



Interreg



EUROPEAN UNION

Danube Transnational Programme

URBforDAN

URBforDAN Key Stakeholder Profiles

Overall stakeholder analysis on the level of the
URBforDAN partnership

Table of content

URBforDAN Key Stakeholder Profiles

Table of content2

1. Introduction3
 - 1.1. About the URBforDAN Project3
 - 1.2. About URBforDAN Key Stakeholder Profiles3
2. Brief description of the data collection and analysis process4
3. Overview of identified types of stakeholders5
4. Key Stakeholder group profile – HIKERS6
5. Key Stakeholder group profile – CYCLISTS8
6. Key Stakeholder group profile – DOWNHILL CYCLISTS10
7. Key Stakeholder group profile – JOGGERS12
8. Key Stakeholder group profile – PET WALKERS14
9. Key Stakeholder group profile – FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN16
10. Key Stakeholder group profile – TEACHERS WITH PUPILS18
11. Conclusions20
12. Lessons learned about the process22

1. Introduction URBforDAN Key Stakeholder Profiles

1.1. About the URBforDAN Project

Management and Utilization of Urban Forests as Natural Heritage in Danube Cities (with acronym URBforDAN) is an EU co-financed project, which was designed to deliver a change in urban forest management and utilization of ecosystem services. URBforDAN project is being implemented in 7 Danube Cities – Ljubljana (SLO), Vienna (AT), Budapest (HUN), Zagreb (CRO), Cluj-Napoca (ROM), Belgrade (SRB) and Ivano-Frankivsk (UA). Its' implementation is closely observed by 3 associated partner cities – Prague (CZE), Sarajevo (BIH) and Podgorica (MNE), as well as by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Urban and Peri-urban Forests (UPF) in Danube Cities play an extremely important role as “green city lungs” - preserving the rich biodiversity of Europe and its vivid landscape. They also deliver many economically/socially important ecosystem services – UPFs are key areas for experiencing natural/cultural heritage within cities, important tourist attractions, areas for recreation and high quality of living.

All URBforDAN Cities face similar challenges – all manage substantial NH areas (mostly UPF) within their city limits. Due to their characteristics, they attract many users (citizens, tourists...), but also have many stakeholders (managers, owners, interest groups...) trying to manage those activities. Today, this is usually done without proper coordination of all stated key actors. UPF also lack appropriate infrastructure and equipment to cope with the ever-increasing number of users. Thus, UPF are under increasing pressure from a diverse set of activities, arising conflicts and unsustainable use of resources – all leading to the poor state of NH. Management of UPF in some cities is further challenged by the extreme fragmentation of the ownership (which is often mostly private).

This is why URBforDAN takes on the challenge of mobilization of key actors in URBforDAN Cities to ensure their active participation in integrated planning/management. Protection regimes, mapping/valuation of ecosystem services and development ideas will be combined through a participatory process to deliver Integrated multi-use Management Plans for UPF on a strategic and operational level. UPF Danube Network will be established to strengthen the cooperation between key actors, ensure timely knowledge/best-practice sharing, dissemination/transferability of project outputs and enable further capitalization. UPF managers, owners, and users will be equipped with management tools supporting multi-purpose use of UPF and exploiting new opportunities for sustainable development. Participatory Planning & UPF Management Guidelines will be developed, based on lessons learned and best practices used.

1.2. About URBforDAN Key Stakeholder Profiles

The overall aim of Key Stakeholder Profiles developed by each project partner of the URBforDAN project was to ensure “in-depth understanding” of their key stakeholder groups on the city level, as well as to channel all relevant information gathered by questionnaires for urban forest users and owners into the planning process of Integrated Multi-use Management Plans.

It was designed and developed by a team of external experts from the company ZaVita d.o.o., tasked to provide expert support to the City of Ljubljana (Lead Partner) and the URBforDAN Partnership.

It is the aim of this report to gather all relevant information on the level of URBforDAN partnership – thus providing a bigger picture, applicable to the level of whole Danube Programme area, as well as allowing URBforDAN partnership opportunity to draw key conclusions, record the partnership learning process and formulate lessons learned.

2. Brief description of the data collection and analysis process

Key Stakeholder Profiles were developed on the basis of data gathered through questionnaires for users and owners of urban forests, first workshops with users and owners of urban forests, as well as additional individual meetings carried out by URBforDAN project partners. All such data was analyzed, interpreted and compiled in city-level reports.

Key Stakeholder Profiles were jointly developed by all project partners coming from the same City. The main reason lies in the necessity to construct and agree upon a joint and unanimous understanding of all project partners from the same city about who key stakeholders are and how partners from the same city understand their needs and expectations.

To further guide this process, a uniform template questionnaire was developed. However, project partners were encouraged to translate questionnaires into their national languages in order to remove language barriers and add additional topics, if they found them necessary to create the “in-depth understanding” of their key stakeholders. This is important as profiles represent a tool for designing further steps of the participatory process and used as input information for the Integrated Multi-use Management Plans.

URBforDAN project partners used different survey techniques to disseminate the questionnaires amongst stakeholders and collect data – for example, an on-line survey, conducting the survey during workshops, on-site surveys, etc. Some of them even combined techniques, prolonged their execution or even repeated the survey – all with one aim to get the best possible results and an appropriate number of stakeholders. Surveys were carried out from October 2018 – January 2019

Forest managers and forest owners were already at the stage of the design of the URBforDAN project idea recognized as key stakeholders. As they are in vast majority known institutions (with exception of private forest owners which are presented only in Ljubljana and to a smaller extent in Belgrade and Zagreb) with already determined legal responsibilities, authority and clearly defined goals and assignments. This is why URBforDAN understood from the start of the project that their profiles are already known on the city level, while their comparison on URBforDAN project level brings no added value. For this reason, such key stakeholders received a key stakeholder profile exclusively on the city level – if project partners from that city considered such stakeholder profile useful and necessary for their work on the city level.

An URBforDAN level key stakeholder profile (presented in the next chapters) was created only for those user stakeholder groups, which were selected as key stakeholders from at least 4 project partners. Of course, other stakeholder groups were not disregarded but were taken into account only on the individual city level.

Answers presented in the following chapters represent average values aggregated from UPF user questionnaire answers – thus creating a profile of a typical representative of the specific stakeholder group in each city. For each answer we also provide a percentage of the most common answer – the percentage is provided in brackets and is rounded up or down on the basis of 5% accuracy, thus allowing transnational comparison and needed a level of generalization.

3. Overview of identified types of stakeholders

In the process of data collection and during workshops (organized within the context of WP3 – Participatory Approach) URBforDAN project partners identified the following types of stakeholders – as listed in the table below. The table also offers the overview of identified types of stakeholders per URBforDAN project partner (marked with ✓), as well as the decision of each City to recognize a specific type of stakeholders as Key Stakeholders (colored in green).

Identified type of stakeholder	BELGRADE	BUDAPEST	CLUJ-NAPOCA	IVANO-FRANKIVSK	LJUBLJANA	VIENNA	ZAGREB	Detected in %	Identified as Key SH in %
FOREST USERS									
Hikers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	85,71 %	85,71 %
Cyclists	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	100,00 %
Downhill Cyclists	✓*	✓*	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓*	85,71 %	71,43 %
Joggers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	100,00 %
Pet walkers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	71,43 %
Horseback riders	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	71,43 %	14,29 %
Families with children	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	100,00 %
Forest fruit pickers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	28,57 %
Teachers with pupils	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	100,00 %
Scientists	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	28,57 %
Working in forest	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	85,71 %	28,57 %
Paragliders	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	14,29 %	14,29 %
Climbers	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	14,29 %	0,00 %
Photo-hunters	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	71,43 %	28,57 %
Pedestrians	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	14,29 %	14,29 %
Archers	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	14,29 %	0,00 %
Boy-scouts	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	14,29 %	14,29 %
In-line skaters	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	14,29 %	14,29 %
Bathers/Swimmers	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	14,29 %	14,29 %
FOREST MANAGERS									
Forest Managers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	100,00 %
FOREST OWNERS									
Public owners	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	100,00 %	100,00 %
Large private owners	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	0,00 %	0,00 %
Small private owners	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	42,86 %	42,86 %
Micro private owners	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	42,86 %	42,86 %

*Due to the form of this city-level questionnaire, it was not possible to separate downhill cyclists from regular cyclists.

4. Key Stakeholder group profile – HIKERS



The average hiker visiting urban and peri-urban forests in one of URBforDAN cities is 31-45 years old, highly educated and employed. He/she is either:

- A citizen of the URBforDAN city living over 3 km away from the focus area, visiting the urban forest a few times a week or a month.
- A visitor of the URBforDAN city visiting the urban forest a few times a year.

He/she most commonly uses public transport or a car to access the urban forest and spends there 1-5 hours.

Despite rather poor knowledge about the actual protection/adapted management regimes applicable to the urban forest, she/he believes that his/her activity does not create conflicts with other users or has negative impacts on nature.



He/she enjoys the natural environment and is bothered by the poor state of the urban forest and bad behavior of visitors. Ban of motorized vehicles is high on his/her agenda and supports the development of well-equipped entrance points with rather limited interventions with urban equipment in the urban forest.

He/she would like URBforDAN project to:

- Improve marking of trails and overall navigation of visitors of the urban forest.
- Install urban equipment and resolve waste collection issue.
- Set-up educational paths/polygons and other points of interest.

She/he supports further sustainable development of the urban forest and recognizes its potential for education and high-quality leisure environment.

In the table below you can find a more detailed overview of hiker profiles per URBforDAN cities.

PHOTO SOURCES:

<https://www.mykawartha.com/community-story/8635517-best-hiking-trails-in-the-kawarthas/>

KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL URBFORDAN CITIES - HIKERS

HIKERS	BELGRADE	BUDAPEST	CLUJ-NAPOCA	IVANO-FRANKIVSK	LJUBLJANA	VIENNA	ZAGREB
No. of respondents:	59	97	132	33	171	10	Not applicable
Age group:	45-60 years old (60%)	31-45 years old (50%)	31-45 years old (65%)	18-30 years old (60%)	31-45 years old (60%)	30-45 (33 %), 45-60 (33%) and above 60 years old (33%)	Not applicable
Education status:	University degree (80%)	University degree (90%)	University degree (85%)	University degree (75%)	University degree (60%)	University degree (60%)	Not applicable
Working status:	Employed (100%)	Employed (80%)	Employed (95%)	Employed (50%)	Employed (70%)	Employed (100%)	Not applicable
The average distance from the focus area:	Citizen of Belgrade (80%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (60%)	Citizen of Budapest (80%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (30%)	Citizen of Cluj-Napoca (90%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (55%)	Citizen of Ivano-Frankivsk (80%), but lives 2-5 km (45%) or over 5 km away from the focus area (50%)	Citizen of Ljubljana (80%), but lives less than 1 km away (35%) or over 5 km away (20%)	Citizen of Vienna (80%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (65%)	Not applicable
Frequency of the average visit to the focus area:	Several times per year (70%)	Several times per year (75%)	Several times per week (25%) or once per week (20%)	Several times per year (60%)	Several times per week (25%), month (21%) or year (28%)	Several times per year (50 %)	Not applicable
Predominant type of access to the focus area:	By car (75%)	By public transport (40%) or by car (30%)	By car (40%)	By car (65%)	By foot (60%) or by car (25%)	By public transport (40%) or by car (30%)	Not applicable
Average time spent on the focus area:	2-5 hours (65%)	1-2 hours (40%) or 2-5 hours (40%)	2-5 hours (45%) or 1-2 hours (40%)	2-5 hours (65%)	1-2 hours (75%)	2-5 hours (65%)	Not applicable
Detection of conflicts with other users:	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (85%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (95%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (95%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)	Not applicable
Knowledge about the type of protection/adapted management regime present in the focus area:	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (65 %)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (80%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (90%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (80%)	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (50%)	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (50%)	Not applicable
Sensibility towards own negative impacts on the nature of the focus area with key reasons:	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (75%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (95%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (90%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (95%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (65%)	Not applicable
List of key expressed problems/challenges:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Motor – racing Unleashed and stray dogs Vandalism Waste collection Urbanization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focus area is neglected Lack of urban equipment Waste collection A bad condition of existing equipment (paragliding) Poor access to toilets and water Accessibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Waste collection Picnicks/parties Lighting fires/ smoking Forrest exploitation & illegal cuttings Grazing of animals Urbanization Hunting Unleashed pets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of urban equipment Poor accessibility – lack of roads, paths and equipped entrance points (e.g. toilets) The focus area is neglected Motorized vehicles Poor behavior of visitors Urbanization Waste collection Lack of recreational and educational infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presence of motorized vehicles Lack of urban equipment Poor maintenance of trails Poor access to toilets and water Waste collection Poor control Lack of parking places Unleashed animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Not enough space devoted to spawning grounds and resting areas for animals 	Not applicable
List of key expressed suggestions for improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playground Marking of trails New trails for sports Outdoor fitness equipment Parking lots Sports infrastructure Improved maintenance Ban of motorized vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness rising tools Urban equipment New trails for sports Educational Paths Bird watching point Playground Toilets and water access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational paths/activities New trails for sports Urban equipment Marking of trails Entrance points Parking lots Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, ZOO, etc.) Surveillance Picnic areas Ban of motorized vehicles Toilets and water access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness rising tools Urban equipment Toilets and water access Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, etc.) New sports infrastructure Educational paths/activities Camping Festivals / events Extreme sports Improved maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bann motorized traffic Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, downhill polygon, etc.) Educational paths/activities Playground Urban equipment Outdoor fitness equipment Improve surveillance Toilets and water access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Playground Parking lots Toilets and water access Entrance points with info New green and flower strips Sports infrastructure Educational paths/activities 	Not applicable

5. Key Stakeholder group profile – CYCLISTS



The average cyclist visiting urban and peri-urban forests in one of URBforDAN cities is 31-45 years old, highly educated and employed. He/she is either:

- A citizen of the URBforDAN city living 2-5 km away from the focus area, visiting the urban forest a few times a week or a month.
- A visitor of the URBforDAN city visiting the urban forest a few times a year.

He/she most commonly uses a bicycle or a car to access the urban forest and spends there 1-5 hours.

Despite rather poor knowledge about the actual protection/adapted management regimes applicable to the urban forest, she/he believes that his/her activity has no negative impacts on nature. He/she is more aware of potential conflicts with other users but is still convinced that he/she is not responsible for them.



He/she enjoys the natural environment and is bothered by the poor maintenance of trails and urban infrastructure. Ban of motorized vehicles is high on his/her agenda and supports the development of well-equipped entrance points with good and well-maintained trails in the urban forest.

He/she would like URBforDAN project to:

- Improve marking of trails and separate cycling and walking trails in the urban forest.
- Install urban equipment and improve sports/recreational infrastructure.
- Set-up additional points of interest.

She/he supports the further sustainable development of the urban forest and recognizes its potential for recreation, sports and education.

In the table below you can find a more detailed overview of cyclist profiles per URBforDAN cities.

PHOTO SOURCES:

<https://www.thenewforest.co.uk/ideas-and-inspiration/blog/read/2018/05/new-forest-cycling-where-two-wheels-are-better-than-four-b78>

KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL URBORDAN CITIES – CYCLISTS

CYCLISTS	BELGRADE	BUDAPEST	CLUJ-NAPOCA	IVANO-FRANKIVSK	LJUBLJANA	VIENNA	ZAGREB
No. of respondents:	11	26	103	28	108	40	27
Age class:	31-45 years old (45%) or 45-60 years old (45%)	31-45 years old (55%)	31-45 years old (65%)	18-30 years old (65%)	31-45 years old (50%)	45-60 years old (50%)	18-30 years old (50%)
Education status:	University degree (75%)	University degree (90%)	University degree (85%)	University degree (80%)	University degree (50%)	University degree (45%)	University degree (50%)
Working status:	Employed (100%)	Employed (75%)	Employed (65%)	Employed (55%)	Employed (70%)	Employed (85%)	Employed (80%)
The average distance from the focus area:	Citizen of Belgrade (100%), but lives over 5 km away from the focus area (90%)	Citizen of Budapest (80%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (50%)	Citizen of Cluj-Napoca (95%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (45%)	Citizen of Ivano-Frankivsk (80%), but lives 2-5 km (50%) or over 5 km away from the focus area (35%)	Citizen of Ljubljana (80%), but lives less than 1 km away (15%) or over 5 km away (40%)	Citizen of Vienna (80%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (50%)	Citizen of Zagreb (85%), but lives over 3 km from the focus area (40%)
Frequency of the average visit to the focus area:	Several times per year (75%)	Several times per year (35%) or several times per week (30%)	Several times per week (30%) or once per week (25%)	Several times per year (60%)	Several times per month (30%) or several times per week (25%)	Several times per year (35 %) or several times per week (25%)	Several times per month (25%) or several times per week (20%)
Predominant type of access to the focus area:	By car (75%)	By car (35%) or by bicycle (25%)	By car (26%) or by bicycle (20%)	By bicycle (45%) or by car (40%)	By bicycle (70%) or by car (20%)	By bicycle (50%) or public transport (25%)	By bicycle (80%)
Average time spent on the focus area:	2-5 hours (65%)	1-2 hours (40%) or 2-5 hours (40%)	1-2 hours (45%) or 2-5 hours (40%)	2-5 hours (60%)	1-2 hours (70%)	1-2 hours (45%) or 2-5 hours (40%)	1-2 hours (70%)
Detection of conflicts with other users:	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (75%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (95%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (65%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (55%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (80%)
Knowledge about the type of protection/adapted management regime present in the focus area:	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (65 %)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (90%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (80%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (65%)	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (50%)	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (40%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (70%)
Sensibility towards own negative impacts on the nature of the focus area with key reasons:	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (75%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (95%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (95%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (90%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (65%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)
List of key expressed problems/challenges:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Motor – racing Unleashed and stray dogs Vandalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Poor access to toilets and water Separation of trails Lack of marking of trails Lack of urban equipment Accessibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Waste collection Picnicks/parties Lighting fires Forrest exploitation & illegal cuttings Urbanization Hunting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of urban equipment Poor accessibility – lack of roads, paths and equipped entrance points (e.g. toilets) The focus area is neglected Motorized vehicles Poor behavior of visitors Urbanization Waste collection Lack of recreational and educational infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presence of motorized vehicles Lack of urban equipment Poor maintenance of trails Poor access to toilets and water Waste collection Poor control Lack of parking places Unleashed animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abuse of narcotics Waste collection Conflicts with other users – no separation of paths and poor behavior of some Lack of information on nature and protection regimes Electric scooters Unleashed pets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of attractions for visitors and supporting infrastructure Lack of educational paths/activities Waste collection
List of key expressed suggestions for improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment Parking lots Sports infrastructure Improved maintenance Ban of motorized vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playground Urban equipment Awareness rising tools Toilets and water access New trails for sports Educational Paths Bird watching point Marking of trails Access by public transport Reforestation of parking lots Ban of motorized traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational paths/activities New trails for sports Urban equipment New downhill trails Promoting public transport Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, bike-park, etc.) Entrance points Parking lots Surveillance Picnic area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness rising tools Urban equipment Toilets and water access Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, etc.) New sports infrastructure Educational paths/activities Camping Festivals / events Extreme sports Improved maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bann motorized traffic Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, downhill polygon, etc.) Educational paths/activities Playground Urban equipment Outdoor fitness equipment Improve surveillance Toilets and water access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access New trails Playgrounds Outdoor fitness equipment Marking of trails Events Sports infrastructure Picnic areas Improved maintenance Awareness raising Educational paths/activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New trails Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment

6. Key Stakeholder group profile – DOWNHILL CYCLISTS



The average downhill cyclist visiting urban and peri-urban forests in one of URBforDAN cities is 31-45 or 18-30 years old. He/she is highly educated and employed or is still studying. He/she is either:

- A citizen of the URBforDAN city living 2-5 km away from the focus area, visiting the urban forest a few times a week.
- A visitor of the URBforDAN city visiting the urban forest a few times a year.

He/she most commonly uses a bicycle or a car to access the urban forest and spends there 1-2 hours.

Despite rather poor knowledge about the actual protection/adapted management regimes applicable to the urban forest, she/he believes that his/her activity has no negative impacts on nature. He/she is more aware of potential conflicts with other users but is still convinced that he/she is not responsible for them.



He/she is an advocate for the separation of trails and introduction of “code of conduct” for all users. He/she is bothered by motorized traffic and unleashed animals. He/she supports the development of downhill polygons, well-equipped entrance points with good and well-maintained trails in the urban forest.

He/she would like URBforDAN project to:

- Improve accessibility of urban forests by bike.
- Improve marking of trails and separate cycling and walking trails in the urban forest.
- Set-up additional points of interest – like downhill polygon.
- Install urban equipment and improve sports/recreational infrastructure.

She/he supports the further sustainable development of the urban forest and recognizes its potential for recreation, sports and education.

In the table below you can find a more detailed overview of cyclist profiles per URBforDAN cities.

PHOTO SOURCES:

<https://www.thenewforest.co.uk/ideas-and-inspiration/blog/read/2018/05/new-forest-cycling-where-two-wheels-are-better-than-four-b78>

KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL URBORDAN CITIES – DOWNHILL CYCLISTS

DOWNHILL CYCLISTS	BELGRADE	BUDAPEST	CLUJ-NAPOCA	IVANO-FRANKIVSK	LJUBLJANA	VIENNA	ZAGREB
No. of respondents:	11	26	Not applicable	24	256	Not applicable	27
Age class:	31-45 years old (45%) or 45-60 years old (45%)	31-45 years old (55%)	Not applicable	18-30 years old (60%)	31-45 (45%) and 18-30 years old (35%)	Not applicable	18-30 years old (50%)
Education status:	University degree (75%)	University degree (90%)	Not applicable	University degree (75%)	University degree (45%) and high school (30%)	Not applicable	University degree (50%)
Working status:	Employed (100%)	Employed (75%)	Not applicable	Employed (65%)	Employed (60%) or studying (20%)	Not applicable	Employed (80%)
The average distance from the focus area:	Citizen of Belgrade (100%), but lives over 5 km away from the focus area (90%)	Citizen of Budapest (80%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (50%)	Not applicable	Citizen of Ivano-Frankivsk (80%), but lives 2-5 km (00%) or over 5 km away from the focus area (55%)	Citizen of Ljubljana (80%), but lives 2-5 km away (30%) or over 5 km away (40%)	Not applicable	Citizen of Zagreb (85%), but lives over 3 km from the focus area (40%)
Frequency of the average visit to the focus area:	Several times per year (75%)	Several times per year (35%) or several times per week (30%)	Not applicable	Several times per year (70%)	Several times per week (40%)	Not applicable	Several times per month (25%) or several times per week (20%)
The predominant type of access to the focus area:	By car (75%)	By car (35%) or by bicycle (25%)	Not applicable	By bicycle (25%) or by car (35%)	By bicycle (70%) or by car (25%)	Not applicable	By bicycle (80%)
Average time spent on the focus area:	2-5 hours (65%)	1-2 hours (40%) or 2-5 hours (40%)	Not applicable	2-5 hours (65%)	1-2 hours (70%)	Not applicable	1-2 hours (70%)
Detection of conflicts with other users:	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	Not applicable	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (85%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (70%)	Not applicable	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (80%)
Knowledge about the type of protection/adapted management regime present in the focus area:	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (65 %)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (90%)	Not applicable	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (70%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (70%)	Not applicable	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (70%)
Sensibility towards own negative impacts on the nature of the focus area with key reasons:	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (75%)	Not applicable	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (90%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (90%)	Not applicable	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)
List of key expressed problems/challenges:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Motor – racing Unleashed and stray dogs Vandalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Poor access to toilets and water Separation of trails Lack of marking of trails Lack of urban equipment Accessibility 	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of urban equipment Poor accessibility – lack of roads, paths and equipped entrance points (e.g. toilets) The focus area is neglected Motorized vehicles Poor behavior of visitors Urbanization Waste collection Lack of recreational and educational infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presence of motorized vehicles Lack of urban equipment Poor maintenance of trails Poor access to toilets and water Waste collection Poor control Lack of parking places Unleashed animals 	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of attractions for visitors and supporting infrastructure Lack of educational paths/activities Waste collection
List of key expressed suggestions for improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment Parking lots Sports infrastructure Improved maintenance Ban of motorized vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playground Urban equipment Awareness rising tools Toilets and water access New trails for sports Educational Paths Bird watching point Marking of trails Access by public transport Reforestation of parking Ban of motorized traffic 	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness rising tools Urban equipment Toilets and water access Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, etc.) New sports infrastructure Educational paths/activities Camping Festivals / events Extreme sports Improved maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bann motorized traffic Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, downhill polygon, etc.) Educational paths/activities Playground Urban equipment Outdoor fitness equipment Improve surveillance Toilets and water access 	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New trails Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment

7. Key Stakeholder group profile – JOGGERS



The average jogger visiting urban and peri-urban forests in one of URBforDAN cities is 31-45 or 18-30 years old. He/she is highly educated and employed or is still studying. He/she is either:

- A citizen of the URBforDAN city living 2-5 km away from the focus area, visiting the urban forest a few times a week.
- A visitor of the URBforDAN city visiting the urban forest a few times a year.

He/she most commonly visits the urban forest on foot or by car and spends there 1-2 hours.

Despite rather poor knowledge about the actual protection/adapted management regimes applicable to the urban forest, she/he believes that his/her activity does not create conflicts with other users or has negative impacts on nature.



He/she enjoys the natural environment and is bothered by the poor state of the urban forest, poor maintenance of trails and bad behavior of visitors. Ban of motorized vehicles is high on his/her agenda and supports the development of well-equipped entrance points and installation of urban equipment in the urban forest.

He/she would like URBforDAN project to:

- Improve marking of trails and overall navigation of visitors of the urban forest.
- Install urban equipment and recreational equipment.
- Set-up educational paths/polygons and other points of interest.

She/he supports further sustainable development of the urban forest and recognizes its potential for recreation, education and high-quality leisure environment.

In the table below you can find a more detailed overview of cyclist profiles per URBforDAN cities.

PHOTO SOURCES:

[HTTP://WWW.MARATHONFUNRUN.IN/CITY-FOREST-RUN/](http://www.marathonfunrun.in/city-forest-run/)

KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL URBORDAN CITIES – JOGGERS

JOGGERS	BELGRADE	BUDAPEST	CLUJ-NAPOCA	IVANO-FRANKIVSK	LJUBLJANA	VIENNA	ZAGREB
No. of respondents:	13	40	70	26	117	21	23
Age class:	31-45 years old (60%)	31-45 years old (65%)	31-45 years old (70%)	18-30 years old (60%)	31-45 (40%) or 18-30 years old (35%)	45-60 (50 %) or 30-45 years old (30%)	18-30 (50%) or 31-45 years old (40%)
Education status:	University degree (85%)	University degree (95%)	University degree (85%)	University degree (75%)	University degree (65%)	Professional school (60%)	University degree (50%) or high school (40%)
Working status:	Employed (90%)	Employed (80%)	Employed (75%)	Self-employed (35%) or studying (30%)	Employed (70%)	Employed (90%)	Employed (80%)
The average distance from the focus area:	Citizen of Belgrade (90%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (60%)	Citizen of Budapest (80%), but lives less than 3 km away from the focus area (50%)	Citizen of Cluj-Napoca (95%), but lives over 3 km away from the focus area (50%)	Citizen of Ivano-Frankivsk (80%), but lives 2-5 km (40%) or over 5 km away from the focus area (45%)	Citizen of Ljubljana (80%), but lives less than 1 km away (30%) or 2- 5 km away (30%)	Citizen of Vienna (80%) and lives less than 1 km away from the focus area (40%)	Citizen of Zagreb (80%) and lives more than 3 km away from the focus area (70%)
Frequency of the average visit to the focus area:	Several times per year (70%)	Several times per week (60%)	Several times per week (45%) or once per week (25%)	Several times per year (65%)	Several times per week (35%) or once per week (25%)	Several times per week (30%) or per year (30 %)	Several times per month (35%) or per year (40 %)
Predominant type of access to the focus area:	By car (65%)	By car (55%) or on foot (25%)	By car (44%) or on foot (25%)	By car (40%), by bicycle (25%) or on foot (25%)	By foot (65%) or by bicycle (25%)	By public transport (30%), by bicycle (25%) or by car (25%)	By public transport (35%), by bicycle (30%) or by car (30%)
Average time spent on the focus area:	2-5 h ours (60%)	1-2 hours (55%) or 2-5 h ours (35%)	1-2 hours (55%) or 2-5 hours (40%)	2-5 hours (60%)	1-2 hours (75%)	1-2 hours (60%)	1-2 hours (50%)
Detection of conflicts with other users:	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (85%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (80%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (70%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)
Knowledge about the type of protection/adapted management regime present in the focus area:	Good knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (85 %)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (95%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (85%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (65%)	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (50%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (60%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (60%)
Sensibility towards own negative impacts on the nature of the focus area with key reasons:	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (80%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (95%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (90%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (90%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)
List of key expressed problems/challenges:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Motor – racing Vandalism Picnics and open fires Waste collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Poor accessibility Lack of urban equipment Marking of trails Ban of motorized traffic A bad condition of existing equipment (paragliding) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Waste collection Picnics/parties Lighting fires Camping Urbanization Hunting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of urban equipment Poor accessibility – lack of roads, paths and equipped entrance points (e.g. toilets) The focus area is neglected Motorized vehicles Poor behavior of visitors Urbanization Waste collection Lack of recreational and educational infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presence of motorized vehicles Lack of urban equipment Poor maintenance of trails Poor access to toilets and water Waste collection Poor control Lack of parking places Unleashed animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abuse of narcotics Conflicts with other users – no separation of paths and poor behavior of some Lack of information on nature and protection regimes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of attractions for children and supporting infrastructure Lack of educational paths/activities Waste collection
List of key expressed suggestions for improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment Parking lots Sports infrastructure Improved maintenance Ban of motorized vehicles New trails for sports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Awareness rising tools Bird watching point Educational Paths Playground Marking of trails Reforestation of parking lots Ban of motorized traffic Access by public transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational paths/activities New trails for sports Urban equipment Promoting public transport Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, ZOO, etc.) Entrance points Picnic area Sports infrastructure Bird-watching Surveillance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness rising tools Urban equipment Toilets and water access Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, etc.) New sports infrastructure Educational paths/activities Camping Festivals / events Extreme sports Improved maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bann motorized traffic Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, downhill polygon, etc.) Educational paths/activities Playground Urban equipment Outdoor fitness equipment Improve surveillance Toilets and water access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Outdoor fitness equipment Marking of trails Events Sports infrastructure Picnic areas Improved maintenance Awareness raising Educational paths/activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New trails Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment Educational paths/activities

8. Key Stakeholder group profile – PET WALKERS



The average pet walker visiting urban and peri-urban forests in one of URBforDAN cities is 31-45 or 45-60 years old. He/she is highly educated and employed. He/she is either a citizen of the URBforDAN city living 2-5 km away from the focus area, visiting the urban forest a few times a week.

He/she most commonly visits the urban forest on foot or by car and spends there 1-2 hours.

Despite rather poor knowledge about the actual protection/adapted management regimes applicable to the urban forest, she/he believes that his/her activity does not have negative impacts on nature. He/she recognizes the conflict with cyclists (especially downhill cyclists) and other users which don't like unleashed pets.



He/she enjoys the natural environment and is bothered by bad behavior of other visitors and unresolved waste collection situation. Ban of motorized vehicles and separation of trails with cyclists is high on his/her agenda and supports the development of well-equipped entrance points and installation of urban equipment in the urban forest.

He/she would like URBforDAN project to:

- Improve marking of trails and separate cycling and walking trails in the urban forest.
- Install urban equipment, especially access to drinking water and waste baskets.
- Improve maintenance and surveillance.

She/he supports further sustainable development of the urban forest and recognizes its potential for recreation, education and high-quality leisure environment.

In the table below you can find a more detailed overview of cyclist profiles per URBforDAN cities.

PHOTO SOURCES:

<https://www.mysmokymountainpark.com/park/pets-great-smoky>

KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL URBORDAN CITIES – PET WALKERS

PET WALKERS	BELGRADE	BUDAPEST	CLUJ-NAPOCA	IVANO-FRANKIVSK	LJUBLJANA	VIENNA	ZAGREB
No. of respondents:	Not applicable	21	Not applicable	26	85	11	29
Age class:	Not applicable	31-45 years old (45%) or 45-60 years old (35%)	Not applicable	18-30 years old (50%)	31-45 (40%), 18-30 (35%) or 45-60 years old (25%)	45-60 years old (70%)	45-60 years old (50%)
Education status:	Not applicable	University degree (75%)	Not applicable	University degree (70%)	University degree (50%) or high school (30%)	Professional school (50%)	University degree (55%)
Working status:	Not applicable	Employed (75%)	Not applicable	Self-employed (30%) or employed (40%)	Employed (65%)	Employed (85%)	Employed (65%)
The average distance from the focus area:	Not applicable	Citizen of Budapest (95%), but lives less than 3 km away from the focus area (40%)	Not applicable	Citizen of Ivano-Frankivsk (80%), but lives 2-5 km (45%) or over 5 km away from the focus area (45%)	Citizen of Ljubljana (80%), but lives less than 1 km away (45%) or 1- 2 km away (20%)	Not a citizen of Vienna (50%) or citizens of Vienna living more than 3 km away from the focus area (35%)	Citizen of Zagreb (95%) and lives more than 3 km away from the focus area (40%)
Frequency of the average visit to the focus area:	Not applicable	Several times per year (65%)	Not applicable	Several times per year (70%)	At least once per week (60%)	On a daily basis (50%)	Several times per month (20%) or per year (40 %)
The predominant type of access to the focus area:	Not applicable	By car (50%) or on foot (35%)	Not applicable	By car (46%), by bicycle (20%) or by public transport (20%)	On foot (65%) or by car (25%)	By public transport (30%), by bicycle (25%) or by car (20%)	By on foot (40%) by car (35%)
Average time spent on the focus area:	Not applicable	1-2 hours (50%) or 2-5 hours (45%)	Not applicable	2-5 hours (60%)	1-2 hours (75%)	1-2 hours, 2-5 hours or more than 5 hours (each 33%)	1-2 hours (60%)
Detection of conflicts with other users:	Not applicable	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (75%)	Not applicable	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (70%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (85%)
Knowledge about the type of protection/adapted management regime present in the focus area:	Not applicable	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (75%)	Not applicable	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (75%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (70%)	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (50%)	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (55%)
Sensibility towards own negative impacts on the nature of the focus area with key reasons:	Not applicable	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (75%)	Not applicable	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (95%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (70%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)
List of key expressed problems/challenges:	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Lack of urban equipment Marking of trails Ban of motorized traffic 	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of urban equipment Poor accessibility – lack of roads, paths and equipped entrance points (e.g. toilets) The focus area is neglected Motorized vehicles Poor behavior of visitors Urbanization Waste collection Lack of recreational and educational infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflicts with bikers and people who don't like pets Presence of motorized vehicles Lack of urban equipment Poor maintenance of trails Poor access to toilets and water Waste collection Poor control Lack of parking places Unleashed animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflicts with other users – no separation of paths and poor behavior of some Lack of information on nature and protection regimes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Urbanization Poor awareness about the value of the forest Conflicts with other users (cyclists)
List of key expressed suggestions for improvement:	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Awareness rising tools Bird watching point Educational Paths Playground Marking of trails Reforestation of parking lots Ban of motorized traffic Access by public transport 	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness rising tools Urban equipment Toilets and water access Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, etc.) New sports infrastructure Educational paths/activities Camping Festivals / events Extreme sports Improved maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bann motorized traffic Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, downhill polygon, etc.) Educational paths/activities Playground Urban equipment Outdoor fitness equipment Improve surveillance Toilets and water access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Outdoor fitness equipment Marking of trails Sports infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment New trails Educational paths/activities Parking places

9. Key Stakeholder group profile – FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN



The average visitor with children visiting urban and peri-urban forests in one of URBforDAN cities is 18-60 years old. He/she is highly educated and employed. He/she is either:

- A citizen of the URBforDAN city living 2-5 km away from the focus area, visiting the urban forest a few times a month.
- A visitor of the URBforDAN city visiting the urban forest a few times a year.

He/she most commonly visits the urban forest on foot or by car and spends there 1-5 hours.

Despite rather poor knowledge about the actual protection/adapted management regimes applicable to the urban forest, she/he believes that his/her activity does not have negative impacts on nature. He/she recognizes the conflict with cyclists (especially downhill cyclists) and pet walkers due to safety issues.



He/she enjoys the natural environment and is bothered by motorized vehicles, unleashed animals and bad behavior of other visitors. Ensuring safe and relaxing environment is high on his/her agenda. He/she supports the development of well-equipped entrance points and installation of urban equipment in the urban forest. He/she also supports development of new services in urban forests or near entrance points and points of interest.

He/she would like URBforDAN project to:

- Improve marking of trails and separate cycling and walking trails in the urban forest.
- Install urban equipment, recreational equipment and playgrounds.
- Set-up educational paths/polygons and other points of interest.

She/he supports further sustainable development of the urban forest and recognizes its potential for recreation, education and high-quality leisure environment. In his/her opinion this can be up-graded by provision of new services.

In the table below you can find a more detailed overview of cyclist profiles per URBforDAN cities.

PHOTO SOURCES:

<https://www.celje.si/sl/kartica/drevesna-hisa-v-mestnem-gozdu>

URBforDAN Key Stakeholder Profiles

KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL URBORDAN CITIES – FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN	BELGRADE	BUDAPEST	CLUJ-NAPOCA	IVANO-FRANKIVSK	LJUBLJANA	VIENNA	ZAGREB
No. of respondents:	28	58	44	56	140	25	35
Age class:	45-60 years old (55%)	31-45 years old (45%)	31-45 years old (75%)	18-30 years old (50%)	31-45 (65%)	31-45 (35%) or 45-60 years old (40%)	45-60 years old (50%)
Education status:	University degree (85%)	University degree (90%)	University degree (85%)	University degree (75%)	University degree (60%)	University degree (60%)	University degree (70%)
Working status:	Employed (950%)	Employed (70%)	Employed (62%)	Employed (60%)	Employed (75%)	Employed (95%)	Employed (85%)
The average distance from the focus area:	Citizen of Belgrade (100%), but lives over 5 km away from the focus area (75%)	Citizen of Budapest (90%), but lives more than 3 km away from the focus area (65%)	Citizen of Cluj-Napoca (95%), but lives less than 3 km away (35) or over 3 km away from the focus area (40%)	Citizen of Ivano-Frankivsk (80%), but lives 2-5 km (35%) or over 5 km away from the focus area (50%)	Citizen of Ljubljana (80%) – with no significant discrepancies between all 4 distances – 20-30% for all	Citizen of Vienna (70%) living more than 3 km away from the focus area (55%)	Citizen of Zagreb (90%) and lives more than 3 km away from the focus area (55%)
Frequency of the average visit to the focus area:	Several times per year (90%)	Several times per year (90%)	Several times per week (35%) or once per week (20%)	Several times per year (65%)	Several times per year (35%) or per month (20%)	Several times per year (40%) or per month (40%)	Several times per year (65%)
Predominant type of access to the focus area:	By car (95%)	By car (50%)	By car (36%) or on foot (20%)	By car (60%)	On foot (50%) or by car (35%)	By public transport (45%)	By on foot (30%) by car (45%)
Average time spent on the focus area:	2-5 h ours (80%)	1-2 hours (55%) or 2-5 h ours (30%)	2-5 hours (60%)	2-5 hours (55%)	1-2 hours (75%)	2-5 hours (70%)	1-2 hours (65%)
Detection of conflicts with other users:	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (95%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (75%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)
Knowledge about the type of protection/adapted management regime present in the focus area:	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (55 %)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (85%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (80%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (60%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (70%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (60%)	Medium knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (50%)
Sensibility towards own negative impacts on the nature of the focus area with key reasons:	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (95%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (70%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (85%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (60%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)
List of key expressed problems/challenges:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Motor – racing Unleashed and stray dogs Vandalism Open fires Urbanization Waste collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Lack of urban equipment Lack of Toilets and water access Marking of trails Ban of motorized traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Exploitation of forest Waste collection Picnicks/parties Lighting fires Camping Urbanization Grazing Hunting Unleashed animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of urban equipment Poor accessibility – lack of roads, paths and equipped entrance points (e.g. toilets) The focus area is neglected Motorized vehicles Poor behavior of visitors Urbanization Waste collection Lack of recreational and educational infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conflicts with bikers and people who don't like pets Presence of motorized vehicles Lack of urban equipment Poor maintenance of trails Poor access to toilets and water Waste collection Poor control Lack of parking places Unleashed animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Lack of information on nature and protection regimes Conflicts with other users – no separation of paths and poor behavior of some Unleashed animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Lack of urban equipment Poor maintenance
List of key expressed suggestions for improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment Parking lots Sports infrastructure Improved maintenance Ban of motorized vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Awareness rising tools Educational Paths Playground Marking of trails Reforestation of parking lots Ban of motorized traffic Access by public transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational paths/activities New trails for sports Urban equipment Promoting public transport Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, ZOO, etc.) Entrance points Picnic area Sports infrastructure Bird-watching Surveillance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness rising tools Urban equipment Toilets and water access Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, etc.) New sports infrastructure Educational paths/activities Camping Festivals / events Extreme sports Improved maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bann motorized traffic Marking of trails Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, downhill polygon, etc.) Educational paths/activities Playground Urban equipment Outdoor fitness equipment Improve surveillance Toilets and water access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Educational paths/activities Marking of trails Sports infrastructure Awareness raising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Marking of trails Outdoor fitness equipment New trails Educational paths/activities Parking places

10. Key Stakeholder group profile – TEACHERS WITH PUPILS



The average teacher with pupils visiting urban and peri-urban forests in one of URBforDAN cities is 18-60 years old. He/she is highly educated and employed. He/she is either:

- A citizen of the URBforDAN city living 2-5 km away from the focus area, visiting the urban forest a few times a week.
- A visitor of the URBforDAN city visiting the urban forest a few times a year.

He/she most commonly visits the urban forest by public transport or on foot and spends there 2-5 hours.

Despite rather poor knowledge about the actual protection/adapted management regimes applicable to the urban forest, she/he believes that his/her activity does not create conflicts with other users or has negative impacts on nature.



He/she enjoys the natural environment and is bothered by motorized vehicles and lack of educational contents. Ensuring safe and educational environment is high on his/her agenda. He/she supports the development of well-equipped entrance points and installation of urban, educational and recreational equipment in the urban forest.

He/she would like URBforDAN project to:

- Improve marking of trails and overall navigation of visitors of the urban forest.
- Install urban equipment and recreational equipment.
- Set-up educational paths/polygons and other points of interest.

Some of teachers are against too-much urban equipment in urban forests, as they prefer

She/he supports further sustainable development of the urban forest and recognizes its potential for recreation, education and high-quality leisure environment.

In the table below you can find a more detailed overview of cyclist profiles per URBforDAN cities.

PHOTO SOURCES:

<https://www.delo.si/kultura/glasba/glasba-v-objemu-drevesnih-krosenj-in-pticjega-petja-65645.html>

11. KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUP CHARACTERISTICS OF INDIVIDUAL URBFOR DAN CITIES – TEACHERS WITH PUPILS

TEACHERS WITH PUPILS	BELGRADE	BUDAPEST	CLUJ-NAPOCA	IVANO-FRANKIVSK	LJUBLJANA	VIENNA	ZAGREB
No. of respondents:	/*	10	19	13	/*	8	/*
Age class:	/*	31-45 years old (50%)	30-45 years old (75%)	18-30 years old (60%)	/*	45-60 years old (70%)	/*
Education status:	/*	University degree (90%)	University degree (95%)	University degree (75%)	/*	University degree (50%)	/*
Working status:	/*	Employed (100%)	Employed (70%)	Employed (40%) or self-employed (30%)	/*	Employed (85%)	/*
The average distance from the focus area:	Average distance is more than 5 km away	Citizen of Budapest (80%), but lives less than 3 km away from the focus area (50%)	Citizen of Cluj-Napoca (95%), but lives less than 3 km away (70%)	Citizen of Ivano-Frankivsk (90%), but lives 2-5 km (45%) or over 5 km away from the focus area (45%)	Average distance is less than 1 km or 1-3 km away.	Citizen of Vienna (65%) living more than 3 km away from the focus area (50%)	Average distance is less than 1 km away
Frequency of the average visit to the focus area:	Several times per year	Several times per year (70%)	Several times per week (35%), once per week (15%), daily (15%)	Several times per year (75%)	Kindergartens several times per week, primary schools several times per year.	On a daily basis (50%) or several times per year (50%)	Several times per week
The predominant type of access to the focus area:	By privately organized transportation (bus)	By public transport (50%) or by car (90%)	By car (30%) or on foot (30%)	By car (70%)	On foot or by public transport.	By public transport (40%) or by car (40%)	On foot
Average time spent on the focus area:	2-5 hours	1-2 hours (70%) or 2-5 hours (30%)	2-5 hours (40%) or 1-2 hours (30%)	2-5 hours (60%)	2-5 hours	2-5 hours (50%)	1-2 hours
Detection of conflicts with other users:	Their activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (100%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (85%)	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (90%)	Their activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users	My activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users (50%)	Their activity does not create conflicts with other activities and users
Knowledge about the type of protection/adapted management regime present in the focus area:	Poor knowledge of the protection	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (80%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (100%)	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (75%)	Poor knowledge of the protection	Poor knowledge of the protection/adapted management regime on the focus area (60%)	Poor knowledge of the protection
Sensibility towards own negative impacts on the nature of the focus area with key reasons:	Their activity has no negative impacts on nature	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (60%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (100%)	Their activity has no negative impacts on nature	My activity has no negative impacts on nature (70%)	Their activity has no negative impacts on nature
List of key expressed problems/challenges:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Picknicks/parties Unleashed animals Waste collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection Lack of urban equipment Lack of Toilets and water access Marking of trails Ban of motorized traffic Urbanization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Exploitation of forest Waste collection Picknicks/parties Lighting fires Camping Urbanization Grazing Hunting Unleashed animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of urban equipment Poor accessibility – lack of roads, paths and equipped entrance points (e.g. toilets) The focus area is neglected Motorized vehicles Poor behavior of visitors Urbanization Waste collection Lack of recreational and educational infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Unresolved ownership status Lack of educational paths/activities Poor accessibility on some parts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overcrowding for flora and fauna Waste collection Unleashed animals Conflicts with other users – no separation of paths and poor behavior of some Poor control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized vehicles Unleashed animals Waste collection
List of key expressed suggestions for improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational paths/activities New trails for sports Urban equipment Marking of trails Entrance points Playgrounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Awareness rising tools Educational Paths Playground Marking of trails Reforestation of parking lots Ban of motorized traffic Access by public transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational paths/activities New trails for sports Urban equipment Promoting public transport Marking of trails Points of interest Entrance points Picnic area Sports infrastructure Bird-watching Surveillance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness rising tools Urban equipment Toilets and water access Points of interest (e.g. adventure park, etc.) New sports infrastructure Educational paths/activities Camping Festivals / events Extreme sports Improved maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open forest playground Educational paths/activities Improved accessibility (entrance points, public transport) Marking of trails Toilets and water access Urban equipment Points of interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban equipment Toilets and water access Playgrounds Educational paths/activities Sports infrastructure Awareness raising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational paths/activities New trails for sports Urban equipment Marking of trails Forest classroom

*In some cities teachers with pupils were identified as key stakeholders rather through workshops than through the survey (very small % of survey respondents). Their answers are based on information provided on workshops, bilateral meetings, and interviews.

12. Conclusions URBforDAN Key Stakeholder Profiles

Project cities were free to decide amongst various approaches how to implement the survey – for example on-site questioners, on-line survey, questioners sent by mail, questioners filed out by workshop participants, etc. Almost all cities decided to conduct a combination of at least 2 methods in order to get better response. Two combinations were most common – on-site & on-workshop questioners and on-line survey & on-workshop questioners.

While on-workshop questionnaires were usually well responded to, other two methods were conducted with mixed results. As surveys were carried out from October 2018 to January 2019 – not an ideal time to carry out on-site surveys, as many of stakeholders were no-longer present in urban forest. This resulted in a rather low number of respondents in those cities which opted for on-site survey approach. On the other hand, on-line surveys proved to be a much more successful approach, in case of Ljubljana leading to an unexpectedly high response.

Regardless, all project partners ensured statistically relevant survey results with minimum numerus around 100. Subsequently we consider results relevant not only on the transnational level, but also on local city level. The table below shows the number of respondents linked to individual stakeholder group.

CITY / Key SH group	Hikers	Cyclists	Downhill cyclist	Joggers	Pet walkers	Families with children	Teachers with pupils	TOTAL per city
Belgrade	59	11		13	X	28	/	75
Budapest	97	26		40	13	X	/	176
Cluj-Napoca	132	103	X	70	X	44	19	146
Ivano-Frankivsk	33	28	24	26	26	56	13	109
Ljubljana	171	108	256	117	85	140	11	1.134
Vienna	10	40	X	21	11	25	8	102
Zagreb	X	27		23	29	35	/	96
TOTAL per Key SH group	502	343*	280	310	164	328	51	1.838

LEGEND: X – not detected or not analyzed due to too-low no. of respondents. / - not included in the survey.

Based on survey results and their analysis, each URBforDAN city prepared its own Key Stakeholder Profiles report. In it each city selected most relevant stakeholder groups and developed stakeholder profiles – generalized descriptions of key stakeholders based on their answers (with exception of Vienna and Ivano-Frankivsk – they opted to do full analysis of all detected stakeholder groups). These were used as a tool in development of Integrated Multi-use Management Plans (IMMPs) for each city. Later on, URBforDAN LP joined all above described documents, joined all results together, analyzed them and prepared even more generalized Key Stakeholder Profiles relevant for the Danube Region.

From this perspective and based on above presented Key Stakeholder Profiles **we can conclude that:**

- 1) Despite our expectations, **variation between demographic characteristics key stakeholder profiles of all 7 cities is surprisingly low**. Namely, **vast majority of respondents are 30-45 years old, highly educated and employed people**. Some variations linked to predominant age class, for example – respondents taking children to urban forests are younger in Ukraine than in Austria – can be contributed to diverse demographic and cultural situations between cities.

The reason for this can be found in the fact that in urban areas we have a statistical anomaly by default, because there are more highly educated and employed people in urban than in rural areas. Also, well educated people tend to have higher incomes (important for those types of recreation requiring more expensive tools – e.g. downhill cycling), as well as higher awareness about importance of recreation and healthy life-style. Such people also more often have sitting and lower physically intensive jobs, making their desire to spend free time actively in open green areas even greater. One could also argue that in

URBforDAN Key Stakeholder Profile survey results were corrupted by lower digital literacy of less educated and older demographic groups.

But all stated does not mean that other demographic groups do not use urban forests – they are just represented in smaller percentage. Also, urban and peri-urban forests in some cities today still present rather unexplored terrains and are not as popular as in Ljubljana or Vienna – yet! This might quickly change through promotion and popularization of recreation in urban forests, as well as with improved urban/recreational/educational equipment, new attractions and services and improved maintenance.

- 2) Almost all **URBforDAN cities selected hikers, cyclist, joggers, pet walkers, families with children and teachers with pupils as most important types of users of urban forests**. Of course, each city has different type of urban or peri-urban forest that attracts different types of users. However, stated types of users represent most common and numerous types.
- 3) **The distance between location of living and urban forest is not a limiting factor for users of urban and peri-urban forests** as, in almost all cities and almost all key stakeholder profiles, users seem to travel with ease up to 5 km several times a week or a month. On the other hand, vast majority of urban and peri-urban forests is also visited by visitors living outside the city or in its outskirts, of course in lower intensity, but still several times a year.
- 4) **In cities with good public transport access to urban and peri-urban forests, this option of access is often exploited, while request for improvement of public transport are common in those cities without it.** For citizens living closer to focus areas access on foot or by bicycle is the preferred option, however more distanced visitors and specific users (e.g. families with children, downhill cyclists, etc.) are still relying on access by car. This is resulting in increasing need for parking spaces near entrance points, subsequently adding pressure on urban and peri-urban forests.
- 5) **Vast majority of users spends 1-2 or 2-5 hours in urban forests.** This is important information for URBforDAN cities, as they plan to equip pilot areas with appropriate urban equipment.
- 6) **Surprisingly high number of users knows very little about characteristics and nature protection/management regimes of focus areas they are visiting.** This is also recognized by themselves (to an extent), as almost all users are asking for more educational and awareness rising contents.
- 7) **Also, surprisingly high number of users recognizes their own activities as problematic from nature protection and conflict creation point of view.** Or in other words – vast majority of UPF users believes that they create very little pressure on nature and are not responsible for conflicts between various user groups or with managers and/or owners. On the other hand, they are able to recognize most common conflicts and actually complain about them.
However, conflicts are usually correlated with improper behavior of few representatives of various user types, rather than with behavior patterns of selected user groups. This is also why vast majority supports introduction of “code of behavior” for all users, as well as separation of cyclist and walking trails and improved marking of trails.
- 8) **Expectations towards URBforDAN projects are quite high and diverse – but still in line with predominant needs of individual key stakeholder profiles.** Of course, exposed challenges and needs are closely interlinked with specific characteristics of the individual focus area. However, they are again quite universal when it comes to specific user types.

Based on all above findings we can conclude that performed “in-depth” stakeholder analysis provided high-quality understanding of key stakeholder groups, as well as mobilized them for active participation in URBforDAN project. All findings can and will be easily used in the process of preparation of Integrated Multi-use Management Plans (IMMPs) and are expected to be vital for adaptation of final solutions to the actual needs of key UPF user types in URBforDAN cities.

13. Lessons learned

Activities of the URBforDAN project linked to identification, analysis and mobilization of key stakeholders occupied the URBforDAN partnership in first 2 reporting periods. Time invested in these activities proved to be well spent, as all project partners recognized its value for further steps. However, activities proved our expectations that this is a “learning by doing” project. This is why in this chapter we want to emphasize lessons learned, thus contributing to documented learning interaction process, which is embedded in the core of the URBforDAN project.

Key lessons learned are:

- 1) **The winter period is not the best time to conduct on-site surveys**, as many UPF user groups are not present in the area.
- 2) On the other hand, **on-line surveys proved to be a very successful tool**, but it is imperative that they are well publicized and announced/promoted on several channels – in Ljubljana we used workshops, official web-page, local media and social media as key communication channels.
- 3) **Workshops also proved to be extremely successful communication and mobilization tool**, especially if they are announced and implemented as an interconnected series. **They also enabled us to test and verify conclusions from the survey analysis**, significantly improving the relevance of provided answers.
- 4) **It is smart to use the same questioner for all cites, as this enables us to compare results and draw conclusions on regional level. However, some flexibility** (in the form of allowed additional questions or deleting non-relevant ones) **must be allowed**. This allows cities to obtain specific information on their pilot sites and does not hinder joint efforts of the partnership.
- 5) **On the other hand, this makes already broad or long questionnaires** (questioner had to be very broad, as we didn't know what types of stakeholders we will identify) **even longer and makes them less attractive to respondents**, for example – in Ljubljana over 1.700 respondents started answering the survey, but only little over 1.100 answered all questions. Also, some questions were not well defined or specific enough, subsequently some answers (usually the ones where respondents had to provide own ideas) were not well understood and we got back similar answers. This means that **any time spent on design of questions is well spent time**.
- 6) **Questioners must be always translated in local languages.**
- 7) **The majority of project partners underestimated the time and effort needed to carry out and analyze such a survey.** In combination with preferred on-site questionnaire approach this resulted in lower number of respondents and prolonged period of the survey, as well as additional interviews and meetings with representatives of key stakeholder groups.
- 8) **The method of analysis of questions is just as important as pre-agreement on the content and used approach of questioners.** One of the problems we faced was the methodological misunderstanding which respondents to take into analysis of individual stakeholder groups – for example, all respondents had to select their primary reason for visiting UPF, but were of course allowed to also select secondary, third, etc. reason. During overall partnership analysis we noticed that some cities draw their conclusions from selection no. 1 (this was anticipated), while others draw conclusions from all respondents marking certain activity, regardless of the chosen priority. This situation was most common for those cities with lower number of respondents, which is to some point understandable, as they wanted to get best possible info from available data. But in reality, this actually contributed to unified answers from all key stakeholder groups – reducing diversity of opinions from various key stakeholder groups.
- 9) Despite all efforts from the lead partner, **some project partners realized the value of the survey only after it was already finalized.** This brings out questions of in-depth understanding of the project from all project partners and ownership of the project idea. This can be to some extent contributed to slow process of hiring of staff responsible for project implementation and their rather late involvement in initial activities (not the same people were involved in project development and its implementation). It can also be contributed to overall lower level of experience in previous use of such tools or skepticism about its success.

- 10) However, as already said, URBforDAN is to a great extent “learning by doing” project. **All previous lessons learned enabled project partnership to improve the understanding of the project and learn from them.** Communication between partners was improved, overall understanding of the project concept and subsequently its ownership was greatly improved and we expect this to be visible from following deliverables and outputs.