

18.14. Activation of public-private collaboration

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

Author/s and affiliations: Katharina Hölscher¹

¹ Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT), Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Activation of public-private collaboration	Participatory Planning and Governance
<p>Description and justification</p>	<p>Traditionally, most urban green initiatives were, and still are, initiated and governed by local governments (Sekulova and Anguelovski 2017; Dushkova and Haase 2020). However, public agencies tend to withdraw in long-term managing and financing, making interventions one-off measures or leaving them without maintenance funds (Nesshöver et al. 2017; Young and McPherson 2013). Meanwhile, the number of green spaces, especially community gardens, initiated and managed in a bottom-up fashion is increasing (Buijs et al. 2018; Sekulova and Anguelovski, 2017). The private sector has started to be dominant driving force in implementing nature-based solutions, particularly for green roofs and facades. Private initiatives often still need support from local governments in the form of land permits, funding, knowledge and linking to other practitioners (Frantzeskaki 2019).</p> <p>Collaboration between various public and private actors can help overcoming fragmentation, disengagement and social exclusion girdling nature-based solutions planning through integrating multiple perspectives, needs and knowledges and opening up opportunities for innovation with multiple ecological, social and economic gains (Frantzeskaki 2019; Davies and Laforteza 2019). Collaboration can be of importance for the social support of the nature-based solutions over time. Involvement of citizens and other stakeholders during project implementation ensures establishment of a common understanding of the project's longer-term maintenance or management needs, and provides managers and developers with critical input regarding the project's performance relative to stakeholder expectations. It can also be a matter of creating economic insurance, where different financial resources can be activated to sustain functionality over time.</p> <p>For these reasons, public-private collaboration and co-management of nature-based solutions are advocated (European Commission, 2016; Pauleit et al., 2017; Kabisch et al. 2017). Often, the term public-private partnership (PPP) is employed to refer to a more or less formalised relationship formed between public and private sectors, with different levels of responsibilities, to deliver public services (Ahmadabadi and Heravi 2019; Chan et al. 2010). Collaborations between public and private actors in nature-</p>

	<p>based solutions planning, delivery and stewarding can however be much more diverse. They can involve formal and informal government-industry, government-research or citizen-government collaborations – to name but a few. For example, Buijs et al. (2018) show how active citizens can significantly contribute to urban green infrastructure planning and implementation, by developing large parks with volunteers or designing a network of green corridors (Buijs et al. 2018). These collaborations can also be short-term or long-term – important is that at least one public and one private party is involved with the aim to collaborate on the planning, delivery and/or stewarding of a nature-based solution.</p> <p>It is important to note that public-private collaborations are no magical recipe to overcome typical governance problems. Research on PPPs has focused on unveiling various reasons for pitfalls and shortcomings, including regulatory issues, inappropriate and complex financing structures (Ahmadabadi and Heravi 2019; Benítez-Ávila et al. 2018). While this indicator suggests to estimate the level of collaboration by counting the number of collaborations activated, it is therefore important to also consider the (reasons for) success and failure of these collaborations.</p>
Definition	The indicator is defined as the number of collaborations between public and private actors activated for the planning, delivery and/or stewarding of a nature-based solution.
Strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Easy measure of public-private collaboration + Creates space and opportunity to reflect on collaboration (goals, outcomes, interests etc.) - Does not reveal the quality of the collaboration and diversity in terms of (especially private) actors involved - (Qualitative) data mining could be time-consuming
Measurement procedure and tool	<p><i>Quantitative P:</i> number (counting number of collaborations activated)</p> <p><i>Qualitative P:</i></p> <p>T: case study methodology – semi-structured interviews, case study analysis, participant and non-participant observation</p> <p>T: participatory data collections methods, such as focus groups</p>
Scale of measurement	Number
Data source	
Required data	<p>Essential: Information on public-private collaborations activated throughout each nature-based solution project planning, delivery and stewardship</p> <p>Recommended: Data on the types of public-private collaboration, including what type of actors were involved, what were the actors' respective goals and individual roles</p>

	in the collaboration, how was the collaboration structured and how satisfied were the actors
Data input type	Quantitative (number of collaboration) and qualitative if data on the types of public-private collaboration is considered
Data collection frequency	Aligned with NBS implementation and timing of targeted objectives; at minimum before and after NBS implementation
Level of expertise required	Medium: data collection on collaborations requires knowledge about existing and new collaborations
Synergies with other indicators	
Connection with SDGs	Goal 10. Reduce inequality within and among countries Goal 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels Goal 17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development
Opportunities for participatory data collection	Participatory methods (e.g., focus groups, participatory data collection methods, and/or participatory action research) may be applied to collect information on the types of public-private collaboration, including what type of actors were involved, what were the actors' respective goals and individual roles in the collaboration, how was the collaboration structured and how satisfied were the actors
Additional information	
References	<p>Ahmadabadi, A.A., Heravi, G. (2019) The effect of critical success factors on project success in Public-Private Partnership projects: A case study of highway projects in Iran. <i>Transport Policy</i>, 73: 152-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2018.07.004</p> <p>Benitez-Ávila, C., Hartmann, A., Dewulf, G., Henseler, J. (2018) Interplay of relational and contractual governance in public-private partnerships: The mediating role of relational norms, trust and partners' contribution. <i>International Journal of Project Management</i>, 36: 429-443.</p> <p>Buijs, A., Hansen, R., Van der Jagt, S., Ambrose-Oji, B., Elands, B., Rall, E. L., ... & Møller, M. S. (2018). Mosaic governance for urban green infrastructure: Upscaling active citizenship from a local government perspective. <i>Urban Forestry & Urban Greening</i>.</p> <p>Chan, A.P., Lam, P.T., Chan, D.W., Cheung, E., Ke, Y., 2010. Critical success factors for PPPs in infrastructure developments: Chinese perspective. <i>J. Construct. Eng. Manag.</i> 136 (5), 484–494.</p> <p>Davies, C., & Laforteza, R. (2019). Transitional path to the adoption of nature-based solutions. <i>Land Use Policy</i>, 80, 406–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2018.09.020</p> <p>European Commission. (2016). Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystem and their Services (MAES). <i>Urban Ecosystems</i>.</p>

Retrieved from ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/knowledge/ecosystem_assessment/pdf/102.pdf

Frantzeskaki, N. (2019). Seven lessons for planning nature-based solutions in cities. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 93, 101–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENVSCI.2018.12.033>

Kabisch, N., Korn, H., Stadler, J., & Bonn, A. (2017). Nature-Based Solutions to Climate Change Adaptation in Urban Areas. *Theory and Practice of Urban Sustainability Transitions*.

Nesshöver, C., Assmuth, T., Irvine, K. N., Rusch, G. M., Waylen, K. A., Delbaere, B., ... & Krauze, K. (2017). The science, policy and practice of nature-based solutions: An interdisciplinary perspective. *Science of the Total Environment*, 579, 1215–1227.

Pauleit, S., Zölch, T., Hansen, R., Randrup, T. B., & van den Bosch, C. K. (2017). Nature-based solutions and climate change—four shades of green. In *Nature-Based Solutions to Climate Change Adaptation in Urban Areas* (pp. 29–49). Springer, Cham.

Sekulova, F., & Anguelovski, I. (2017). The Governance and Politics of Nature-Based Solutions. Deliverable 1.3: Part VII. NATURVATION project. Retrieved from https://naturvation.eu/sites/default/files/news/files/naturvation_the_governance_and_politics_of_nature-based_solutions.pdf

Young, R. F., & McPherson, E. G. (2013). Governing metropolitan green infrastructure in the United States. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 109(1), 67–75.

18.15. Reflexivity: identified learning outcomes

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

Author/s and affiliations: Marleen Lodder¹, Katharina Hölscher¹, Kato Allaert¹

¹ Dutch Research Institute for Transitions (DRIFT), Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Reflexivity: identified learning outcomes	Participatory Planning and Governance
Description and justification	Conventional governance, policy-making, planning and project management approaches aim to optimize existing processes starting from pre-defined problems and solutions. Only after a problem or solution is identified, a monitoring and evaluation process is designed. For example, indicators are selected to measure the effectiveness of the project(s) after implementation. This is done by experts and involves little participation of other actors. However, implementing nature-based solutions – especially on a large scale in cities – is complex: it touches on multiple goals and interests and requires innovative processes for collaboration, financing and design etc. It cannot be ‘blueprint’ planned beforehand. In addition, the context might change, new opportunities and barriers may