

supported the need for reform of open space planning, maintenance and operations, incorporating business-inspired management practices.

In New Zealand and Brazil, there has been a growing emphasis on cross-service planning. The 2002 Local Government Act in New Zealand requires every local authority to prepare long-term plans that describe key strategies and policies for funding, financing, investment and spending. One aim of this is the better coordination of strategic and regulatory policy. In Curitiba, the establishment of the Municipal Institute for Public Administration (IMAP) has allowed a similar focus on cross-departmental planning. The body formulates and oversees management strategies throughout the municipal administration to ensure that departments coordinate their actions. Since 2000 IMAP has been in charge of the municipal Management Plan, which is now used as a reference for planning, running and evaluating the management of public organisations at the city level.

Key amongst the organisational objectives stressed by the eleven cities were the importance of good day-to-day personal working relationships, the value of inter-departmental cooperation and the benefits of integrating public open space responsibilities. The emphasis on personal working relationships could be seen most directly in Århus, where the continuity provided by long-serving senior staff has made an important contribution to successful open space management. In particular, the close personal contact between four senior officers made for smooth cooperation between the Natural Environment Division (NED), the City Architect's Office, the Road's Office, and the office of the mayor.

INTRA- AND INTER-ORGANISATIONAL COORDINATION

Beyond personal working relationships, the cities demonstrated a commitment to overcome organisational barriers thrown up by the different departmental/organisational responsibilities for different dimensions of the open space management remit. A number of approaches were adopted to achieve this. The first is coordination through higher government tiers such as through the offices of the metropolitan council (regional government) focusing on planning and development activity in the Minneapolis metropolitan area. As such, it is both a planning agency and service provider (transport, housing, sewage) and is in charge of managing the regional park system. In so doing it operates primarily as a planning agency for the regional parks system, helping to coordinate across jurisdictions whilst leaving most of the implementation and day-to-day management to the local parks agencies (including the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board – MPRB).

Although there is a clear structure of local, regional and national government in New Zealand with distinct jurisdictions, 'grey' areas inevitably emerge between open space jurisdictions leading to funding

tensions between regional and local councils. Typically these are solved by adopting memoranda of understanding or partnership agreements between authorities. At city level, open space management is organised in Wellington into several management teams involving various aspects of policy and operation, all under the Built and Natural Environment Committee. A key difficulty has been in-house communication within Wellington City Council where responsibilities still overlap and conflicts arise (e.g. conflict between the needs of roads, cabling and drainage and those of open infrastructure in the city centre where space is limited).

In Zürich, the GSZ routinely works together with other departments in the city administration such as the Civil Engineering, City Planning, City Development, Transport Planning, and the Health and Environment departments. External links are also prioritised, including at the operational level where weekly contact meetings between the maintenance crew of parks and local police are now commonplace. The initiative builds on a project called 'Security and Cleanliness', which, in order to raise the image of the city and its open space has put together a team with representatives of GSZ, the police, PR professionals and council members.

Not all attempts at intra- and inter-organisational coordination have been successful. In Wellington, for example, recent restructuring of the council has improved clarity in the division of responsibilities and funding, including the separation of regular maintenance responsibilities from one-off capital projects. In the short-term, however, it has negatively affected open space management through the loss of institutional knowledge as a result of staff transfers and changed lines of communication within the council and with external stakeholders. In both Groningen and Malmö, attempts to combine the maintenance of public open spaces with those belonging to public housing providers have proved unsuccessful. In both cities, housing corporations work to much higher standards and to a more intensive management programme than the municipalities can hope to meet.

INTEGRATED STRUCTURES

Significantly, the good practice exhibited by the majority of the eleven cities was built upon a move towards unifying responsibilities for public open space in more integrated open space management structures. In Malmö, for example, park management is part of the Streets and Parks Department and is coordinated with the management of streets, bridges and squares. Planning of new parks and management and maintenance of existing ones is coordinated with the same functions for all types of public spaces.

In Groningen, the development and management of open spaces has been the preserve of a single organisation – Municipal Services.