

## THE NETWORK TRANSFER PHASE CONCLUDING REPORT –

Based on partners' final Key

Learning Grid contributions, FLLs, NRP and

ad hoc experts Elements Reports ...



### 0. Intro

The report is based on partners' final Key Learning Grid contributions, FLLs, NRP, online meetings & partners ULG meetings minutes during 2020 and ad hoc experts Elements Reports. Final conclusive comments by the NE on the project strategic focus, leadership & management, In this report are included comments and evaluation by the partners as also main Achievements, Hardships and Successes the are clearly reflecting the strength of the partnership ULGs.

### 1. Comments on the final score of the transfer journey by the partners' cities

Since all transfer partners were asked to evaluate their transfer journey from 1 to 10 in terms of: success,

- methodology tools,
- policy instrument improvement in the city level (urban gardening) and
- networking with peers from other cities

**an average 8,5 of was countered ( 4 cities gave 8, 1 gave 9 and 1 gave 10)**



- According to the partners' contributions through their final KLG, the project has clearly met expectations and has been key to defining a long-term policy in urban gardens. For some cases it is a key starting point to improve the city performance in the topic, as also to start developing new urban gardens in the near future based on the cities' experience on the regulation element and mostly on their ULG members' capacity that was really improved and enriched in many gardens-related aspects.
- Ru:rbán is considered a real driving force to transfer LP long-time experience in managing urban gardens, as also in establishing and developing them.
- For some project partners the project exceeded their initial expectations.
- All the partners would like to join again in a similar project, despite the difficulties encountered.
- Networking is considered as the most successful aspect of the project, followed by the Gardenisers training.
- Approval of each city adopted Regulation by each city council is considered as the most difficult to achieve transfer goal, since its transfer result is depending on local politicians' decisions and priorities.

## 2. *Achievements, Successes and Hardships*

All transfer partners had the opportunity all the way of their transfer journey (but mainly during the last months) to express their final comments on learnings, advice, reflections to other cities and more.

All partners' main or major achievements were mentioned in their FLLs, as this outcome is a critical document to share the transfer journey results internally (as also externally, in wider interesting audience).



## Most valuable achievement

What were considered and stated by the partners as successes were evaluated by the 3 project experts. **The main conclusion - result that considered as the most valuable achievement of the urban gardens management is the involvement of schools and gardening.** Schools have a central role in raising awareness on urban gardening issues.



“Garden with class”, Krakow.

## Strategic Focus

- a. There are a lot of evidence that can confirm a **clear collective understanding** of the project’s deliverables and how the project fitted into all city’s policy instruments, but probably the most crucial are:
  - passing a resolution on regulation concerning the community gardens by each City Councils.
  - clear definition of the Communitarian Urban Gardens Strategy
  - contributing to the cities policies and in particular their resilience strategy
  - most cities ULG members respond and participation
- b. Clear evidence that urban gardening is a topic of interest for the cities administration at the end of 2020:
  - A Coruna will launch a pilot project for gardens in the city's educational centres and will establish an "Information Point" on urban gardens
  - Krakow municipality undertook during the summer the project of creating a community garden in one of the municipal office yards.
  - Loures is adopting an integrated Regulation on Communitarian Urban gardens
  - Thessaloniki considers in multiplying a successful project – Kipos3 to other neighbourhoods

- Vilnius support to urban gardening is included in the annual Environmental and Community support programs, which was not a case before the start of the project
    - Beside that – two URBAN GARDENS projects (NAUJININKAI and MISSIONERS GARDENS) were designed during the Ru:rbán lifespan
  - Caen faces a new challenge to current challenge is to secure green spaces on the Peninsula
- c. Ru:rbán was an opportunity to improve all partners' citizens' awareness on urban gardening:
- In A Coruna and Krakow especially in the educational community
  - In Vilnius and Caen in general public
- d. All cities are now aware which are the aspects of urban gardening to be focused on after the projects end since:
- Ru:rbán has contributed significantly to defining a long-term local urban gardening policy
  - This policy is included in all cities adopted regulations
  - The pandemic was also a reason for deep dives into this policy tool

## Leadership and management



- a. The cities were mostly supported by elected politicians, except :
- Krakow that only one councillor participated in selected ULG meetings
- b. The cities strongly supported the key stakeholders / ULG members for the development of the Transfer Plans, except:
- Thessaloniki where the city support could be stronger

- c. All ULG co-ordinators fulfilled all partner cities expectations to deliver to the project

### Strength of the partnership ULG



- a. All the cities successfully engaged the key stakeholders/ ULG members in the project and in some cases many more stakeholders from a variety of organisations, except:
- Vilnius and Thessaloniki that didn't manage to directly engage the University of the city

### Other Successes and Hardships



- The biggest hardship for some cities during the project implementation has been the initial constitution of an active ULG, represented by the main private and public stakeholder involved in the urban local gardens
- Krakow recognized as hardship the involvement of NGOs in the project, that finally was not successful, as also
  - The low involvement of highly decision-making city officials and a low level of cooperation between non-governmental organizations and the city
- The change of the Municipality administration in Thessaloniki has led to an information gap and loss of crucial time



- Krakow and Loures have developed their Cities Transfer Plans with many new and interesting activities that have already been implemented, above the projects' initial expectations
- Loures set very high targets to achieve during the transfer journey, above all partners expectations
- Vilnius faced difficulties in adopting the Regulation of the city of Rome, but managed to attract new members in Vilnius urban gardening family
- The project has promoted the creation of new urban garden associations in A Coruña and Loures
- Many more Gardenisers from all partners' cities were trained than initially expected

### 3. Indicators

All partners CTPs included a table of indicators. These indicators were set in the 1<sup>st</sup> semester of 2019 and were revised after the midterm review of the project. The partners evaluated at the end of the transfer period their transfer performance, according the indicators set.

- Most of partners fully succeeded in the achievement of the indicators set for Element 1 – Capacity Building. Some indicators set were achieved by 50%.
  - Loures set a variety of indicators that were achieved from 50% to 80%
- All partners managed to train more Gardenisers (Element 2) that initially was planned (6 in partner level)
- All partners prepared their local version of urban gardens management regulation and are working on the next step to be approved by each city council

#### Caen CTP

E1 - Capacity building:	Result
- Participation of ULG members to TNMs	YES
- Opportunity for ULG members to enhance their own knowledge thanks to other members' expertise (i.e. ULG #2: the operation manager for SPLA explained the stakes and background of the overall Peninsula project)	YES
- Better understanding of European participative/collaborative/bottom-up working	YES

methods and approaches for all ULG members (introduction to such methods during an ULG session)	
- Set up of a formal assessment from ULG members at the end of the project so as to know if they disseminated the meetings minutes in their own structures, upgrading the number of people reached by the project.	NA (yet)
<b>E2 - Gardenisers training:</b>	
- Number of people that took part in the training	4
- Number of people that have written a diary input	6
- Publications, posters and/or videos enabling people who didn't attend the "Gardeniser" training to benefit from the main outcomes.	NO
<b>E3 - Regulation / Governance:</b>	
- Succeed in (or not) setting up a shared governance between local authorities and project managers, either private and/or from associations	In progress
- Benefit from tools already designed and used (or usable) by Rome in Caen (partnership agreements, trainings, property watch...	YES: joint convention written and signed by the project leader and municipality.

### A Coruna CTP

E1- Capacity Building	Result	E-2 Gardeniser training	Result	E- 3 Urban garden Regulation	Result
Multiply the number of functioning urban gardens (not less than 6 functioning gardens)	4 Active UG 2 Planned				
		At least 6 persons trained as gardenisers	7		

Good practices repository for community gardens	YES	Good practices repository for community gardens	YES		
Networking with stakeholders and the community	YES				
Involvement of the community	YES				
Define a municipal urban garden strategy	YES				
Urban gardens monitoring and assessment					
Promotional Campaign in media social networks	YES				
				Explore Rome's regulation and adapt relevant aspects to our local context and legal frame	YES

## Krakow CTP – Indicators Table

E-1 Capacity building	Result	E-2 Gardeniser training	Result	E-3 Urban Garden Regulation	Result
				Precise regulation regarding urban gardens on the level of the Municipality	Almost
At least 3 different types of community gardens tested	Yes				



Not less than 9 functioning community gardens	Yes				
		At least 6 persons trained as gardenisers	10		
The manual of organizing and managing the urban gardens which could be helpful for new urban gardeners	Yes	The manual of organizing and managing the urban gardens which could be helpful for new urban gardeners	Yes		
Repository of knowledge for gardeners	50%	Repository of knowledge for gardeners			
Promotional campaign in media	Yes				
Networking within different stakeholders	Yes			Networking within different stakeholders	Yes
Model of evaluation of functioning the urban gardens.	50%				

## Loures CTP

E1- Capacity Building	Result	E2 - Gardeniser training	Result	E3 - Urban garden Regulation	Result
				Define and approve the	85%

				community urban gardens regulation	
3 community urban gardens allotments implemented	75%				
		6 persons trained as Gardenisers	100%  And plus		
Thematic Good practices Files for community gardens	50%	Thematic Good practices Files for community gardens	50%		
Networking with stakeholders and the community	80%				
Involvement of the community	60%				
Define a municipal urban garden strategy	80%				
Urban gardens monitoring and assessment	75%				
Promotional Campaign in media social networks	50%				

## Thessaloniki CTP

### Element 1

Indicator	Measurement	Target	Result
ULG members that raised their capacity building during the project lifetime	Persons	5	9
Municipality and KEDITH staff members that raised their capacity building during the project lifetime	Persons	2	2

### Element 2

Indicator	Measurement	Target	Result
ULG members that have been trained as a gardenisers	Persons	6	11

### Element 3

Indicator	Measurement	Target	Result
One Urban Gardening Regulation adapted for the City of Thessaloniki and submitted to the relevant department	Number	1	1 (under submission to the relevant department)

## Vilnius CTP

E-1 Capacity building	Result	E-2 Gardeniser training	Result	E-3 Urban Garden Regulation	Result
-----------------------	--------	-------------------------	--------	-----------------------------	--------

				Precise regulation regarding urban gardens on the level of the Municipality	almost
At least 3 different types of community gardens tested	yes				
The manual of organizing and managing the urban gardens which could be helpful for new urban gardeners	yes	The manual of organizing and managing the urban gardens which could be helpful for new urban gardeners	yes		
Repository of knowledge for gardeners	yes	Repository of knowledge for gardeners			
Training of Gardenisers	yes	At least 6 persons trained as Gardenisers	yes		
Networking within	50%			Networking within different stakeholders	50%

different stakeholders					
Model of evaluation of functioning the urban gardens.	no				

#### 4. Next Steps



- The great challenge for A Coruña is to consolidate soon a comprehensive strategy to support urban gardens, based on a public-private network of stakeholders, and structured through:
  - The "Information Point".
  - The pilot project for school urban gardens.
  - and the Gardeniser figure as operational instrument
- Caen will secure long-lasting governance (capitalising on E2 & E3) and Implement foreseen activities (E1)
- Krakow will become a city of blooming community gardens and continue to support the existing community gardening programs, education and community development.
- Thessaloniki is expanding the Kipos3 to another neighbourhood
- Loures is preparing Thematic workshops for all the community on:
  - seeds,
  - eatable flowers,
  - healthy food,
  - the vegetables and fruits of the season,
  - aromatic plants,
  - auxiliary insects and bees,
  - show cookingalso, to promote:
  - Promote Social and multicultural events to connect the community.





## 5. Final Comments, also as tips for the sharing period!



- Even the transfer target was very difficult, the idea to work on 3 different but strongly connected elements made the transfer journey more interesting and finally successful
- No aspect of the projects is identified that went totally wrong
- The project has clearly met expectations and has been key to defining a long-term policy in urban gardens for all transferring cities
- The partners scored the transfer journey from 1 to 10 in terms of success, methodology tools, policy instrument improvement in the city level (urban gardening) and networking with peers from other cities – The average result is: 8,5
- Communication efforts could have worked better just for one partner
- Changes in the personnel involved or somehow responsible for the project implementation are not helping the ULGs participation
- The LP managed also to improve its capacity of this urban policy tool, through its improvement plan

- The partnership adapted its methodology for the final transfer steps due to the pandemic, following a very coherent plan of online meetings, to prepare the partners FLLs, the project NRP and Transfer Story
- Each city's regulation for urban gardens management is still in progress to be delivered to all partners respective departments and then officially to their city councils



Ru:rbán can share its' transfer stories experiences in urban gardens management in regional, national and international level. It can share that even the hardships that some partners faced, when you are working in a project team that can really support you, there are always solutions to be adopted and proceed to achieve initial targets set.

The project was managed in a professional and cohesive way, but always friendly and supporting to partners and their ULG members.