.11 SHEFFIELD FRIENDS OF FIRTH PARK MODEL

“Friends of” Model – Friends of Firth Park (FoFP), Sheffield Community-based voluntary organisation involved in place-keeping of Firth Park in partnership with SCC				
Purpose of PK: maintenance & management of open space and facilities				
Actors		Place-Keeping - no formal agreement: Green Flag Management Plan for Firth Park sets improvement measures and identifies FofP as delivery partner & FofP constitution (states they will work in partnership with SCC and other organisations to achieve aims)	Monitoring	Redress
Sheffield City Council Parks & Countryside Service divided in 4 sections below that work closely to deliver PM & PK		Landowner & responsible for park management. They must be informed and approve any event or improvement project.		
Parks Section	initiate	Onsite maintenance & management staff. Staff & Parks Officer liaise with FoFP. Daily contact between FoFP and on-site staff where issues may be raised.	Progress on ideas & issues may be raised via different routes: FofP	Loss of Green Flag status, if park management falls below Green Flag standards. Report to Councillors
Policy & Projects Section		Park improvement & development. Regeneration Officer liaises with FoFP to develop ideas, seek funds, and manage larger projects	Progress monitored via Regeneration Officer reports to FoFP meetings, on-site staff, letter/phone call to North Area District Parks Officer or reported to Local Council.	Little redress. Loss of project budget. Report to Councillors.
Community Services Section includes the Ranger Services		Support & guidance to FoFP in delivering activities & events via Rangers Services.	Reports to FoFP meetings & to funder	
Trees & Woodlands Section		Responsible for woodlands. May attend FoFP meetings.	Reports to FoFP meetings & to funder for specific projects.	
Friends of Firth Park (FofP) – constituted group of residents & park users		Monthly meeting & lobbies for park users. Specific responsibilities in projects.	Informal responsibility for general management monitoring, also via reports to FoFP. Formal reporting to funders of specific projects.	Loss of project budget.