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 community-relevant information on facilitator's skills and how it affected their perception of the co-production process.
Additional information	
References	Bens, I. (2009) Advanced Facilitation Strategies. Tools & Techniques to master difficult situations. Wiley Imprint: San Francisco. Chatterton, P., Owen, A., Cutter, J., Dymski, G., Unsworth, R. (2018) Recasting urban governance through Leeds city lab: developing alternatives to neoliberal urban austerity in co-production laboratories. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research: 226-243. DOI:10.1111/1468-2427.12607 Cserti, R. (2019) Essential facilitation skills for an effective facilitator. https://www.sessionlab.com/blog/facilitation-skills/ Djenontin, I.N.S., Meadow, A.M. (2018) The art of co-production of knowledge in environmental sciences and management: lessons from international practice. Environmental Management, 61: 885-903. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-018-1028-3 Green, F. (2013) Skills and skilled work. An economic and social analysis. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. Hölscher, K., Wittmayer, J. M., Avelino, F., Giezen, M. (2019). Opening up the transition arena: An analysis of (dis) empowerment of civil society actors in transition management in cities. Technological Forecasting and Social Change. OECD (2017), Getting Skills Right: Skills for Jobs Indicators, OECD Publishing, Paris. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264277878-en Reed, M.G., Abernethy, P. (2018) Facilitating Co-Production of Transdisciplinary Knowledge for Sustainability: Working with Canadian Biosphere Reserve Practitioners, Society & Natural Resources, 31:1, 39-56, DOI: 10.1080/08941920.2017.1383545 Weyers, M., Rankin P. (2007) The Facilitation Assessment Scale (FAS): Measuring the effect of facilitation on the outcomes of workshops. The Social Work Practitioner-Researcher, 19(1).

18.17. Procedural fariness

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

Author/s and affiliations: Kato Allaert[1], Katharina Hölscher[1]

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

Procedural fairness	**Participatory Planning and Governance**
Description and justification	Procedural fairness refers to "the fairness of the processes used to produce […] decisions" (Lauber et al, 2010). It is important in relation to participatory planning and

	governance of nature-based solutions as it gives interested or affected parties the opportunity to take any legitimate role in a decision-making process. This implies that all stakeholders have equal opportunities to express and defend opinions as well as to request evidence and justification from other stakeholders (Rosentröm and Kyllönen 2007; Laktic and Malovrh 2018). Procedural fairness requires basic ground rules (e.g. on timetables, procedures) that ensure legitimacy, accountability and inclusivity of the process, treat everyone as equals and give clarity to how discussions and data are treated can build trust (Ferlie et al. 2019; Frantzeskaki 2019; Ferretti et al. 2018; Chatterton et al. 2018).
Definition	The extent to which the decision-making process was perceived as fair by the participants.
Strengths and weaknesses	+ easy measure of how process was organized and perceived by participants -simplified measure with little information about what kind of groups were involved, and what it implies for roles, relationships and empowerment
Measurement procedure and tool	☒ *Quantitative P*: Scale inventory/Questionnaire (survey procedure, paper-and-pencil administration, computer-based administration) o T: Six items at measuring procedural fairness ☒ *Qualitative P*: o T: case study methodology – semi-structured interviews, case study analysis, participant and non-participant observation o T: participatory data collections methods, such as focus groups
Scale of measurement	Responses to survey questions using a five-point Likert scale based on (Lauber et al 2010): *strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree* (1) Impartiality Whether organising party/decision-maker was impartial during the process (2) Honesty Whether organising party/decision-maker was honest during the process (3) Equal opportunity whether all participants had an equal opportunity to participate in the process (4) Representation whether all viewpoints were adequately represented during the process (5) Voice whether all participants had the opportunity to voice their opinions during the process

	(6) Influence whether participants influenced the final decision
Data source	
Required data	✓ Essential: questionnaire scoring on procedural fairness ✓ Desirable: qualitative data on reasons and causes for procedural fairness or lack hereof, and implications for how the process and results are perceived
Data input type	Quantitative (quantitative and qualitative, if participatory data collection methods, and/or participatory action research are opted for)
Data collection frequency	Annually; at minimum, before and after NBS implementation
Level of expertise required	☒ Quantitative data collection requires no expertise ☒ Qualitative data collection requires medium level expertise in social science research
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 may be applied to collect information about perceptions of diverse actors to reveal challenges and opportunities, power dynamics, as well as reflect on outcomes with regards to procedural fairness
Additional information	
References	Ferlie, E., Pegan, A., Pluchinotta, I., Shaw, K. (2019) Co-production and co - governance: strategic management, public value and co-creation in the renewal of public agencies across Europe. COGOV Deliverable 1.1. 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 Laktić, T., & Malovrh, Š.P. (2018). Stakeholder participation in Natura 2000 management program: case study of Slovenia. Forests, 9(10), 599. Lauber, B. (1999) Measuring Fairness in Citizen Participation: A Case Study of Moose Management, Society & Natural Resources, 12:1, 19-37, DOI: 10.1080/089419299279867 Rosenström, U. & Kyllönen, S. (2007). Impacts of a participatory approach to developing national level sustainable development indicators in Finland. Journal of Environmental Management 84: 282-298. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2006.06.008