Interreg CENTRAL EUROPE
European Union
European Regional
Development Fund
GreenerSites

TAKING
COOPERATION
FORWARD

Warsaw, 9 October 2018

PROJECT MEETING

Toward the deployment of the strategic plan

Greenersites | Veneto Region | Experts: Francesca Borga, Raffaella Lioce

Workpackage overview

- **Timing**: from August 2018 to May 2019

- **WP Leader**: Veneto Region. **Involved**: all partners

- **Outputs**:

  ➢ 9 Strategic Action Plans (1 each FUA)

  ➢ 1 Common transferability manual for sustainable environmental brownfield management

  ➢ 18 stakeholders tables

  ➢ 9 signed Memorandum of Understanding

  ➢ 1 catalogue of lessons learnt

  ➢ 11 local transferability events

Workpackage overview

- **Inputs**:
  - ➢ Common template for Strategic Action Plans at FUA level + SAP Guidelines (WP1)
  - ➢ Common training material (WP2)
  - ➢ Pilot Actions experience (WP3)

  → The Strategic Action Plans must be coherent with the common approach defined in WP1

  → The lessons learnt Catalogue and the Transferability Manual directly derivate from WP2 & WP3 (& WP4) experience

Strategic Action Planning

➢ A Strategic Action Plan is a comprehensive and integrated plan to address needs; i.e. to successfully carry out a programmatic mission.

➢ Because strategic planning is a team effort that builds consensus on a future direction for a project, the process itself is more important than the resulting document.

➢ In simple terms, strategic planning helps to ask four basic questions:

  ➢ WHERE ARE WE NOW?
  ➢ WHERE DO WE WANT TO BE?
  ➢ HOW DO WE GET THERE?
  ➢ HOW DO WE MEASURE OUR PROGRESS?

SAP structure

1. Introduction

2. The context:
   - description of the FUA and the pilot area
   - description of the alternative actions (use template already shared by the partnership, but simply summarise the action)

3. The decisional process developed
   - The focus group, the stakeholders workshop

4. Analysis of the outcomes

5. Detailed description of selected action(s)

Description of possible actions

Content of specific action

Setting the scene. Please provide brief background information on the action.
For infrastructure projects - please attach map of location.

Short problem description

Please outline the specific problem to be solved. Please also indicate possible risks

Objective of specific action

What should be the outcome of this action?

Partners involved and description of participation process

Who does what? Please list partners involved and briefly explain their function in the process. You should also refer to your regional stakeholder tables and the associated partner network

Planning of activities (timeline)

Please describe the stepwise process planning (short, mid and long-term perspective).

Financing

Please describe amount and source of funding (public: municipal, regional, national, European / private).

Progress of implementation

Please describe your concrete steps of implementation of the specific action. You should also refer to positive and inhibiting factors affecting the process (e.g. use of measures, instruments, and remediation techniques, development of recommendations for brownfield remediation, discussion with funding bodies, political support).

This section should be regularly updated (every two months).

SAP structure

1. Introduction
2. The context:
   - description of the FUA and the pilot area
   - description of the alternative actions (use template already shared by the partnership, but simply summarise the action)
3. The decisional process developed
   - The focus group, the stakeholders workshop
4. Analysis of the outcomes
5. Detailed description of selected action(s)

The decisional process – AHP methodology

➢Our rationale:

- To give a *common*, *transferable* and *"objective"* methodology to select among different possible actions → i.e. to lead the strategic planning process, create consensus, and provide value added information to final decision makers

- To ensure real and active stakeholders involvement, remaining in line with previous project steps

SAP structure

1. Introduction
2. The context:
   - description of the FUA and the pilot area
   - description of the alternative actions (use template already shared by the partnership, but simply summarise the action)
3. The decisional process developed
   - The focus group, the stakeholders workshop
4. Analysis of the outcomes
5. Detailed description of selected action(s)

Description of selected actions

> Same structure

> More detail

Content of specific action

Setting the scene. Please provide brief background information on the action.
For infrastructure projects - please attach map of location.

Short problem description

Please outline the specific problem to be solved. Please also i...

Objective of specific action

What should be the outcome of this action?

Partners involved and description of participation process

Who does what? Please list partners involved and briefly expl...
You should also refer to your regional stakeholder tables and i...

Planning of activities (timeline)

Please describe the stepwise process planning (short, mid and long-term perspective).

Financing

Please describe amount and source of funding (public: municipal, regional, national, European / private).

Progress of implementation

Please describe your concrete steps of implementation of the specific action. You should also refer to positive and inhibiting factors affecting the process (e.g. use of measures, instruments, and remediation techniques, development of recommendations for brownfield remediation, discussion with funding bodies, political support).
This section should be regularly updated (every two months).

The methodological approach

the Analytic Hierarchic Process AHP in brief

AHP Analytic Hierarchic Process

- AHP is one of the **multiple criteria decision-making method**
- It was originally developed by Prof. Thomas L. Saaty (1977).

  - AHP provides measures of judgement **consistency**
  - AHP derives **priorities** among criteria and alternatives
  - AHP **simplifies preference ratings among decision criteria using pair wise comparisons**

Decision making process

To make a decision we need to know:

- the problem,
- the need and purpose of the decision,
- the criteria of the decision, their subcriteria,
- stakeholders and groups affected and the alternative actions to take.

- We then try to determine the best alternative, or in the case of resource allocation, we need priorities for the alternatives to allocate their appropriate share of the resources.

AHP is one of the multiple criteria model that can support this complex process

Public Decision Making

Decision making involves **many criteria and subcriteria** used **to rank** the alternatives of a decision.

- Not only does one need to create priorities for the alternatives with respect to the criteria or subcriteria in terms of which they need to be evaluated,
- **but** also for the criteria in terms of a **higher goal**,
- **or** if they depend on the alternatives, then in terms of the **alternatives** themselves.

- If **criteria are tangible the rank is** easier then with intangible criteria,
  - → in any case even when numbers are obtained from a standard scale and they are considered objective, their **interpretation** is always, I repeat, always, subjective
- So we need a tool to support the decision process especially when it is a public process.

The AHP as a participative process coherent with the WP4

AHP as participated process

Decompose the decision-making problem into a **hierarchy** → Desk expert activity

Make pair wise **comparisons** and establish priorities among the elements in the hierarchy → Focus Ggroup

Synthesise judgments (to obtain the set of overall or **weights** for achieving your goal) → Desk expert activity

Evaluate and check the consistency of judgements and estimate average weights → Desk expert activity

Assess alternative actions **performaces** → Stakeholders workshop

Analyse outcomes, arrange interpretative reports for deciison makers → Desk expert activity