

Stein + Schultz

Stadt-, Regional-  
und Freiraumplaner

++



## **SAUL Transnational Review Scheme**

### **Integrated Report of Individual Reviews, Reviewers' Workshop and Steering Group Discussion**

**by Ursula Stein**

**29. Jan. 2006**  
final version

The transnational review scheme is part of the ongoing evaluation of the SAUL Project.

This report is based on the reports of project visits delivered by the reviewers. The author has condensed the contents into summaries of each report (see annex), facilitated the reviewers' workshop, which took place in London on January 12<sup>th</sup> 2006, and taken part in the joint discussion with the steering group on the same day.

In the first part, this report describes briefly the peer review process. In part 2, answers to the guidance questions are summarized from the reports and summaries and from the workshop discussion. Part 3 discusses the connection between projects and Key Messages. Part 4 adds main topics from the joint discussion with the Steering Group.

## 1. The Peer Review Process

All 6 of the partner regions have appointed 2 reviewers. In the framework of a peer review, these reviewers had the opportunity to visit a selected project of one of the SAUL partners, including site visits, discussions with staff and local experts and analysis of written material related to the project. These visits took place in October and November 2005. The reviewers completed a report of their findings, structured either by the guidance questions provided by the Lead Partner or by the SAUL key objectives.

The workshop participants and the steering group members were provided with summaries of the reports based on the guidance questions the day before the workshop (see annex).

The workshop consisted of three main elements:

- on Wednesday, 11<sup>th</sup> January 2006, reviewers and steering group members met for a welcome reception and dinner,
- on Thursday, 12<sup>th</sup> January 2006, the reviewers met for a three-hour-session of internal discussion, facilitated by the author of this report
- in the afternoon, a short report of the findings was given to the steering group members, followed by a general discussion of reviewers and steering group members.

<b>The group of reviewers</b>				
<b>Name</b>	<b>SAUL Partner</b>	<b>Project Reviewed</b>	<b>Report</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
Claire Colomb Univ. College London Bartlett School	London	F Hohe Strasse	yes	no
Marc Bourscheid Objectif Plein Emploi	Luxembourg	F Hohe Strasse	yes	
Beate Huf Planungsverband FRM	Frankfurt Rhein-Main	LUX South Region	yes	
Frank Bothmann Regionalverband Ruhr	Ruhr	LUX South Region	yes	
Kathrin Feigs plan-lokal Dortmund	Ruhr	London Burgess Park	yes	

Marta Doehler- Behzadi Büro für urbane Projekte Leipzig	Saar	London Burgess Park	yes	
Undine Giseke TU Berlin, Büro Becker Giseke Mohren Richard	Saar	Amsterdam	yes	no
Stefan Böhm-Ott Planungsverband FRM	Frankfurt Rhein-Main	Amsterdam	yes	no
Michael Bach Office of the Deputy Prime Minister	London	Saar	yes	
Julien Goris Gemeente 's-Hertogenbosch	Amsterdam	Saar	yes	no
Pieter van Wesemael de Architecten Cie.	Amsterdam	Emscher Waltroper Str.	yes	
(Jean Goedert) Ville d'Esch	(Luxembourg)	(Emscher Waltroper Str.)	*	-

\* Jean Goedert was unable to attend the meeting for Emscher Waltroper Strasse and therefore stopped his participation in the review process.

As far as the reviewers' home institutions are concerned, the group shows a remarkable diversity: we find people from universities, private planning offices, municipalities, government institutions, regional planning institutions and not-for-profit organizations.

Thus, the review process has contributed to the dissemination of SAUL key ideas and findings.

## 2. Answers to the Guidance Questions

### 2.1. How do you rate the quality of the project, including planning, implementation and the final results?

Question No. 1 was not treated in the workshop. In their reports, reviewers generally appreciate a high quality of the projects ("impressive", "excellent", "high-quality", "success", "meets all 4 key objectives", "well done/outstanding"), taking into account different stages of development which sometimes made it difficult to assess the quality from a general point of view. The reasons given for this high standard are to be found on three main levels:

- qualities of the process (e.g. Michael Bach: "Lasting commitment to this style of planning – courage to experiment with citizen involvement – sense of ownership – shared vision"; Frank Bothmann: "ministry launched an open and experimental process")
- qualities of the investments (e.g. Marc Bourscheid: "attractions of exceptional quality")
- qualities of the effects on places and organizations (e.g. Marta Doehler-Behzadi: "improvement of safety and accessibility", Pieter van Wesemael: "cultural change

inside the water-board")

## 2.2. What do you consider to be the innovative aspects of the project?

In the workshop, three levels of innovation have been identified. Innovation can relate to

- professional practice in the respective country  
*In many projects, the amount and quality of direct involvement of citizens has proved to be innovative with respect to professional standards.  
New governance structures bring together the public and private sectors.*
- the specific context of the people or the organization involved  
*Working in partnerships is innovative in most settings.  
Some technical solutions (e.g. using the bare slagheaps as points of interest and outlooks on the urban landscape instead of "burying" them under bushes and trees in the Regionalpark Saar) are innovative and even prove to be cheaper than the conventional ones.  
To recognize that the character of open space has turned from traditional farming land to a new urban landscape with multi-layered uses is an innovation (see Giseke).*
- solutions innovative to the professional or institutional context in other countries  
*The "trust model" intended for the maintenance of Burgess Park is a new solution not only for the British context, but is also expected to bring new solutions to challenges in Germany (see Doehler-Behzadi).*

Innovation was also related to the transnational work of the SAUL Partnership and the feedback gained by the review scheme (see Bourscheid).

Workshop participants have seen **two common features of innovation** in all projects: they change people's minds about their own regions, and they open up areas to new uses and perceptions.

## 2.3. How successfully has the project engaged local people? What do you think of plans to maintain/develop the involvement of local people?

The extent and the intensity of participation has been estimated by all reviewers: to a great extent, new approaches have been applied. Some reviewers point at an important difference between involvement of stakeholders and of the general public. The reports give appraisals of the respective projects, taking into account the development phases, the nature of the project (e.g. local investment or regional strategy development) and the starting point of planning culture. Some reviewers also offer advice about steps to the future (need for long-term strategies, need for stronger involvement of local people, websites ...).

In the workshop, this question has been discussed in connection with Guidance Question No. 4 (Sustainability): if the "new style" of strong public involvement was a success within the projects, it may remain a "fragile flower" if the basic concepts of the institutions involved are not changed – "if the change is embodied in individuals, not in organizations". A possible and necessary focus of ongoing work (or a successor to the

SAUL project) should explore the ways to establish substantial and sustainable cultural change through organizational learning.

SAUL should try to promote the “mainstreaming” of its results.

#### **2.4. Comment on the sustainability of the project (environmentally, socially, etc).**

The workshop discussion concentrated on the question of sustainable change of planning culture in organizations.

In their reports, the reviewers have pointed at various aspects of social and environmental sustainability: win-win-solutions, the importance of participation, high-quality/low-cost solutions combined with low maintenance costs, developing a sense of ownership with the local inhabitants, high standards of buildings or open space investments, developing open approaches to learning, ...

In some cases, room for improvement is seen concerning the issue of social inclusion, a matching comprehensive urban strategy for shrinking regions or a deeper understanding of sustainable regional planning.

#### **2.5. How successfully has the project benefited from the involvement of SAUL Joint Planning Group members?**

In their reports, reviewers have discussed positive effects of various kinds of transnational exchange. Beyond the JPGs, which were part of the SAUL layout from the beginning, numerous transnational activities have emerged from the needs and ideas of partners: the “young ambassadors project” in Amsterdam and London, mutual visits of initiative group members in Saarland and Luxemburg (partly coordinated with a JPG meeting), visits to partners, inspiration taken to Saarland from Dutch knowledge of urban forestry, and as a result of the peer review scheme new exchange between the Hohe Strasse Project in Frankfurt and the “Konscht am Bësch” (Arts in the Forest) Project in Luxemburg. The latter intends to include results of the Luxemburg SAUL activities into its further development and into the activities of the European Cultural Capital in the region in 2007.

In the workshop, the following topics were highlighted:

- Generally, the transnational exchange on methodology of participation and partnership building has been very positive.
- There seem to have been much less or no exchange about methods for organizational change (are the organizations prepared to be learning organizations?).
- Technical solutions seem to have been in the focus of exchange to a far too little extent, although this matter should be integrated in EU-Partnerships, too.
- Transnational exchange in the framework of EU-Partnerships helps to further the development of European professional standards.
- Interest shown by foreign partners help to raise the profile and importance of a project locally (e.g. Colomb: “Giving a European dimension to a local/regional project: important trigger for the inhabitants and local politicians!”)

Transnational exchange is particularly helpful if the partners can be chosen with respect

to various needs:

- practical effects are easier to obtain if transnational partners work in similar pre-conditions (e.g. growing or shrinking region),
- transfer of know-how and encouragement is more effective with partners in the same business (mayors to mayors, foresters to foresters),
- the opportunity to encounter partners from different preconditions, professional worlds etc. helps to widen horizons of theory and practice.

This should be taken into account when putting together transnational partnerships and arranging transnational work.

## **2.6. What does the project contribute to the development of spatial planning in the region?**

In the reports, reviewers give various examples of contributions:

- innovative approach to regional planning (see Huf)
- integration of landscape and inner city open space into spatial reorganization of metropolitan areas (see Giseke)
- experience of co-operation between government, municipalities and associations (see Bothmann, Bach)
- speed of processes as good practice (see Colomb)
- furthering awareness of patience needed (see Goris)
- art and design help to generate "sense of place" and regional identity (see Colomb, Bach, Feigs; see van Wesemael: "branding")
- trust in co-operation and in participation created, possibility to transfer this to other planning jobs (see Bach)

For discussion with the steering group, the workshop group identified three key levels for contributions to the development of regional planning:

- participation and partnership building
- change of planning institutions concerning planning culture
- quality of investments

## **2.7. What does the project contribute to the development of spatial planning on an EU level?**

Reviewers displayed variations in their understanding of both the guidance questions No. 7 and No. 8. In their reports, effects were seen as

- good practice for specific tasks (see Doehler-Behzadi, Colomb), strategies (see Bach, Goris) or institutional constructs (see Colomb),
- new challenges for research (see Giseke),
- proposals for new versions of the European Spatial Development Perspective which should take up the subject of new planning cultures (see Bothmann) and peri-urban areas (see Böhm-Ott, Giseke).

## **2.8. What relevance does the project have to future EU funding priorities?**

The reviewers who comment on this question propose

- to integrate the topic of peri-urban areas into the funds of cohesion (see Böhm-Ott)

- to deepen the SAUL subject especially for cities and regions in shrinking economies (see Goris, Bach)
- to continue funding for SAUL projects (see van Wesemael)

Claire Colomb, the reviewer who is most familiar with EU Spatial Strategies, is sceptical about the future role of spatial planning in EU policies. She proposes to discuss the category "environment" for the findings of SAUL.

### 3. The reviewed Projects and the SAUL Key Messages

In the workshop, reviewers spent a moment on trying to match one of the four SAUL Key Messages with each of the projects reviewed. The Key Message chosen should be the one to which the respective project can make its best contribution.

The Key Messages, taken from the draft of the final report (December 2005):

1. *Europe's new urban landscapes are now a reality with a vital impact on people's quality of life in city-regions. Their unique challenges need innovative solutions.*
2. *Sustainable regions are ones where people want to live, now and in the future. A clear regional strategy, based on a vision shared by all, gives people a stronger sense of belonging.*
3. *The impacts of globalisation and social change mean that Europe's citizens now expect to be in the driving seat of shaping their future environment. Partnerships offer a new approach to planning and governance for Europe's urban landscapes.*
4. *Transnational partnerships hold the key to greater understanding, co-operation and shared objectives in Europe. A strong transnational partnership like SAUL is greater than the sum of its parts.*

Project Reviewed	Key Message No.	Reasons
Frankfurt Rhein-Main Hohe Strasse	3	Involvement of local people although top-down-idea
Luxembourg South Region	3	Open approach with results, input to regional planning
London Burgess Park	3	Community involvement; transnational exchange, partnership building, trust model
Amsterdam Noorderpark	3	Long-term bottom-up strategy, new ways of participation
Amsterdam Amstel Wedge	1	New perception of open space in metropolitan context
Saarland Saarkohlenwald and Warndt	2 (with some 3)	Need to plan for decline; Creation of new image for the region – new access to space and history/culture (3: Trust between partners and in the public established)
Emscher Waltroper Str.	2	Change of subject, of focus and of strategies and means

Asking themselves why Key Message No. 1 was rarely chosen, reviewers came to the hypothesis that “New Urban Landscapes” are too familiar to most of the participants although “outsiders” might need more explanation.

Reviewers feel that Key Message No. 4 is embodied in each of the projects. They all have given proof of it.

#### **4. Joint Discussion of Reviewers and Steering Group**

##### **The short visits and brief introductions during the reviewers' visits could only provide limited information. Did this affect the reviews? (Michiel Firet)**

Michael Bach had lots of information to take in. He met an upbeat and optimistic partnership for the project. Beate Huf felt she was getting all information, not only the good news. Marta Doehler-Behzadi points out that she didn't enter into each detail of the SAUL structure but did her very best to write a report from her personal, professional point of view which may be helpful to the local partners. Kathrin Feigs underlines this for her report, too. Frank Bothmann received open information about aims of the Luxembourg project which had not been met. He, too, used his professional practice as a regional planner as a starting point for his review.

##### **Question by Michael Bach and Frank Bothmann to the steering group members: Are the reviews helpful in the context of SAUL?**

Michiel Firet tells the participants that the Amsterdam group has already discussed the findings of the review and that the local leaders have very much appreciated the candid feedback. Andrea Hartz will discuss the report with the Saarland Initiative Group in the next two weeks and thinks there is a lot of helpful remarks. Philippe Peters considers the reports helpful for the projects because they represent a professional external view. In this respect, it doesn't matter if reviewers did not get all the information.

##### **Was innovation a major point, and has there been a connection between innovation in methods as well as in techniques? (John Zetter)**

##### **Was the review process useful for the reviewers? (Rhiannon Lewis)**

Innovation has been found by the reviewers in every project, but there was not systematic evaluation of the connection between methods and techniques. Frank Bothmann was impressed by the way that theory was put into practice in Luxembourg. He points to the fact that the Emschergenossenschaft is now creating an internal group charged with European Partnership Projects and sees this as a proof for institutional side effects which at least partly have been achieved through SAUL.

Marc Bourscheid gives an example for his review of the Hohe Strasse project: the visit had the character of an open exchange, from which he took inspiration back to his own project in Luxembourg. Frankfurt partners will visit the Luxembourg “Konscht am Bësch” project this year.

Andrea Hartz proposes to give the issue of innovation high importance in the final report of SAUL. Clive Fox stresses the question of sustainable innovation. The relationship between individual learning and institutional learning has been one of the important issues discussed in the reviewers' workshop.

### **Key Messages**

Philippe Peters underlines the remark by the reviewers about the Key Messages: No. 1 – on New Urban Landscapes as a widespread reality – was chosen as a key feature of a project only once. He feels that the target groups for the final report need thorough explication of the nature and challenge of New Urban Landscapes, because many of them are not familiar with the findings of the NUL-project as a predecessor of SAUL. The exercise undertaken by the reviewers to choose one Key Message for each project should help to illustrate the final report.

### **Difference between participation and partnership**

The reviewers group had a message for the steering group about the SAUL Key Messages: they feel that participation and partnership are used in a confusing way in the key messages and throughout the draft of the final report. Andrea Hartz clearly supports this opinion. Clive Fox thinks that in the UK these aspects tend to be closer together than in other European countries. Other discussants disagree. To Jane Carlsen, ownership is the key.

### **Are there things we could have done differently in the Transnational Review Scheme? (John Zetter)**

To Ursula Stein as workshop facilitator and rapporteur of the review scheme, the review scheme has clearly had positive outcomes for both the reviewed projects and for the reviewers. The aim of taking the SAUL ideas to new people (dissemination) was well met. Michiel Firet adds the remark that transnational exchange has not always (or only) taken place where it was planned (in the JPGs). From Ursula Stein's point of view, the JPGs may not always have functioned as originally planned. In the end, there has been a much larger array of transnational learning events. But this shows that the SAUL structure was flexible enough for adjustments along the way. It seems to be necessary to have an anchor point such as the JPGs or the Evaluating Sauls Influence Scheme for transnational work in the application process.

(Michiel Firet asked for the added value for the European context – this is covered in chapter 2.7.)

### **Question by Frank Bothmann and other reviewers to the steering group members: What will the review reports be used for?**

Clive Fox will receive the completed report on the results of the workshop and the joint discussion from Ursula Stein by the beginning of February. He will integrate the results into all chapters of the final report. He suggests a reflection in the steering group about the possibility to integrate some of the review findings into the project reports which will be part of the final report.

Concluding the session, Clive Fox recalls that the review process has obviously been valuable on the local and regional level. It also has given valuable input to the final report. He expresses his gratitude for the effort which the reviewers and Ursula Stein have made.

Thanks to Martin Jones for carefully taking notes during the joint discussion!

## Annex: Summaries of Reviewers' Reports

stein+schultz++060109ust

**Report: Amsterdam Noorderpark and Amstel Wedge /Amsterdam 1**

**Reviewer:** Stefan Böhm-Ott

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	Amstelland project: impressive Restriction due to unclear solution for transportation  Northern Park too early to rate – clear connection of participation to aims
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	Amstelland: focusing on the relationship between central city and peri-urban areas, non-formal organization Northern park: plan for 6 years of participation, integration artists and the creativity of the inhabitants
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	Amstelland: high level of public involvement, establishing a working structure between stakeholders Northern Park: working with target groups in all the neighbourhoods
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	Amstelland: high level of social and environmental sustainability, redefining the area as a cultural landscape Northern Park: social sustainability shall be attained by integrating neighbourhoods in the regeneration of "their" open space (sense of ownership USt.)
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	Exchange with projects in similar situations (agglomeration/peri-urban areas) very useful.
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	The project within SAUL could help to integrate the category of peri-urban areas into the ESDP.
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	Topic of peri-urban areas should be integrated into the funds of cohesion.
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

stein+schultz+ +060109ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Amsterdam Noorder Park and Amstel Wedge / Amsterdam 2**

Reviewer: Undine Giseke

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	Amstel Wedge: no final results yet, multi-level dialogue, modernization of a traditional urban landscape, boatbus-debate possibly too much concentrated on private solutions, should the public involvement into consideration Noorderpark: "high-quality initiation of a long-term development"
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	Amstel Wedge: recognition of active "modernization" for leisure purposes; integration of farmers and farming; step-by-step, communicative strategy Noorderpark: open space development as key for local economy; long-term participation with large and small interventions, awareness-building strategies
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	Amstel Wedge: problem to engage future users not strongly connected to the area (discontinued participation); multi-level working group with different stakeholders – long-term: important to realize starter-projects, open up for other transport than boatbus Noorderpark: very successful in engaging different groups from difficult neighbourhoods, increased social inclusiveness; long-term: work out a clear strategy
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	Amstel Wedge: widening up the range of discussion from nature conservation to active development, needed for sustainability; too ambitious boatbus project may block sustainable spatial development! Noorderpark: win-win-situation: less traffic, more and better open space
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	Big benefits for both projects, practical (youth group project) in Noorderpark, strategic in Amstel Wedge Project
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	Amstel Wedge: learning to integrate landscape into spatial reorganization of metropolitan area Noorderpark: better leisure facilities in a depressed area and better connections with other areas as a part of the new "regional identity" within a changing metropolitan region. No "low budget project", technical quality should be o.k.
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	Amstel Wedge: example of adding new layers of use/users to a long-established cultural landscape, getting aware of new stakeholders Noorderpark: raises questions for evaluation: is green space upgrading a key ingredient for sustainable urban development? What is the influence of different types of investments?
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Luxembourg South Region / Luxembourg 1**

Reviewer: Beate Huf

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	Although the project did not “substantially” change the landscape, the non-material and spatiotemporal actions as results of the project are excellent.
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	Open approach: learning about the specific character of the peri-urban landscape of the South Region and how to deal with them Non-hierarchic teamwork of state representatives, local authorities and association activists Experiments: spatial interventions (art) in the landscape, walks and bicycle tours with special character
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	Successful cooperation with local associations and local opinion makers, less successful in involving local authorities, not very successful in engaging local people “who are not stakeholders of something” (“normal in this early phase of creation of ideas of the landscape”)
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	Learning approach able to establish a good basis for future sustainable development, “avoiding investment ruins”. Need to go beyond the visible aspects of the landscape and tackle history, social aspects, economy and agriculture.
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	Project benefits a lot: particularly from exchange with Saarland and Ruhr, due to similar types of post-industrialised, post-mining landscapes
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	No contributions to development of special sites. Project contributed a lot to the innovative approach now used by the state authorities in the development of regional planning: open, practise-oriented, team-work-oriented and non-ideological.
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Luxembourg South Region / Luxembourg 2**

Reviewer: Frank Bothmann

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	SAUL project has positively influenced a regional planning process. Ministry launched an open process (bottom-up-approach) and experimental process. Final output is a tangible result: map "Reisen durch die Stadtlandschaften" representing a new understanding of urban landscape.
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	Using the subject of urban landscape to introduce a regional planning process is innovative. Helpful method: journeys with artist. Re-consideration of the landscape by the stakeholders is an innovative output, too.
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	"High level of public involvement" (stakeholders, organized public, USt.)  Associations willing to continue their efforts: e.g. Luxembourg Bicycle Club intends to propose guided tours.
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	The better recognition of the regional landscape by local and regional people has an environmental impact; raising awareness for the quality and value of the landscape means that the "project has shown a high level of social and environmental sustainability".
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	Positive influence of exchange with Saarland project.
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	There is a general tension between the local authorities (represented by Pro-Sud) and the state level (represented by the ministry), thus cooperation needs time and positive experiences to develop. The experience of cooperation (although restricted number of municipalities) through the SAUL urban landscape approach was positive. Associations have taken a very active role.
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	Hard to assess. The urban landscape approach would be a new subject and a contribution to new planning cultures as goals of ESDP.
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Regionalpark Frankfurt Rhein-Main – Hohe Strasse / Frankfurt 1**

Reviewer: Claire Colomb

Question	Notes - Key conclusions by Claire Colomb (all quoted)
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good. The project is considered a success in the local and regional context by the local press, residents and project managers.</li> <li>• At the level of SAUL, the project meets all 4 key objectives, with an emphasis on the first 3.</li> </ul>
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional construct (GmbH and coordination). *</li> <li>• Use of design, street furniture and public art in a rural / periurban context and appropriation by users.</li> </ul>
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public feedback and influence on the design: an important element in the project!</li> <li>• Public participation relied heavily on direct interactions between project managers and local population. This is only possible in a small-scale project!</li> <li>• Website still weak.</li> </ul>
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental sustainability: the installations involve minimal interventions into the landscape with natural materials (wood, stone).</li> <li>• Stations 'appropriated' and respected by the local users.</li> <li>• 'Socially inclusive' dimension was not a strong element in the project. Potential for more reflection on this at Regionalpark level?</li> </ul>
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ERDF made project possible.</li> <li>• Capacity building for staff involved.</li> <li>• Giving a European dimension to a local/regional project: important trigger for the inhabitants and local politicians!</li> <li>• Influence of SAUL on 'public participation' practices.</li> <li>• Difficult to assess shift from personal to organization learning.</li> <li>• JPGs and symposia: sometimes too theoretical?</li> </ul>
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to the Regionalpark concept on the Eastern side of the Frankfurt metropolitan area.</li> <li>• Speed of the process: a good practice example!</li> <li>• Innovative use of art and design to generate 'sense of place' and regional identity.</li> </ul>
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional construct: role of Planungsverband and GmbHs (interesting – but specific to German context?)</li> <li>• Transferability to other German regions, possibly other countries?</li> <li>• Innovative use of art and design to generate 'sense of place' and regional identity in a peri-urban context.</li> </ul>
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the future Objective 3, spatial planning seems to loose momentum in the proposals of the Commission. New priorities are R&amp;D, environment, risk prevention, and integrated water management, to be tackled through bigger '<i>projets structurants</i>'.</li> <li>• The project could be relevant to 'environment'?</li> </ul>
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

\* This is a quote from Claire Colomb's draft of the report. Meanwhile, Reinhard Henke has pointed out that in this case, the "GmbH" is not a public-private-partnership but a public owned company with private status. This may have altered Claire Colomb's assessment to some degree.

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: : Regionalpark Frankfurt Rhein-Main – Hohe Strasse / Frankfurt 2****Reviewer:** Marc Bourscheid

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- enormous amount of work within two years</li> <li>- irreproachable standard</li> <li>- very impressive</li> <li>- attractions of exceptional quality</li> <li>- animation as promotional tool</li> </ul>
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	<p>Transnational exchange! ("exchange brings solutions to questions or problems")</p> <p>Continuous co-operation makes communication easier</p> <p>Review: report from a neutral view</p>
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	<p>Ambiguous attitude: seen as a handicap, little regular involvement, but very efficient local contact through forest officer</p> <p>Communication should be strengthened: additional information meetings on a regular basis, internet site with exchange forum</p>
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The selected country lane has a strong historical and cultural background – a major asset to sustainability</li> <li>- Environmental aspects controlled by professional (forest officer)</li> <li>- Project strengthens recreational capacity of the Frankfurt Region</li> </ul>
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integration of international experts strengthens the position of the project partners in the local context</li> <li>- Mutual learning</li> </ul>
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	Without EU funding via SAUL, the project would not have been realized
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Regionalpark Saar / Saarland 1**

Reviewer: Jules Goris

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	Well done/outstanding: vision, plan, implementation, including participation of inhabitants (representative to which extent?) High cultural dimension: need of a large part of the population or hobby of a few? Partnership and "good vibrations" between activists of "utmost importance" – investments in these relationships and in open minds are very important
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- partnership between people who have seldom worked together before</li> <li>- change of professional role of foresters to managers, educators and hosts</li> <li>- involvement of inhabitants and of French partners</li> </ul>
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	Intensive participation! Need for continuation: green strategy not yet finished, monitoring of citizens' recreational demands and acceptance of green strategy
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	"The Saarland project is sustainable." But the Saarland as a whole lacks an urban strategy for shrinking cities and regions (remove dispersed urban areas in the green landscape/improve the quality of urban environment).
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	Most important: joint problem recognition (→ feeling of solidarity, stimulus, consolation). Participation methods: Learning from the methods of Staatsbosbeheer/NL.
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	"A very important lesson from the SAUL approach is to be patient in the restoring the patchwork in the landscape." Making slag heaps accessible and people aware and proud of them is an important step in regaining confidence.
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	Project can help to turn attention towards shrinking regions and ageing populations (author's proposed: transnational migration of elderly people looking for quiet surroundings, space and green landscape).
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	New SAUL-type project for cities with shrinking economies.
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Regionalpark Saar / Saarland 2**

Reviewer: Michael Bach

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	"The keynote ... has been the quality and strength of partnerships and the personal relationships which have developed into a lasting commitment to this style of planning." → courage to experiment with citizen involvement → sense of ownership by all stakeholders → shared vision as a major strength
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	New governance structures, bringing together the public and private sectors New strategies and capacities of public involvement Enthusiasm, commitment, physical results, teamwork
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	Gradually developing from a weak outset into early and continuing reengagement, tackling more deep-seated problems (Warndt project). Regular publicity with publicity material of high quality and striking images result in a high local profile. Determination of partners to continue is evident.
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	Economy: well targeted, low-cost solutions with low maintenance costs resulted in high-quality, low-cost results Nature: Minimised impact on the environment Social Sustainability: Opportunity for townspeople to escape into formerly inaccessible forest and mining areas, involvement in design. Urgent need to continue in a permanent programme of change.
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	Mentoring received from the JPG Good examples from Staatsbosbeheer, esp. forest management, citizen participation
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	Development of new concepts for the formerly dense and inaccessible forest – "Minimalist approach: acupuncture through selective interventions related to the project's vision", strong experimental artistic dimension; contribution to transforming the image of the Saarkohlenwald, involving users. Capacity-Building for joint work and partnership now being transferred to more difficult tasks. Urgent need to develop a spatial strategy for restructuring the urban area under the condition of shrinking.
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	Lessons from this project may be generally applied and useful for regions facing the new problems of a shrinking region.
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	Need for EU funding to focus not just on growth and new infrastructure, but also on the restructuring problems of shrinking regions (new funding priorities)
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Burgess Park London South Central /London 1**

Reviewer: Kathrin Feigs

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	Attention: Author relates her report to SAUL objectives!  Author expresses appraisal for - awareness of activists of the social importance of open space - community involvement - innovative details (see sustainability)
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	Projects realized within SAUL perform various tasks simultaneously: - tennis centre offering social control in a formerly obscure part, - football pitch building producing and using geothermal and solar energy - Youth exchange project (cooperation with SAUL Amsterdam Noorderpark)
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	"Especially the people working in the park have a strong focus on involving people from the local neighbourhood." A long-term strategy is needed to achieve more metropolitan importance, the idea of "arts" as a general theme could offer opportunities for participation. "The future challenge is to keep housing out of the park and to keep up people's commitment for the park."
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	Park Activists have so far been successful in withstanding the metropolitan demand for building grounds and kept the park size. Young Ambassadors project: importance of learning in terms of knowledge as well as in terms of capacities (teamwork, decision-making) by hands-on experience See 2 and 3, too!
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	JPG has worked well. Great importance of the special partnership with Amsterdam Noorderpark SAUL Project – Young Ambassadors a "major success". No direct transferability of approaches, but "by learning about other approaches to park planning, they become more sensitive about achievements, qualities and possible strategies for their own park".
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	Raising awareness about the need for a park to offer a specific profile within a metropolitan region – in addition to a strong community focus.
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Burgess Park London South Central /London 2**

Reviewer: Marta Doehler-Behzadi

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	Note: author used own guidance subjects.  Successful project, accepted by users and fixed in the community. Clear strategic orientation (schematic design). High quality facilities for the public, balanced functional network, improvement of safety and accessibility
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	Extraordinarily innovative as a metropolitan park needs to meet the needs of the local community first, which can only succeed by integrating local people into the project. Young Ambassadors project outstanding!
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ? Long-term involvement?	See 2 Long-term involvement by the planned trust in which local associations and individuals can engage
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	High standard of new facilities from a spatial, functional, social and architectural point of view. Sustainable transport concept based on tram line.
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	Profited from exchange with Amsterdam Noorderpark - comparable preconditions! Young Ambassadors Project "exciting and stimulating"
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	The British tradition of charity, voluntary work and the organizational form of trusts can serve as a good practice model for other European countries (e.g. Germany) seeking for a new balance of market, state and civil society.
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	Hints to further work: central path network for different users of paths and park, opening up for new leisure and sports activities, better and more diverse green structure; concept to integrate historic traces into green concept

stein+schultz+ +060107ust

**SAUL Review Scheme****Report: Emscher Bridge Waltroper Strasse / RheinRuhr 1**

Reviewer: Pieter van Wesemael

Question	Notes
1 How do you rate the <b>quality</b> of the project (planning, implementation, final results)?	Attention: Author relates his report to SAUL objectives!  Clear appreciation of direct results of project (cultural changes inside the water board, concerning listening to the outer world, and with press, politicians and people recognizing that the water board is no longer that hard-headed)
2 <b>Innovative aspects</b> of the project?	Generally: First attempt to "brand the New Emscher", making the new qualities of the River Area visible. Innovation within the Organization resp. the given setting: participation of citizens in bridge design
3 How successfully has the project <b>engaged local people</b> ?	Broad array of participatory methods. Local people emphasized practical aspects of the design, turning it less "artistic".
4 <b>Sustainability</b> (environmentally, socially etc.)?	Sustainability of the New Emscher Project as a whole is quoted. Sustainability of the change in planning culture is doubted.
5 Benefit from the involvement of SAUL <b>Joint Planning Groups</b> ?	SAUL projects did teach the team a lot, and SAUL experts helped to convince local politicians and experts
6 Contribution to development of spatial planning in the <b>region</b> ?	Necessity to develop a "toolbox", stressing the aesthetical aspects to be used in other Emscher Bridge projects and contributing to the "branding" of the general project
7 Contribution to development of spatial planning on a <b>EU level</b> ?	
8 Relevance to future <b>EU funding priorities</b> ?	International funding would help to continue the Emscher Dialogues.
9 <b>Other</b> remarks	Bridge Waltroper Strasse underpins the potential of the Emscher to develop regional identity.