

Le:Notre Webinar Q&A	
Ellen Fetzer: (18:56) Health seemed to be missing in this matrix,	Health is becoming an increasingly important aspect of GI discussions. Whilst it has always been viewed as important, hence the health and well-being agenda being incorporated into GI discussions, only when you start to add in the socio-economic benefits of green space to health do people start to listen. This (along with economic valuations) will be one of the most prominent avenues to pursue for GI development in the future.
hamid: (18:57) where is aesthetics	Aesthetics comes under the quality of place agenda within GI discussions. However, the notion of attractive places is often sidelined as this is not always seen as a priority (or even a function). This is a difficult aspect to rationalise as attractive places are used more and are valued more so we need to consider how a place looks, as well as, its function if we are to make sustainable and liveable places.
Anna Szilagyi-Nagy: (19:02) It is also said that NATURA 2000 is strongly connected to GI, and basically the backbone of the concept	NATURA 2000 takes a lot of cues from GI and visa versa but this only really applies to the EU. In the rest of the world other policy (at different scales) is linked to GI development. I would therefore say that NATURA 2000 utilises GI as a mechanism to promote to values and objectives rather than the other way around.
fadera: (19:04) I am interested in the estimation of value. if it is subjective, then apart from the equation shown earlier is there some other index to determine the premium which the people place on the socio- ecology as well as the cultural aspect?	All economic valuations are subjective, even those based on 'robust' or grounded economic analysis/theory. GI suffers in this respect as it is less well defined and has less support for valuing intangibles. As a result all economic valuations are subject to a whole range of validity arguments which used to be visible in other forms of valuation. There is also a cultural aspect (which draws on urban-rural issues) where some resources and actions are deemed appropriate (and/or valuable) whilst others aren't. This is a major impact on the formation and process of valuation. The Roe & Taylor (2013/14) New Cultural Landscapes book looks at these issues as does the Valuing Attractive Landscapes in the Urban Economy Final Report (http://www.value-landscapes.eu/).
ABDULLAH AL-GHAMDI.UD: (19:08) What different about green city and sustainable?	Not a lot – terminology and semantics mostly.
wiebke: (19:11) what should be new aspects in the education of landscape architect students in order to support GI (as landscape architecture is very integrative discipline already)?	Many institutions are now providing GI modules or integrating it into their curriculums. The University of Liverpool has a programme, whilst the University of Sheffield and Newcastle University teach elements of GI. Also in the USA UMass (Amherst) and Portland State have GI programmes. This provides a basic (and in many cases more detailed) education for planners and landscape architects to engage with GI and its principles. However, this needs to (a) continue and (b) expand to ensure that the ideas and values of GI become mainstreamed. There is also a need to do the same with practitioners to ensure continued engagement and development of these ideas by professional planners, architects and landscape specialists.
Paulina Escobar: (19:12) what's the method for implement a landscape project in a rural zone?, How you socialize the project with the habitants?	In rural areas you need to be more aware of the scale and interactivity of resources. Water and ecological networks work at a landscape scale so are more prevalent in rural areas and so can be managed accordingly. However, there is normally (in the UK at least) resistance to such processes as they work across administrative and legal boundaries. This causes problems as people are not formally forced to have a duty to cooperate but do so in ad hoc or informal ways. As a consequence the

	<p>management and development of rural/landscape focussed projects are more diverse and subject to more extensive scoping/design/implementation problems. To ensure that this is mitigated requires strong leadership from appropriate land owners and managers (i.e. Natural England/Forestry Commission in the UK and the EPA in the USA) and an ongoing process of negotiation between stakeholders.</p> <p>To socialise habitat construction and protection we need strong advocacy, awareness raising and education. We need to promote the value of the landscape and how it works to as broad a range of people as possible to make sure that landscape and GI knowledge permeates the political and decision-making structures of planning and development. This is not easy but is an ongoing process which is heavily dependent on the people doing the awareness raising/projects.</p>
Kimia Kiani: (19:12) What is your recommendation for researching about GI?	<p>GI is very broad so can be researched in many different ways. Health, water, valuation and climate change are good areas to start as they are contemporary and popular. What you need to do is identify a problem and try and work out whether (a) GI can offer solutions or (b) how a GI perspective can be applied to a planning/development/investment scenario. In most cases there will be opportunities to integrate GI into a research project but this is dependent on how you frame your investigation. In locations where rapid development is occurring GI can be researched as a promoter of liveability, health and economic growth. It can also be seen as an alternative approach to policy/practice that provides a more sustainable form of investment. One of the benefits of GI is this flexibility, which can be translated into research.</p>
Teodora Koos-Morar: (19:13) Can you give us an example of a city where a GI plan was developed and successfully implemented?	<p>New York (NY GI Plan), Philadelphia Green City/Water Plan, the 1st and 2nd Cambridgeshire GI plans have seen very good investment, London (Olympic Park and historically), Copenhagen's Finger Plan, Stockholm and Malmö in Sweden and their utilisation of small scale GI investment. I would recommend Tim Bealkey's (2000) book Green Urbanism as a good compendium of projects/examples from across Europe.</p>
DERYA YAZGI: (19:13) My PhD thesis depends on green infrastructure and its applications. I think evaluation of green infrastructure should be prevalent and the method the matrix I mean could be prepared and the criteria might be scored in order to weight them. Do you agree with my idea, Mr. Ian	<p>I'm always a little worried when people start to think about quantifying GI through a set of matrices or scoring options. Mainly this is because to get the metrics right takes a long time and can nearly always be contested. This is one of the problems people have with EIA and SEA, which may be too simplistic a rebuttal of these methods, but is still mentioned a lot. If you're going to score or discuss a metric based assessment then I would suggest you try and apply a counter qualitative socially orientated approach as well to (a) try and balance the process and (b) provide an alternative perspective to the data.</p>
RaduMirceaGiurgiu: (19:13) what are the means to go from research to practice ?	<p>People. Simply put people (researchers, academics, decision-makers, students and citizens) all need to be able to take the data and apply it in practice. This is not always easy given the constraints people experience in engaging with decision-making and investment but they have to try. If they are successful as we see in Sweden and Germany then we start to see really interesting and sustainable development occurring. Linked to this is a need to continue growing the evidence base and support for GI. This is paramount to maintaining its visibility within planning,</p>

	the media and people's imaginations. If people are forced to think about GI then they will start to value it and move beyond talking/rhetoric to investment.
Omar al sharife - KSA - UOD: (19:14) As we know there is a relationship between biodiversity and green infrastructure but how can we apply it in a green Corridors green network for example?	GI is inherently spatial in its form and function. Ecological/biodiversity networks are a key component of this and need to be promoted as an essential delivery mechanism for GI. Most planners understand the value of corridors and indeed the majority of GI strategies produced draw heavily on networks to locate their investment opportunities. What we need to do it relay the value and benefits that GI can deliver using corridors as the delivery mechanism to do so. In the USA the Greenways literature has been pretty good at doing this and in the UK the work on landscape scale investment can be considered to work from a network perspective. One further thing to remember is that urban developers and engineers understand the notion of networks (especially in water-centric development), therefore by using the same language but adapting the focus to biodiversity and GI provides them with a terminology they understand.
Omar alsaqabi\ uod: (19:16) Beside the environmental goals of green infrastructure, is the elements of concept could make a function for human being or user, and how to integrate the goals and function?	Yes, GI should and is seen as a mechanism to deliver environmental but also social and economic benefits. Whilst it is not a problem to develop mono-functional environments, those developments that can provide multiple functions in one location are much better at achieving long term sustainability. The social aspects of GI (health, education, economic development, social cohesion, environmental consciousness) are well documented and can, and do, play a significant role in promoting the values of GI.
wiebke: (19:17) is there a possibility to receive a reference list for the cited studies in during the presentation?	Yes – I'll send one to Ellen.
RaduMirceaGiurgiu: (19:18) Ian, are you working in practice also or more research, or both?	I'm now mostly looking at research and evaluations of policy and delivery. I worked for a number of years in community forestry research in England and in local government development landscape/GI projects – all of which I draw on in academic work. Having said that I still work with consultants and advocacy groups to help shape developments and policy and will continue to do so. This role is constantly changing depending on where I'm working but I'm happy to work with GI people around the world on project/delivery work.
fadera: (19:19) To implement a GI plan, is it necessary to conduct a landscape assessment with a view to getting people opinions concerning their environment or should that be done after the GI plan has been implemented?	Yes. You need buy-in from people to ensure that (a) the place is appropriate and meets the need of the local population (as well as the environment) and (b) that you get longer-term support from people and politicians. If you try and impose a GI or development strategy that is alien to people they often oppose it. Whereas, inviting people to be involved doesn't guarantee their participation but at least it will raise their awareness.
Attila Toth_Vienna_Nitra: (19:20) GI in rural areas can be perceived as a tool to improve the permeability and connectivity of the landscape, which in many agricultural landscapes has been massively disrupted during the previous decades - GI brings a new approach, which might help to revitalize the rural landscape and implement the European Landscape Convention	True and I think it European nations start to be fully compliant with the ELC then this should happen more. However, research by Roe, Jones and Mell (2008) and Roe, Selman, Swanick, Mell & Jones (2009) for Natural England and Defra looking at the UK's compliance with the ELC highlights that this is very varied. Some European nations are a lot better at meeting their commitments and if this becomes more widespread then we should see better rural based management across an increased number of nations.
Hamidreza: (19:20) I had a comment before about WTP that you have shown during your presentation and I suggest about willingness to participate now you are talking about	WTP is simply a measure of valuation for future options. There is also Willingness to Accept (WTA) which looks at damage. This does however imply that people are involved in the process.

participation of ordinary civilians in urban projects that is great but what about that formula specifically?	There is no point conducted a stated/revealed preference survey if people are not involved. How this is achieved varies between locations and countries as people are afforded my input in some locations than others. This needs to be addressed to ensure validity to the results. As for the equation this is simply a representation of what factors might influence WTP – getting people to participate is beyond the scope of this simple equation.
Milena: (19:21) Dr Mell, in developing countries GI is not implemented in city planing. How that can be changed?	You need to frame GI in language that is understood. For instance in India green space and urban green space are used to discuss GI therefore its how you frame the debate that is important. Secondly, you need to align GI with other essential infrastructure and promote it as a vital component of urban form. This may mean debating GI in engineered terms or in terms of housing and transport infrastructure. However, to gain acceptance it needs to directly engage with these discussions to give it validity. Also, you can bring into these conversations lots of evidence from the host country and elsewhere to show the successful use of GI especially where other urban problems occur (I.e. surface flooding). This should provide scope to promote the use of GI.
fadera: (19:21) reason for this question is, to carry people along it may seem alright to take the first route but in cases where the country is underdeveloped, waiting for people consensus may mean waiting forever so the approach is usually	Developing consensus is difficult and thus there is a need to ensure that evidence and expertise in integrated into these processes. Only with the right level of information can people make informed decisions.
Anna Szilagyi-Nagy: (19:21) in my master thesis I wrote about how those previously rural playgrounds and how they disappeared when the area became more urban in the perihpery of Budapest. It is said to see how people's interaction changed or basically disappeared in the last 50 years.	True, how people interact and value the landscape has changed dramatically but we are starting to see people return to their previous relationships with the environment. This will need to continue to ensure that GI is conserved and improved across urban/urban-fringe and rural areas.
Omar al sharife - KSA - UOD: (19:25) What is the design methods that we can use it as a landscape architectures to design a green Corridors that contains a biodiversity and maintain the sustainability of it?	I would check out the work of Almo Farina, Jongmann and Pungetti and the Greenways literature for examples of how GI and ecological corridors can be delivered.