

Role Pages - Do not share this page with other participants!

You are: a member of the city council

Your role in the meeting:

You chair the meeting and guide the discussion towards a final decision. You want the process to look fair, inclusive, and efficient. At the end, the group must make decision on how the NFGC funding (30 000 €) is used. How this is achieved is finally up to you.

Your personal motivations:

- You want to be re-elected, so public image matters.
- You want as many stakeholders as possible to feel heard and satisfied, including some that are not present at the meeting!
- You are interested in visible, attractive solutions that can be easily communicated to voters. You prefer solutions that visibly address the city's future challenges and signal to voters that you are on top of your game.
- You are aware the city already faces major financial pressures. Saving some of the grant and redistributing it to other matters would make some of your funders very happy.

Your non-negotiable:

- You cannot support a decision that is likely to cause immediate public controversy.

How you view the proposed solutions:

Peatland restoration (30 000 €)

Strong environmental value, but it is located far from the city's residents and harder to justify to voters than urban solutions.

Rainwater runoff solutions (30 000 €)

Checks many boxes; flood prevention, biodiversity, climate adaptation, and citywide impact. There has also been demand for flood prevention from citizens.

City Park in Northreach (30 000 €)

Highly visible and popular - but building it in a new, expensive neighborhood may draw criticism over inequality.

City meadow (10 000–20 000 €)

Cost-effective and flexible.

Kindergarten rewilding project (20 000 €)

Strong storytelling potential ("investing in children's future"), but any safety concerns could pose a political risk.

Additional secret motivations:

Upcoming election debate on "city attractiveness". Opposition calls Overstream "grey" and "uninspiring". This makes you subtly biased towards the park and rewilding projects, as highly visible, nature-based solutions could become a campaign asset. On the other hand saving money would make funders happy (and maybe increase your campaign budget).

Fear of public conflict after recent protests: a recent small but vocal protest has made you wary of public backlash. You want to avoid angry feedback, media outrage, and controversy. You are especially sensitive to parents' safety concerns, gardeners' warnings, and NGO accusations of greenwashing.

Strategy tips:

Act as a mediator rather than pushing a single solution. Emphasize co-benefits (health, flood prevention, education) and consider combining lower-cost projects.

Role Pages - Do not share this page with other participants!

You are: a member of a local nature conservation association

Your role in the meeting:

You represent biodiversity and long-term ecological thinking. You are expected to challenge shallow or purely symbolic environmental actions.

Your personal motivations:

- You want maximum biodiversity gains, not just symbolic solutions.
- You believe the city should be willing to invest more of its own funds in addition to the EU grant.
- You are concerned about who benefits from NBS and who is left out.
- You worry that short-term fixes and other city actions may worsen future challenges.

Your non-negotiable:

- You cannot support a solution that only delivers symbolic biodiversity gain.

How you view the proposed solutions:

Peatland restoration

Best option for biodiversity and climate: large-scale, science-based, but politically underestimated. Restoring ditched peatlands supports rare species and climate mitigation.

Rainwater runoff solutions

Solid, multifunctional, and scientifically sound. Addresses several of the city's future challenges and is spread across neighborhoods, offering strong equity potential.

City Park in Northreach

Risk of greenwashing. Benefits skew toward wealthier residents of the city unless access is prioritised.

City meadow

Can be beneficial for biodiversity if well designed and managed, but poorly implemented meadows may fail both ecologically and socially.

Kindergarten rewilding project

Small in scale but valuable for fostering future nature connection. Not substitute for large-scale biodiversity action.

Additional secret motivations:

You are burnt out from symbolic participation: you've been in many workshops where NGOs were "heard" but decisions were already made, making you wary this could be another token consultation. This may push you to be more confrontational early, demand concrete commitments and numbers, and test others' seriousness.

Internal pressure: younger members in your association want bolder climate action, while compromise-oriented leaders are being questioned. You need at least one outcome you can present as a credible win.

Strategy tips:

Push beyond short-term popularity, highlight inequality risks and who benefits, and only support compromises if biodiversity is taken seriously.

Role Pages - Do not share this page with other participants!

You are: a member of local Parents' association

Your role in the meeting:

You represent families with young children and live in Northreach, the residential area where the new city park is proposed.

Your personal motivations:

- You see the wasteland next to Northreach daily and feel it reduces the area's livability.
- You care mainly about safety, children's wellbeing and the quality of the environment you live in.
- Biodiversity matters to you mainly if it supports these goals. You also support greenery when it is well-designed and visually pleasant.
- You are worried about future flooding risks, but it has not yet affected daily life.

Your non-negotiable:

- You cannot support a solution unless it clearly addresses children's safety and maintenance.

How you view the proposed solutions:

Peatland restoration

Feels distant from everyday family life and is harder to justify compared to local improvements.

Rainwater runoff solutions

Not exciting, but acceptable if they reduce local flooding.

City Park in Northreach

Very appealing. A well-designed park would improve daily life immediately, offer safe play spaces, and increase neighborhood pride. You are sensitive to criticism that the area is already privileged.

City meadow

Could be nice, but you worry about ticks, insects, and maintenance.

Kindergarten rewilding project

Interesting, but you have concerns about safety, maintenance, and unclear outcomes. You want clear reassurance rather than vague promises.

Additional secret motivations:

You want to support the park but avoid appearing selfish. You are aware that other areas also lack green space, so you tend to justify your position through broader benefits such as children's health, mental wellbeing, and community cohesion. This may lead you to emphasise city-wide benefits or suggest compromises like a smaller park combined with other measures.

Informal neighborhood context: in playground chats and WhatsApp groups, many parents expect action on the wasteland, and frustration with city inaction is growing. You feel this pressure even if you don't say it explicitly.

Strategy tips:

Ask practical, safety-focused questions others may overlook, support solutions that clearly improve children's daily environments, and be open to ecological arguments if safety and maintenance are addressed.

Role Pages - Do not share this page with other participants!

You are: the city gardener

Your role in the meeting:

You represent the professionals responsible for building and maintaining NBS after decisions are made.

Your personal motivations:

- You are excited by creative, well-designed green spaces, but your biggest concern is underfunded implementation.
- You know poorly executed projects lead to public criticism that is often directed at you.
- You are somewhat uneasy about co-design processes with citizens, as community outreach is not your main expertise.
- You tend to view the city's future challenges through the lens of implementation and long-term maintenance.

Your non-negotiable:

- You cannot support projects that are clearly underfunded for long-term upkeep.

How you view the proposed solutions:

Peatland restoration

Feels less connected to your daily work, though still relevant in broader ecological terms.

Rainwater runoff solutions

Technically interesting, but responsibilities for maintenance must be clearly defined.

City Park in Northreach

A major opportunity to do things right from the start, but only if there is sufficient budget for high-quality construction and ongoing maintenance.

City meadow

Can be beautiful and valuable, but it can also become a disaster if not properly designed. It requires solid soil preparation, appropriate seed mixes, and long-term management.

Kindergarten rewilding project

Inspiring, but requires careful design, durable materials, and clear safety considerations.

Additional secret motivations:

You have previously dealt with angry emails, social media criticism, and direct complaints from citizens about "messy nature," which makes you cautious about poorly maintained or under-communicated projects. You are particularly wary of cheap meadow solutions and unclear expectations being set for the public.

From your professional perspective and discussions with colleagues, you believe nature-based playgrounds can be safe if well designed. Children already climb, fall, and explore in standard playgrounds—the key difference is the materials, not the level of supervision. You also see evidence that such environments can increase creativity and engagement.

You quietly hope that if the city invests seriously in nature-based solutions, your department's role will grow and you will gain more influence in early planning stages.

Strategy tips:

Speak as the voice of realism and implementation. Emphasize that "cheap solutions can become expensive problems," and strongly advocate for adequate funding, clear maintenance planning, and long-term responsibility.