

PILOT EVALUATION REPORT - TEMPLATE

Summary reports on the main outcomes of pilot actions and the lessons learnt within, with an outlook to prospective follow-up actions and potential transfer of the results to other areas within the same FUA and beyond.

Authors: Maribor Development Agency



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Inhalt

1. Activities and outcomes.....	2
1.1 Brief summary.....	2
1.2 Activities performed – What happened in you pilot action?.....	2
1.3 Outcomes - What are the results?	3
1.4 Evaluation – Are you satisfied with the results?	5
Budget table	7
2. Follow-up actions.....	8
2.1 What about the future?.....	8
2.2 Lessons learned to upgrade the draft models to “make them smart” – What can be transferred?.....	8

1. Activities and outcomes

1.1 Brief summary

Following preparatory and parallel activities were carried out in order to prepare the final goal of the pilot activity: a) identification of private and public owners within the pilot areas; b) identification of users of pilot areas; c) initial interviews within occasional users; d) establishing communication with permanent users; e) stakeholders events; f) animation of participants for each cycle; g) tender for technical assistance; and h) achieving synergy with other, similar initiatives. The preparatory activities were followed by preparation of outputs of the pilot activities: a) validation of the conceptual solution for rehabilitation; and b) preparation of the conceptual design.

Additionally, the preparation of the project identification fiche might also be carried out.

The preparatory and parallel activities provided the opportunities for owners, stakeholders, interested public and general public to participate in the regeneration of the urban green space. Based on these activities the preparation of outputs was carried out and the pilot activity succeeded in preparing the recommendations of maintenance of the existing urban green space within the pilot area, with the guidelines on revitalization of the green space within the pilot area and the visualizations for revitalization, along with proposals on how to achieve the revitalization.

1.2 Activities performed – What happened in you pilot action?

The small-scale rehabilitation pilot project conducted by MRA tested the Community Involvement Model, by beginning the restructuring of UGS. It tested two types of participation: Consultative participation; and Self-mobilised participation. Both types included the following four phases: identification, mobilisation, management, and sustainability.

Awareness raising was achieved through participation at social and cultural events, by setting up an online platform and organizing public presentations and exhibitions of the visualizations for regeneration of the UGS.

1) Consultative participation:

The consultative participation was achieved in 4 phases:

- a) identification of stakeholders to participate in consultations;
- b) mobilisation of identified stakeholders to actively participate in consultations;
- c) management of the process to achieve joint recommendations and guidelines for regeneration;
- d) preparation and confirmation of visualizations to achieve sustainability of the agreed upon achievements.

2) Self-mobilized participation:

The self-mobilized participation was also achieved in 4 phases:

- e) identification of interested public;
- f) mobilisation of interested public to participate in providing inputs for the regeneration of UGS;
- g) management of the participation to achieve joint recommendations and guidelines for regeneration;
- h) confirmation of visualizations to achieve sustainability of the agreed upon achievements.

The process included the following four approaches of the Community Involvement Model:

- Detecting and defining the community at thematic social events dealing with green issues (Festival dobrega počutja).
- Forming a Community Consultative Assembly (CCA) and handing out tasks to its members.
- Bring them in – by developing an action plan within D.T2.2.1 PILOT ACTIVITY CONCEPTS FOR THEMATIC WORKING GROUP 2, based around the 3 circles of identified users.
- Building responsibility to ensure the sustainability of the rehabilitated small-scale area.

The stakeholders (owners and users) of the pilot area and the interested public (general population with interest in the pilot area) were identified at various independent or joint events with the city municipality. These stakeholders were forming a community to be consulted upon further activities. The community involved the organizations who are renting their facilities within the pilot area; private owners within the pilot area and immediate neighbourhood; the city district Magdalena; and the municipality of Maribor (associated partner in the project). They all further disseminated the project activities and attracted more interest and raised awareness about the pilot area, which was also achieved by the project partner through events (such as the Festival dobrega počutja).

The stakeholders were directly involved in workshops to determine the needs and wants of the people who are daily using the pilot area. The interested public was animated through online campaign and by a suggestion box that was located at several locations within the pilot area and in the city district and on the spot survey.

Based upon the feedback received from both participating groups the visualizations were prepared by three groups of students, who incorporated all the elements proposed by the active stakeholders and interested public.

The visualizations were presented to the stakeholders, who provided direct feedback on how the visualizations meet their expectations and needs.

Furthermore, the visualizations were presented to the general public that voted on the most agreeable visualization based on their own personal understanding of the function of the UGS of the pilot area.

When consensus was reached the follow-up was prepared and the documentation on how the green area should be revitalized was prepared. The project partner therefore prepared the full conceptual design including all elements described within the Construction act, and the Project identification fiche: for preparation and treatment of investment documents in the field of public finance. Additionally the arborist report on the pilot area was prepared with guidelines for maintenance of the organ green area of the pilot area.

The owner of the publicly owned land slots within the pilot area had already started. So far the removal of inappropriate plant life has begun.

An agreement was also made with an owner of a private area to match the activities on the public area on his own property, however, they were postponed due to current impossibility of the private owner to implement any agreed activities.

By this the responsibility for the revitalization and regeneration of the pilot area was taken over by the public and private owners within the pilot area, which replaced the foreseen user protocols, as the users themselves will not be maintaining the area, as the revitalized green areas are the responsibility of the owners.

1.3 Outcomes - What are the results?

The main transferable method was the action plan which consisted of 3 circles of users to participate in the process. The specific situation of the pilot area is as follows:

- mixed public and private ownership;
- no residents;
- users of business infrastructure;
- users of temporary parking space;
- owners of either empty degraded land slots, degraded buildings with adjacent land slot, renovated buildings with adjacent land slot;
- public interest of the city district,
- public interest of the city municipality – also a partial owner of land and buildings.

For this purpose the pilot area was subdivided into 3 areas with different target group of stakeholders (3 circles) and the action plan was prepared that involved all potential stakeholders and interested general public.

With each circle being larger in territory and number of stakeholders, the activities followed this structure where the solutions would include previously proposed solutions by the previous circle.

Each of the proposals was therefore an upgrade of the existing situation, following the needs and wishes of the even broader group of people involved. Following this model each group was included to provide suggestions about their area and a broader circle, this the first circle group provided suggestions for each of the sub areas, the second circle group for areas of circle 2 and 3 and the 3 circle group only for the overall area, as each of the groups had less involvement in the previous sub-areas.

This way it was possible to reach the consensus and provide suggestions for areas of direct interest for each group (example – the general community of the city district was only involved with the overall arrangements of the pilot area, while the owners and users of the cultural hub were involved in the overall and specific area of the joint parking). The owners and direct users were involved in the consultations, while the indirect users activated to provide self-mobilized ideas and were given the opportunity through the suggestion box and online survey.

Circle 1:

During preparation activities, some suggestions were already collected and a representative for 7/8 organizations was nominated by each organization. A date was selected through Doodle online tool. Only 3/8 representatives participated. Through the consultative participation they presented the point of view of their staff and the users of their services. In the workshop session the needs and wishes of the organizations were presented as well as a proposition for the protocol us usage.

As a follow-up activity, all 8 organizations were sent the minutes of the event, with a possibility to contribute additional suggestion, either in person, via e-mail, or through a suggestion box that was set up within the MRA office building (5 responses were collected).

Circle 2:

During preparatory activities the owners were contacted. As the key owner, the owner of the degraded green area to the south of the access road was identified (a single owner of the largest area used as unregulated parking). Out of all contacted owners 4 (2 public and 2 private) attended the meeting and the key owner responded in a written form, stating his support to initiatives, which would not involve his investment in the area. Other 2 owners remained unresponsive (however, as their land is strictly adjacent to their wings of the building complex, they only have a low impact on the overall issues concerning the pilot area).

Additionally, the coordinator of the Cultural Hub carried out activities to animate the users of the building and the parking lot to attend.

On October 24th 2017 a meeting with a workshop was held at MRA premises, with 13 participants from 8 different identified owners (4/7), organizations (2/29) or stakeholders (2).

The participants presented their interests in the pilot area, with a clear need for undertaking actions to regulate the unregulated situation within the pilot area.

As a follow up activity, the suggestion box was set up in the Cultural Hub Karantena, for the users of services and organizations to contribute their suggestions. No suggestions were provided.

The users of services of the Cultural Hub Karantena were also animated to participate in the online survey set up by the External Expert in December 2017.

Circle 3:

Following the outcome of the circle 2 meeting and workshop, the content of circle 3 meeting was modified. As meetings of circle 1 and circle 2 were more of consultative type of participation, the meeting of circle 3 was now designed more as a self-mobilized type of participation, including a moderated discussion about the temporary usage of the pilot area.

The meeting and the discussion were held at the premises of the city district MČ Magdalena on January 24th 2018, with 12 participants, including the elected representative of the city district, landscape architects, multi-municipal inspectorate, municipality of Maribor (spatial planning and project office) and owners of the pilot area.

At the meeting the current situation was presented: the UGB project and the pilot activities were summarized, the synergy Urbact project was presented, the local analyses prepared within the UGB project were presented and the external expert hired for animation of the public presented the contemporary results of the online and live survey conducted.

Feedback gathered through suggestion box and online survey:

The suggestion box was set up and used for collecting suggestions in an anonymous way and not restrained with time issues. 5 suggestions were collected from Circle 1 users, which indicated the need to regulate the parking and open the backyard for usage.

A live survey (25 responses) and an online survey (38 responses) were conducted, providing a total of 63 answers provided, with further 15 people declining the live survey.

Based on the answers provided, most people would prefer this area to remain a free parking opportunity, as they use it in their daily commuting. However, some improvements were suggested (public lighting, asphalt, removal of the parking gate, better regulation of the parking gate to prevent unauthorized usage).

Based on the presented information, the stakeholders gathered proposed the following action plan, to achieve the rehabilitation of the pilot area:

- 1) The proposals for rehabilitation of the green area within the UGB pilot area will be aligned with the action plan for revitalization of the abandoned building complex prepared by the Project office of the municipality of Maribor.

2) City district will support such a joint action plan at the city council to be accepted at the city level and receive a budget for its implementation.

<u>Circle 1</u>	Indicator	Minimum	Achievement
Meeting of users	Attendance of user organization representatives	50% of user organizations	7/8 organizations animated (87,5%), but only 3/8 (37,5%) attended. Further 5/8 suggestions from the organizations were collected through the suggestion box, however, it cannot be certain that all 8/8 organizations provided feedback.
Upgrade of backyard	Mutually agreed usage of backyard	1	1 – an agreement was achieved that the backyard will be used as an open air green office.
Conceptual rehabilitation	Approved concept of rehabilitation	1	1 – an agreement on what the open air green office will be like was reached.
Users protocol	Approved protocol for management and maintenance of the rehabilitated area	1	0 – as the activity will not take place within the duration of the pilot, no final protocol was not signed. An oral agreement was reached about the reservation system of the open air green office.
<u>Circle 2</u>			
Meeting of owners and users	Attendance of owner and user organization representatives	1 owner 50% of user organizations	4/7 owners attended, A representative of all user organizations attended The meeting was successful.
Upgrade of shared parking	Mutually agreed usage of shared parking	1	1 – an agreement was achieved that the shared parking must be upgraded to allow better security, bicycle access and storage.
Conceptual rehabilitation	Approved concept of rehabilitation	1	1 – an agreement was reached that the owner of public area should maintain the revitalized area of current shared parking.
Users protocol	Approved protocol for management and maintenance of the rehabilitated area	1	0 – as the activity will not take place within the duration of the pilot, no final protocol was not signed. An oral agreement was reached that the public owner (Municipality of Maribor) will maintain the area as the sole owner of the public land plots in the area.
<u>Circle 3</u>			
Meeting of owners and users	Attendance of owner and user organization representatives	50% of owners 50% of user organizations	3/7 owners (42,86%) attended the meeting, however, with the large attendance of owners within Circle 2 there was no need for further animation or attendance. Instead of organization representatives of users, the elected representatives of the city district participated to involve the broader public (as the representative of all user organization was present at Circle 2).
Upgrade of shared parking	Mutually agreed usage of shared parking	1	1 – an agreement was achieved that the shared parking must be upgraded to allow better security, bicycle access and storage.
Conceptual rehabilitation	Approved concept of rehabilitation	1	1 – an agreement was reached that the owner of public area should maintain the revitalized area of current shared parking.
Users protocol	Approved protocol for management and maintenance of the rehabilitated area	1	0 – as the activity will not take place within the duration of the pilot, no final protocol was not signed. An oral agreement was reached that the public owner (Municipality of Maribor) will maintain the area as the sole owner of the public land plots in the area.
OVERALL			
	Survey responses	50	63 responses (126%)
	Conceptual design for the rehabilitation study	1	1 prepared

1.4 Evaluation – Are you satisfied with the results?

The financial aspect of the pilot activity was well planned and covered the needs of the project partner to conduct the proposed activities.

The pilot activities tackled the main challenges of raising awareness about the degraded urban green area and involving stakeholders to participate in the process of revitalization of the area.

The methods were tested and have proven useful, although the main obstacle – of forming the community in the pilot area without any residents – was overcome through self-proposed methodology of replacing the residents with users, who do not have a direct impact in the process of decision-making.

The preparation of an action plan, which is a living document, was very useful. However, it was necessary to hold face to face meetings with individual representatives of the users, as that was the best way to gather feedback.

The recommendation would be, to not invite users to come to you, to come to events, to attend joint platform meetings. The users in this case were not owners and did not have a personal relationship, or did not feel to have a direct link to the pilot area, although they are daily present and would have complaints (which can be easily transformed into suggestions for improvements), suggestions and identified needs.

So in general, go to the people and they will take some time to talk to you. Be prepared to gather as much information possible, do interviews related to the topic and summarize the collected feedback in a way, that will indicate further steps.

Another major drawback that had to be overcome was also the lack of interest by the stakeholders. This was constantly a problem, due to lack of time, motivation or capacities to attend the consultation processes. This was overcome through personal approach of the process manager (project partner) and repetition of activities for various segments of the groups, with opportunities to provide inputs also at other occasion through the online survey or suggestion box.

The suggestion box and the online survey were useful tools, because they provided additional opportunity for give anonymous feedback.

The suggestion box provided opportunity for participation in the process even if involved organization representatives were unable to attend the face to face meeting of stakeholders of individual circle.

The online survey provided the opportunity for general public as well as users who would like to stay anonymous to provide their opinions, which was not possible in live survey in the field.

In the case of Circle 1, the suggestion box provided 5 additional responses, which showed the rather reserved attitude towards the idea of revitalization. Still, it provided inputs from users of Circle 1 upon which the further ideas could be built.

In case of Circle 2 and Circle 3 the suggestion box provided no feedback, indicating the organizations that were declaring their cooperation did either not promote the usage of the tool, or the users of their services were not interested in providing feedback.

In any case, the low result was underlying the low interest in revitalization on behalf of the users of the area, as there is a lack of residents in the nearby zone.

However, the online survey (as the addition to the live survey carried out on the spot) gave 38 responses. The main added value of the online survey was again the fact it was anonymous, as in live survey people were not always willing to provide feedback.

The 38 responses provided insight into the origin of users (who use the green space as the free parking space), and what their demands are. The responses could easily be summarized in two groups:

- keep it a free parking place (but if possible, make it safer and more organized) - 26 responses;
- keep some of the parking spaces but provide cultural/recreational content for other green areas and buildings – 12 responses.

Both models used – consultative participation and self-motivated participation – were partly successful.

The consultative participation created a platform for stakeholders that would otherwise not be directly involved in the decision making process (for example: an organization renting the premises within the publicly owned building within the pilot area has not legal grounds nor platform upon which they can influence the change of status quo – through the pilot activities they were at the same consultative meetings as the owners and representatives of the municipality, therefore they gained a voice in the decision making process); and the self-motivated model of setting up the suggestion box and an online survey provided the opportunity for interested stakeholders to participate at their own terms, without being obliged to participate at a certain time, or within a certain group of other stakeholders (which seem to cause some discomfort – as to having a sense of not belonging at the same table with a different level of a decision maker).

The general stakeholder platform events that were carried out were attracting general public, owners and stakeholders in informal capacities, therefore they contribute to creating a community of stakeholders with whom the process manager communicated. They also helped with promotion and awareness raising as a much larger audience was reached (also through press coverage of the event).

Open Green Office

Due to unforeseen events the Open air green office cannot be implemented during the project duration. As the area neighbors the privately owned land, both would need to be revitalized in order to insure safety of the entire area to

make it accessible to the public. The agreement was reached with the private owner, who has committed to revitalize and secure his area at the same time as the publicly owned area would be revitalized. However, the owner is facing serious health issues and has been hospitalized for an indefinite time period due to intestinal cancer and has therefore been unable to proceed with the investments. Therefore the decision of the director of Maribor Development Agency was to not implement the green office.

Budget table

Update of the mid-term pilot status review and include all relevant costs (grouping similar smaller items) incurred during the pilot implementation!

Costs description	Budget line (<i>external/equipment/infrastructure</i>)	Status 1) <i>performance in progress/</i> 2) <i>performed but not paid/</i> 3) <i>performed and paid</i>)	Final amount of the costs
<i>Organization of the participatory processes – animation of public for the preparation of community-based ideas (survey, web-site and web-based survey, assistance in organizing meeting with circle 3 stakeholders)</i>	<i>External</i>	<i>Performed and paid</i>	3.985,00
<i>Preparation of 3 ideas visualizations contributing to preparation of the conceptual design for the rehabilitation of the degraded area (based on the outcomes of participatory process)</i>	<i>External</i>	<i>Performed and paid</i>	4.500,00
<i>Validation of the conceptual solution for rehabilitation (survey conducted among stakeholders of circle 1, 2 and 3 (animation stand, roll-up printing of 3 visualizations)</i>	<i>External</i>	<i>Performed and paid</i>	490,36
<i>Arborist report of the pilot area (Specification of the flora and proposal for removal of trees and invasive species of flora (pilot area 1 and 2) to be incorporated in Conceptual design</i>	<i>External</i>	<i>Performed and paid</i>	2.400,00
<i>Preparation of the Conceptual design, based on the selected visualization. Preparation of the project identification fiche, required for assuring the sustainability of the conceptual design, by forming a proposal for the city council.</i>	<i>External</i>	<i>Performed and paid</i>	14.318,53
		<i>Performed but not paid</i>	7.482,87
		<i>Total costs:</i>	33.176,76

2. Follow-up actions

2.1 What about the future?

The pilot activities included some multi-municipal stakeholders and stakeholders from other municipalities within the FUA, as some of the events were conducted outside the municipality of Maribor.

The general logic of the process conducted can be transferred to each municipality, however, the field of urban planning and green space revitalization is already well regulated and prescribed there is rarely a need to do many things beyond respecting the wishes of various stakeholders. Therefore the inclusion of stakeholders in the process instead of just consulting them to confirm a proposed solution, has proven to be a good strategy to gain consensus for what has to be achieved.

The pilot activities will continue, as the city has, among other things received the plan for maintenance of trees within the pilot area and will adopt the prepared document instead of preparing a separate document to serve for the maintenance of the area. First removal of inappropriate trees has already begun, following the plan – further works will take place after the project conclusion.

Also the self-motivated participation will continue as the platform for proposing suggestions and connecting stakeholders has proven successful and the meetings between various stakeholders can still be held at public owners (mostly the city municipality or the city district) who are responsible for various aspects of maintenance and regeneration of the urban green area.

The division of the area into sub-areas with various level of stakeholder involvement is a good practice that can be transferred to other areas, as usually the stakeholders do not share the same level of interest or involvement in the entire green area, but in various parts, or various aspects of it.

The pilot activity was communicated to the interested public at various events and was received with interest.

2.2 Lessons learned to upgrade the draft models to “make them smart” – What can be transferred?

The most useful tool that was used within the pilot was the suggestion box. Although online survey was set up, people found it easier to share opinions through a suggestion box as they had more confidence about the information they share. Especially with the GDPR people became very aware how much information they are sharing and were scared that online surveys would remember their IPs, that they would have to use their e-mail address, or that the survey is connected to some other promotional programs and would start offering them adverts; whereas with a low tech tool such as a suggestion box people were sure that no information could be misused as they knew exactly what they wrote on the paper and would not have to leave any contact details.

Another tool that worked well was personal invitations, with direct contacts. The project partner visited each organization within circle 1, presented the project and the goal and encouraged them to nominate a representative to provide inputs. This way, even if there was no response or if nobody attended the event, the stakeholders became familiar with both the project and initiatives to be carried out in the pilot area and could therefore participate in sharing opinions through either the suggestion box or online survey.

However, the most crucial part of the process was the identification of the key stakeholders and motivating them to participate in the decision making process. If the associated partner (municipality of Maribor) would not be present at the meetings, the interest of other key stakeholders (owners within the pilot area) would be lacking. Therefore the stakeholder mapping and motivation for participation is the single most important point of such a process, without which the process could not be successful.

Annex 1:
Photos of beginning of works – removal of trees (left before – right during/after):



Annex 2:

Action plan as set up within D.T2.2.1 PILOT ACTIVITY CONCEPTS FOR THEMATIC WORKING GROUP 2 (modified during implementation)

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Re-sponsi-ble</i>	<i>Involved people</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Purpose</i>
Suggestion box and online survey	September	MRA	Users of the MRA office building, Karantena, owners, and general population of Maribor and FUA	MRA office building, Karantena, Online	Collecting suggestions for the use of the backyard of the building
Meeting circle 1 stakeholders	October / November	MRA	Users of the MRA office building	MRA office building	Brainstorming the usage of backyard
Meeting circle 2 stakeholders	October / November	MRA	Users of MRA office building and Cultural centre Karantena, and Municipality of Maribor	MRA office building	Determining the upgrade of the parking space into a green area
Meeting circle 3 stakeholders	October / November	MRA	Owners within the pilot area	MRA office building	Developing a vision of rehabilitation of the green area
Preparation of community based idea projects	November / January	MRA	Interested users and students of architecture and woodworks	Pilot area, MRA office building	Preparation of idea project on how to rehabilitate the pilot area.
Meeting circle 1 stakeholders	February	MRA	Users of the MRA office building	MRA office building	Selection of the best suited proposal / idea project
Meeting circle 2 stakeholders	February	MRA	Users of MRA office building and Cultural centre Karantena, and Municipality of Maribor	MRA office building	Selection of the best suited proposal / idea project
Meeting circle 3 stakeholders	February	MRA	Land owners of the pilot area	MRA office building	Selection of the best suited proposal / idea project
Preparation of conceptual design	March / April	MRA	Landscape architect	N/A	Preparation of conceptual design for all 3 circles, based on selected proposals.

*MRA office building is the publically owned building at the address: Pobreška cesta 20, where the premises of Maribor Development Agency are located.

Annex 3:
3 visualizations prepared by students



Annex 4:
Prepared documentation – Conceptual design and Project Fiche (photo)
Documentation in Slovenian only

