



## **Jury Report**

# **European Green Capital Award 2018**

June 2016

[ec.europa.eu/europeangreencapital](http://ec.europa.eu/europeangreencapital)

## Table of contents

Jury Report .....	1
European Green Capital Award 2018.....	1
1. Introduction.....	2
1.1 The role of the jury .....	2
1.2 Jury members .....	2
1.3 European Green Capital Award 2018—jury assessment .....	3
2. Jury findings.....	3
2.1 Overall comments .....	3
2.2 Nijmegen .....	3
2.3 Umeå .....	4
2.4 's-Hertogenbosch .....	4
3. Jury conclusion .....	5

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 The role of the jury

The jury's role is to select the winner of the 2018 European Green Capital Award on the basis of the technical assessment and the proposals provided by an expert panel, together with the information provided by the cities in their presentations, as part of the jury assessment.

### 1.2 Jury members

The jury is composed of representatives from six European and international organisations in the environmental field and is chaired by the European Commission's Deputy Directorate-General for Environment. Jury members cover a wide range of expertise and have in-depth knowledge of the issues involved.

The jury for the 2018 European Green Capital Award includes the following organisations and their representatives:

- European Commission: Joanna Drake, Deputy Director-General, DG Environment
- Committee of the Regions: Sirpa Hertell, City Counsellor of Espoo
- European Environment Agency: Katja Rosenbohm, Head of Communications
- ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability: Stefan Kuhn, Deputy Regional Director for Europe

- Covenant of Mayors Office: Frédéric Boyer, Head of Office
- European Environmental Bureau: Dr. Mikael Karlsson, President

### 1.3 European Green Capital Award 2018—jury assessment

The jury received the Technical Assessment Report, as prepared by the expert panel ahead of the jury meeting. The jury took this report into consideration in their decision, noting the technical comments and proposals of the expert panel. The jury expressed its appreciation for the excellent work carried out by the expert panel.

On 22 June 2016, the three finalist cities presented their vision, action plans and communication strategies to the jury. The jury assessed these cities based on the following evaluation criteria:

- 1) Overall commitment, vision and enthusiasm as conveyed through the presentation;
- 2) Capacity to act as a role model to inspire other cities, promote best practices and spread the EGC model further – bearing in mind city size and location;
- 3) Communication actions including:
  - Citizen communication to date in relation to the 12 environmental indicators, effectiveness via changes in citizen behaviour, lessons learned and proposed modifications for the future;
  - The extent of the city’s local partnering to gain maximum social and economic leverage;
  - Outline of the city’s EGC communications strategy should it win.

## 2. Jury findings

### 2.1 Overall comments

The Jury felt that all three candidate cities demonstrated not only their excellent environmental credentials, but also their potential to be worthy European Green Capital winners. In this respect, the Jury found that the quality of the competition was very high, and making a decision between these three well prepared, dedicated cities was not easy. In addition to the findings of the expert technical assessment report, which the Jury supported, (see the link below for details<sup>1</sup>) the Jury had the following remarks based on the presentations of the cities, and the subsequent question and answer sessions:

### 2.2 Nijmegen

Nijmegen presented a passionate, clear and persuasive vision of their city as a Green Capital winner, and of how they would act as an ambassador for the green city movement across Europe if they were to win the Award. The jury was impressed by Nijmegen’s engagement of a wide range of stakeholders from the city.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/wp-content/uploads/2016/05-2016/egca\\_2018\\_technical\\_assessment\\_synopsis\\_report.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/wp-content/uploads/2016/05-2016/egca_2018_technical_assessment_synopsis_report.pdf)

The city's ambitious, well structured, presentation showed not only their concrete ideas for their future as European Green Capital, but also their ability to deliver them and their willingness to invest time and effort into the initiative, should they win. The Jury also appreciated the engagement from the city's residents, who clearly have the concept of a greener city rooted in their values and vision. Nijmegen has already mobilised its citizens for 2018 and has the clear ability to inspire other cities as a role model.

The Jury was also impressed with how the city showcased and presented their strengths, including on cycling infrastructure, traffic organisation, and clean public transport, as well as their excellent approach to waste management. The city also framed the strategic plan well within the wider EU level and global sustainable urban agenda.

### 2.3 Umeå

The jury was impressed by the clarity of Umeå's vision. Their thoughtful communication plan was on clear display in their presentation. They demonstrated their environmental credentials very well, and showed how they could act as a role model for others as a Nordic green city. Umea explained convincingly how they would undertake their communication activities as a Green Capital, outlining their already well developed strategic approach in detail. The Jury appreciated in particular how well the city had already engaged with its citizens in preparing for their bid to be Green Capital, and in their overall approach to sustainable urban planning.

The city has worked hard to identify groups not normally engaged in the discussion around environmental policy. In several instances, Umeå has taken into account how gender impacts engagement with the environment. This approach was appreciated by the Jury.

### 2.4 's-Hertogenbosch

The jury very much appreciated the originality of 's-Hertogenbosch's presentation, which focused on intergenerational cooperation. A youth ambassador played a central role, cross-examining several professionals from the city, showing a collective vision of their sustainability strategy. It was a very well prepared presentation that showcased the city very well and demonstrated their understanding of how important the youth angle of the Green Capital is. The presentation also showed their passion and dedication to the idea of being the Green Capital.

's-Hertogenbosch has an impressive line-up of innovative projects that have contributed to the city's modernization over the years. They particularly excel in biodiversity and water management. 's-Hertogenbosch has developed very interesting strategies for rainwater management and flood protection.

The Jury was impressed with 's-Hertogenbosch approach to innovation and how they proposed to support to start-ups in the green sector as well as the city's leadership role in sustainable agriculture and the food system.

### **3. Jury conclusion**

The jury would like to commend each of the cities shortlisted for the 2018 European Green Capital Award for their excellence demonstrated across a number of the environmental indicators. Concluding its deliberations, the jury decided to award the title of European Green Capital 2018 to Nijmegen. The European Commission looks forward to working with Nijmegen.