Table 1: Description of source materials (Source: Own elaboration with elements of guidelines for media content analysis elaborated by the WP5 research team)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part I:**    **review of**  **secondary sources** | Source 1: | Full reference |  |
| Time(frame) |  |
| Type of discourse | please mark in bold: academic / legal / administrative / political / media / educational |
| Author(s) and represented actors |  |
| Potential biases / limitations | whose perspectives are overrepresented? whose perspectives are missing and should be picked up on in other sources or in the field research? |
| Source 2: | Full reference |  |
| … |  |
| **Part II:**    **media content analysis** | Media content 1:  Brief description | Name/title + reference details |  |
| Project implementation stage | please mark in bold when the content was published or broadcast: before the project started / during the project / after the project had ended |
| Location on political spectrum map (Graph 2) | please indicate with an X |
| Summary |  |
| Context |  |
| Key quote(s) | spoken word, piece of text from article, etc. |
| Key signals | size of font, tone of voice, accompanying visuals, etc. |
| Textual level | identify the topics pertinent to your case study contained in the 'words' and 'signals' |
| Compositional level | explain how the content (i.e., words, signals, sentences, visuals etc.) are put together to create 3 and talk about the topics identified |
| Contextual level | reflect on the content and synthesise what the key insights are from the text pertinent to deliberative and participatory democracies |

Table 2: Background information on the case study (Source: Own elaboration in collaboration with the WP 1 research team).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Where?** | Region | please mark in bold: Atlantic / West Central European / Northern / Mediterranean / CE & Baltic |
| Country |  |
| **City (and district/neighbourhood – if applicable)** |  |
| Population of the city (+ district / neighbourhood – if applicable) | please indicate the year which the data apply to! |
| Position of the city in the country’s urban hierarchy | administrative status of the city, e.g., capital of the country/ region/county |
| Political level of the city’s independence | formal (within the power structure of the state)  informal (is the city in opposition to regional /central administration?) |
| Relevant geographical background of the city (and district/neighbourhood – if applicable) |  |
| Relevant socio-economic background of the city (and district/neighbourhood – if applicable) |  |
| Relevant cultural background of the city (and district/neighbourhood – if applicable) |  |
| Quality of participatory and deliberative democracy at the local level | e.g., relevant legislation, availability of methods and other conditions for citizen participation, the overall level of political culture, readiness of political elites and officials to delegate decision-making to citizens, … |
| **What?** | **Method** |  |
| Topic | main objectives/tasks/problems to be solved |
| Reasons/rationales for use of this method\* |  |
| Initially expected effects |  |
| Initially expected level of participation | please relate to Graph 3 (Arnstein’s ladder of participation) and indicate the adequate rank |
| Innovativeness of the method on the outset | how “new” is the method on the level of the country/region? was it copied from another city (or district/neighbourhood)? |
| **When?** | Time/duration (cycle) | e.g., since 2012 on an annual basis |

Table 3: Characteristics of actors and actions involved (Source: Own elaboration in collaboration with the WP 1 research team).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Who?** | Participants | please paste here a minimized copy of a graph created on the basis of Graph 4 (see Appendix 2) - detailed instructions and a link to an online application will be sent individually by email |
| Main actors and their | on the outset |
| impact\* | during the process |
|  | during the implementation |
| Actor constellations\* | short explanation of interrelations between identified participants (both horizontal and vertical) |
| Level of inclusiveness throughout the process\* | how inclusive is the process?  **which measures were taken to ensure inclusiveness?**  **who does not participate and why?** |
| **By whom?** | Initiators |  |
| Organisers |  |
| Bottom-up vs top-down dimension | is it more bottom-up or top-down or both and to what extent which? |
| Legal / institutional embedding of the procedure (regulatory frameworks) | level of regulatory dependence from the government/region/EU, e.g.,  are there any legal acts regulating the procedure? are any representatives of the government/region/EU involved in the procedure? |
| Financial embedding of the procedure (funding sources) | level of financial dependence from the government/region/EU, is the process co-financed by the government/region/EU? |
| Transfer of knowledge between actors\* |  |
| **For whom?** | Level of inclusiveness in terms of the effects\* |  |
| Levels of effectiveness\* | were the effects satisfying for politicians, policy-makers and experts? |
| were the effects satisfying for NGOs/activists (most active and engaged citizens)? |
| were the effects satisfying for other (“regular”) citizens? |

Table 4: The trajectory of the process (Source: Own elaboration in collaboration with the WP 1 research team).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **How it began?** | How was it initiated?\* |  |
| To what extent was it a product of learning from previous local governance experiences?\* |  |
| How was it designed?\* | what was the original plan for organization of the process (which of course might have changed later)? |
| Initial reception in the media\* |  |
| Turning points and tools applied\* | please identify at least one concrete action within the initial phase of the process and specific circumstances which influenced the process/pushed it in a “good” or a “bad” direction what kind of tools were used here? |
| **How it developed?** | How it kicked off?\* |  |
| Did it run smoothly/as expected?\* | why yes? / why not? |
| Turning points and tools applied\* | please identify at least one concrete action within the more advanced phase of the process and specific circumstances which influenced the process/pushed it in a “good” or a “bad” direction what kind of tools were used here? |
| Reception in the media during the project\* |  |
| **The story so far** | Results so far\* |  |
| Reception and evaluation in the media at this point \* |  |
| Level of participation at this point\* | please relate to the ladder of participation and indicate the adequate rank |
| Level of innovativeness of the effects so far\* | to what extent did the process bring new quality for urban policy in the case-study city? |
| Implementation\* | were the effects fully implemented? if not, why? |
| General assessment of success/failure (1-5) according to groups of actors\* | how successful on a scale 1-5, where 1 is full failure and 5 is full success according to:  public opinion, initiators, organisers, participants |
| Turning points and tools applied\* | please identify at least one concrete action within the most recent phase of the process and specific circumstances which influenced the process/pushed it in a “good” or a “bad” direction what kind of tools were used here? |
| **How it trans-formed?** | Internal change\* | how the process itself evolved between its beginning and end? |
| **How it impacted the outside world?** | External change\* | how the process changed / was integrated into the existing local political practices? |
| Relation to multilevel governance\* | local / regional / central / EU |

Table 5: Lessons learnt (Source: Own elaboration in collaboration with the WP 1 research team).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What went great?** | Key strengths\* |  |
| Critical success factors\* |  |
| Decisive moment(s) for success\* |  |
| Best practices\* |  |
| **What went wrong?** | Key weaknesses\* |  |
| Critical failure factors\* |  |
| Decisive moment(s) for failure\* |  |
| Worst practices\* |  |
| **Transferability** | Key obstacles for transferability\* |  |
| Successful coping strategies\* | how were these obstacles overcome? |
| Local context of responses to key challenges\* | Locally specific economic, political and cultural factors which may limit transferability |
| **What went great?** | Key strengths\* |  |
| Critical success factors\* |  |
| Decisive moment(s) for success\* |  |
| Best practices\* |  |
| **What went wrong?** | Key weaknesses\* |  |
| Critical failure factors\* |  |
| Decisive moment(s) for failure\* |  |
| Worst practices\* |  |