

17.1.1 Openness of participatory processes: proportion of citizens involved

Project Name: UNaLab (Grant Agreement no. 730052)

Author/s and affiliations: Laura Wendling¹, Ville Rinta-Hiiri¹, Maria Dubovik¹, Arto Laikari¹, Johannes Jermakka¹, Zarrin Fatima¹, Malin zu-Castell Rüdénhausen¹, Peter Roebeling², Ricardo Martins², Rita Mendonça²

¹ VTT Technical Research Centre Ltd, P.O. Box 1000 FI-02044 VTT, Finland

² CESAM – Department of Environment and Planning, University of Aveiro, Campus Universitário de Santiago, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

| Openness of participatory processes: proportion of citizens involved | Participatory Planning and Governance |
|--|---|
| Description and justification | Public participation in NBS projects encompasses a wide range of different opportunities for citizens, nongovernmental organizations, businesses, and other stakeholders co-create, co-implement and co-manage NBS, concomitantly creating a sense of ownership. The integral role of citizens and other stakeholders in NBS projects can influence the openness of other processes managed by the municipality. Increasing the openness of processes such as policy planning and implementation strengthens the connections between government agencies and the public they serve. |
| Definition | The proportion of public participation processes in a given municipality per 100 000 residents per year (expressed as %) |
| Strengths and weaknesses | <p>+ Provides an indication of the alignment between citizens' need and desires and the decision-making processes in a municipality</p> <p>- - Does not provide information regarding the quality of participation processes</p> |
| Measurement procedure and tool | <p>Openness of participatory processes (%) is calculated as (Bosch et al., 2017):</p> $\left(\frac{\text{Total number of open public participation processes}}{\text{Population of city}/100000} \right) \times 100$ |
| Scale of measurement | District to municipality scale (project-based) |
| Data source | |
| Required data | Total number of open public participation processes, city population |
| Data input type | Quantitative |
| Data collection frequency | Annually; at minimum, before and after NBS implementation |

| | |
|--|--|
| Level of expertise required | Low |
| Synergies with other indicators | Relation to <i>Design for sense of place</i> and <i>Participatory governance</i> indicators |
| Connection with SDGs | SDG 10 Reduced inequalities, SDG 11 Sustainable cities and communities, SDG 16 Peace, justice and strong institutions, SDG 17 Partnerships for the goals |
| Opportunities for participatory data collection | |
| Additional information | |
| References | |

17.2 Sense of empowerment: perceived control and influence over decision-making

Project Name: CONNECTING Nature (Grant Agreement no. 730222)

Author/s and affiliations: Adina Dumitru¹, Catalina Young², Irina Macsinga²

¹ University of A Coruna, Spain

² West University of Timisoara, Romania

| Perceived control and influence over NBS decision-making | Participatory Planning and Governance |
|--|--|
| Description and justification | Although generally recognized as a concept that bespeaks having, or taking, control over resources and decision-making processes that can affect one's quality of life (Carr, 2016), empowerment remains fairly ambiguous and debatable due to poor definitional clarity, followed by difficulties in measurement (Cross, Woodall, & Warwick-Booth, 2017). One of the most enduring problem arising from definitional diversity and differential understandings is the widespread use of a reductionist approach to its measurement (i.e., centered around individual/psychological empowerment) despite across-the-board acknowledgment that it can occur at different levels (individual, group, community or society) (Cross et al., 2017). Pratley (2016) emphasizes the five conceptual dimensions of empowerment commonly found throughout the literature (i.e., psychological, social, economic, legal, political), and states that the 'major challenges include complexity in measuring progress in several dimensions, and the situational, context dependent nature of the empowerment process' (p. 119). The fact that empowerment is a moving target (i.e., distinction between empowering processes and empowering outcomes, and |