APPENDIX 1: SURVEYS FOR ASSESSING OPEN PUBLIC SPACES

Embedding Resilience and Reconciliation: A Tool for Open Spaces

Evaluating open public spaces in terms of climate resilience, community wellbeing and embedding Truth & Reconciliation.

Overview

This Excel-based tool guides you through a comprehensive data collection process for evaluating the resilience and community well-being of open public spaces, including parks, greenways, and outdoor gathering areas.

It enables you to prioritize improvements to these spaces, integrating both resilience-building and Truth and Reconciliation outcomes to ensure a holistic approach to community enhancement.

By providing robust evidence of a site's impact potential, this tool supports long-term funding applications for Nature-Based Solutions, helping secure resources for vital community green infrastructure projects.

What the Questionnaire Covers?

The questionnaire is thoughtfully structured into two main categories: **Climate Resilience** and **Community Wellbeing**. **Within each of these categories, we consider different criteria essential for a comprehensive evaluation.**

A tailored survey for each specific criterion can be found in the appropriate tabs within this spreadsheet.

Within the Climate Resilience category, you'll find questions pertaining to crucial environmental factors like flood resilience, drought resilience, water quality, biodiversity, air quality, heat resilience, and wildfire resilience.

The Social & Community Wellbeing section explores critical aspects such as urban regeneration, quality and maintenance, participatory planning and governance, safety, accessibility and inclusivity, mental and physical health, community engagement and social cohesion, and direct economic benefits.

Climate Resilience

ID	Criteria	Indicator
FQ	Flood Resilience	Historical flood event Time to flood peak Infiltration capacity Topography Evapotranspiration rates Soil moisture monitoring Site water planning + drainage infrastructure Coastal flood risk Surface permeability Ground and vegetation recovery Risk of infrastructure damage and contamination Surface permeability Flood prevention landscape design Emergency responsivenes
DR	Drought Resilience	Rainwater or greywater use for irrigation purpose Depth to groundwater Water exploitation Index Water conservation and reducing water demand Diversified water supply
WQ	Water Quality	Basic water quality (pH, temperature, EC DO, flow rate) Nitrogen and phosphurus in surface water Metal pollutants in surface water Total suspended solids (TSS) Pollutant discharge to local waterbodies Richness of aquatic macroinvertebrates Water remediation and restoration planning
B	Biodiversity	Proportion of natural areas habitat within the public space Structural and functional connecivity Number of native species of birds within public space Number of native plant species within site Trend in biodiversity Species survival and reproductive success Effectiveness of community engagement on biodiverstiy Biodiversity monitoring

Climate Resilience

ID	Criteria	Indicator
AQ	Air Quality	Concentration of PM10 PM2.5 NO2 and O3 in ambient air Level of canopy cover for pollutants removal Tree composition Traffic proximity
HR	Heat Resilience	Surface and air temperature reduction Level of Canopy Cover & Shade Coverage Albedo effect Thermal comfort index Water bodies and water features
WR	Wildfire Resilience	Vegetation and Fuel Management Vegetation Health Ecosystem Connectivity Hydrological Features Weather Risk Factors Community Awareness Proximity to Built Environment Fire-Safe Design and Infrastructure Accessibility and Emergency Access Monitoring and Early Warning Systems Post-Fire Recovery Indicators Preventative Landscape Design Measures
CM	Climate Change Mitigation	Level of canopy cover + carbon sequestration potential Waste management efficiency Energy efficiency and electricity reduction Low-carbon transportation infrastructure Tree planting programs Implementation of circular economy principles Carbon footprint monitoring

Community Wellbeing

ID	Criteria	Indicator
UQ	Urban regeneration, Quality and Maintenance	Reclamation of contaminated land (brownfields) Ratio of open public spaces to built-up area Proportion of area devoted to roads Preservation of cultural heritage Design for sense of place
PG	Participatory planning & governance	Quality of green space (cleanliness, upkeep of facilities and plant life) Opennes of participatory processes Awareness of citizens regarding urban nature & ecosystem services Participatory governance Ease of governance of NBS New forms of financing Policy learning concerning adapting policies and strategic plans
S	Safety	Climate resilience strategy development Reported incidents of crime or safety concerns in or around public space
AI	Accessibility, Inclusivity & Belonging	Perceptions of safety among green space users Distance from residential areas to the nearest green space Availability of accessible facilities for individuals with disabilities Feature catering to different age groups and interest Frequency of use (daily, weekly, monthly visitor counts) Diversity of users (age, gender, ethnicity)
H	Health	Types of activities conducted (recreational, educational, social) User perception of mental health improvements due to green space usage Reduction in reported stress levels or improvements in wellbeing Opportunities for exercise activies in public space
CE	Community engagement and social cohesion	Exposure to noise pollution Number and diversity of community events held in green spaces Feeling of belonging Instances of volunteering or community-led initiative in the maintnance of public space Participation of vulnerable or traditionally under-represented groups
DE	Direct Economic Benefits	Increase in property values near well-mantained green spaces Number of jobs creation for maintenance and care of public space Local business benefits from increased foot traffic in areas adjacent to green spaces

Climate Resilience

Flood Resilience

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
FR1	How often do floods occur in the site?	◯ (more than once a year)	◯ Often (once a year)	◯ Sometimes (once every 2-5 years)	◯ Rarely (once every 5-10 years)	◯ Never	Local environmental agencies or municipal records for historical data, or stewards for anecdotal evidence	Historical flood events	
FR2	After a moderate rainfall, how quickly does standing water get absorbed in the site?	◯ Very slowly (water pools for several days)	◯ Slowly (water pools for a day or two)	◯ Moderately (water pools for a few hours)	◯ Quickly (water pools briefly)	◯ Very quickly (water absorbs immediately)	Groundskeepers or maintenance staff who can provide insights based on their routine observations.	Run-off and infiltration capacity	
FR3	What is the predominant soil type in the site?	◯ Mostly clay (low infiltration)	◯ Silty loam	◯ Loam (moderate infiltration)	◯ Sandy loam	◯ Sandy or gravelly (high infiltration)	Soil scientists or local agricultural extension services for a precise analysis, or refer to regional geological surveys	Infiltration capacity	
FR4	How would you describe the topography of your area in relation to floodplains?	◯ Mostly low-lying and within a floodplain	◯ Partially within a floodplain, with low-lying areas	◯ Moderate elevation with limited floodplain exposure	◯ Mostly elevated, near but not in a floodplain	◯ Highly elevated and far from floodplains	Topographical maps and design documents of the area.	Topography	
FR5	How would you describe the health and vitality of the vegetation in the site?	◯ Very poor (vegetation is struggling or absent)	◯ Poor (limited or unhealthy vegetation)	◯ Moderate (vegetation exists but shows signs of stress)	◯ Good (healthy and well-established vegetation)	◯ Excellent (thriving and diverse vegetation)	Botanists experts, or maintenance staff who have specific knowledge about the health of plant species in the area.	Evapotranspiration potential, plant health assessments	
FR6	How often does the soil appear dry and in need of watering?	◯ Always	◯ Often	◯ Sometimes	◯ Rarely	◯ Never	Maintenance staff who manage watering schedules and monitor soil.	Soil moisture monitoring	
FR7	Are there water features present (like ponds, fountains)?	◯ No water features present	◯ One small water feature	◯ A few small water features	◯ Several large water features	◯ Extensive water features throughout	Site plan or from anyone who visits the site	Site water planning	
FR8	Are there any man-made drainage systems present at the site?	◯ No drainage system present	◯ Few and poorly maintained drainage systems	◯ Some drainage systems, but capacity issues exist during heavy rainfall	◯ Adequate drainage systems that handle typical rainfall	◯ Advanced and well-maintained drainage systems that efficiently cope during heavy rainfalls	Municipal drainage plans, local infrastructure staff	Drainage infrastructure effectiveness	

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
FR9	**Is there a nearby river that can cause coastal or fluvial flooding?**	◯ Yes, a major river with a history of severe floods	◯ Yes, a river with moderate flood risk	◯ A small river or creek with occasional flooding risk	◯ A minor stream or water body, unlikely to cause flooding	◯ No nearby river or water body that could cause flooding	Flood risk maps, historical flood reports	**Coastal flood risk**	
FR10	**Does the site have permeable surfaces? (e.g., permeable pavements, natural vegetation)**	◯ Entirely impermeable surfaces (e.g., concrete)	◯ Predominantly impermeable, very little permeable area	◯ Balanced mix of permeable and impermeable surfaces	◯ Mostly permeable surfaces with few impermeable areas	◯ Entirely or predominantly permeable surfaces	Site maps, landscape architects, urban planners	**Surface permeability**	
FR11	**Are there delicate/ sensitive ground covers or vegetation that are vulnerable to flooding?**	◯ Highly sensitive vegetation or ground covers that are likely to be severely affected by future floods	◯ Several areas of sensitive vegetation or ground covers that could suffer damage in future floods	◯ Some areas of sensitive ground covers or vegetation	◯ Mostly resilient ground covers or vegetation	◯ Highly resilient ground covers and vegetation unlikely to be affected by floods	Groundskeepers or environmental scientists who can assess the vulnerability of vegetation. Historical records or reports of previous flood impacts on vegetation could also help.	**Impact / ground and vegetation recovery**	
FR12	**Is there a history or risk of contamination from nearby sources?**	◯ High risk and evidence of frequent contamination (e.g., sewer overflows, industrial pollutants), with severe impacts on soil and water absorption	◯ Significant risk and occasional contamination events, with moderate impact on the site's resilience	◯ Moderate risk of contamination from nearby sources, with some localized impacts	◯ Low risk, with rare contamination events and minimal impact on the site	◯ No history or risk of contamination, site free from pollutants and highly resilient to flood-related contamination	Environmental health reports, local water and sanitation departments, or environmental agencies. Consider consulting with nearby land managers (e.g., farms, factories) and historical contamination records.	**Impact / risk of contamination**	
FR13	**Are there Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) or greenways in place to mitigate flooding?** *for an explanation on SuDS access this link.*	◯ No SuDS or greenways, high risk of surface water flooding	◯ Minimal SuDS, limited greenways, ineffective during heavy rains	◯ Some SuDS or greenways, but not sufficient for heavy rainfall	◯ Well-planned SuDS and greenways that manage water effectively	◯ Extensive and effective SuDS and greenways that prevent flooding	Urban planning records, site architects, municipal planners	**Flood prevention landscape designs (SuDS)**	
FR14	**Is there ground-level material that can be easily damaged by flooding?**	◯ High amount of vulnerable equipment/ materials at ground level	◯ Some critical equipment at risk, no protection measures	◯ Limited vulnerable material, partial protection in place	◯ Minimal risk, most equipment protected or elevated	◯ No vulnerable material at ground level, full protection	Site maintenance staff, infrastructure reports	**Flood prevention design**	
FR15	**Are there flood gates or designs in place to protect the site?**	◯ No flood gates or flood-sustaining designs, and the site is highly exposed to flooding	◯ Minimal flood-sustaining designs, which offer limited protection during severe floods	◯ Some flood gates or basic flood-resilience designs, but they may not be sufficient for extreme events	◯ Well-designed and maintained flood gates or other flood-sustaining structures that offer good protection during typical flood events	◯ Extensive and highly effective flood-sustaining infrastructure (e.g., advanced flood gates, levees) that provide strong protection against major flood events	Municipal engineering or infrastructure departments, site architects or planners, records of flood-prevention infrastructure and design documents, as well as maintenance logs for existing structures.	**Flood prevention design**	

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
FR16	Are there materials in the site that recover quickly from water damage?	◯ No, materials highly susceptible to permanent water damage	◯ Most materials take a long time to recover	◯ Some materials are quick to recover, but others are not	◯ Most materials recover relatively quickly	◯ All materials are water-resistant or quick to recover	Site maintenance staff, infrastructure reports	Impact / risk of infrastructure damage (material durability)	
FR17	Is there a protocol or team in place to respond in case of flooding?	◯ No protocol or response team in place	◯ Minimal or informal protocol, few people involved	◯ Some protocol in place, but response is slow or incomplete	◯ Well-established protocol, with a trained team of volunteers	◯ Comprehensive, well-practiced protocol with a dedicated response team	Stewards, maintenance staff, municipal emergency response teams, disaster recovery plans	Emergency responsiveness	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed	2 Emerging Awareness	3 Exploration & Learning	4 Community Engagement & Testing	5 Co-creation & Leadership	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
		Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.			
R–FR1	To what extent do water design and flood risk assessments on site include Indigenous water stewardship and community environmental monitoring? (e.g. watershed monitoring + restoration, flood forecasting, rain gardens)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Indigenous Knowledge Keepers and researchers, local water/land stewards, Indigenous data sources, environmental protection agencies, water science and protection resources.	Integration of Indigenous Water Stewardship & Community Monitorin	
R–FR2	How well do water stewardship and/ or flood readiness planning recognize and protect the agency and significance of water as a living entity?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Indigenous Knowledge Keepers and researchers, water/ land stewards, Indigenous data sources, environmental protection agencies, historical and cultural documentation.	Protection of the Sacred Dimension of Water	

Drought Resilience

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
DR1	How is the site irrigated, considering the use of alternative water sources to reduce drought impact?	◯ No use of rainwater or greywater; relies solely on municipal water	◯ Rarely uses rainwater or greywater; primarily depends on municipal water	◯ Sometimes uses rainwater or greywater alongside municipal water	◯ Mostly uses rainwater or greywater; minimal reliance on municipal water	◯ Exclusively uses rainwater or greywater for irrigation	Maintenance staff responsible for irrigation	Drought Vulnerability for Irrigation	
DR2	What is the typical depth to groundwater in the area of the site?	◯ Over 30 metres deep	◯ 30 to 20 metres deep	◯ 20 to 10 metres deep	◯ 1 to 10 metres deep	◯ Less than 1 metre deep (lowest drought risk)	Geological surveys or local environmental agencies that maintain records of groundwater levels.	Groundwater Depth	
DR3	How susceptible is the site to the effects of drought?	◯ Very susceptible (vegetation often dies off, soil cracks)	◯ Quite susceptible (reduced vegetation health and soil dryness)	◯ Moderately susceptible (occasional signs of drought stress)	◯ Slightly susceptible (rare signs of drought impact)	◯ Not susceptible (no signs of drought impact)	Geological surveys or local environmental agencies that maintain records of groundwater levels.	Drought Risk	
DR4	Are water conservation measures utilized to minimize water demand and the risk of water shortages at the site?	◯ No measures in place	◯ Intention to minimize water demand	◯ Moderate measures to reduce water demand in response to drought event	◯ Very good measures in place to reduce water demand in response to a drought event	◯ Proactive water conservation measures in place to reduce water demand at all times	Site operations and facilities staff, resources on water conservation and reduced demand	Water Conservation and Reducing Water Demand	
DR5	Does the site water management plan include diversified water supply strategies to ensure a more reliable supply? (e.g. increased storage capacity, water recycling, rainwater harvesting)	◯ No strategies for diversified water supply	◯ Some strategies for diversified water supply	◯ Moderate strategies for diversified water supply	◯ Reliable strategies for diversified water supply	◯ Proactive strategies for diversified water supply at all times	Site operations and facilities staff responsible for water supply, water conservation specialists	Diversified Water Supply	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	2 Emerging Awareness Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	3 Exploration & Learning Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	4 Community Engagement & Testing Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	5 Co-creation & Leadership Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
R–D1	To what extent does water conservation and drought resilience planning integrate Indigenous techniques (e.g. traditional irrigation systems, rainwater harvesting, drought-tolerant landscaping, beaver dams)	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous Knowledge Keepers and researchers, local water/ land stewards Indigenous data sources, environmental engineers, landscape architects with expertise in Indigenous practices.	Integration of Indigenous Techniques in Water Conservation & Drought Resilience	
R–D2	How well are native drought-resistant plants incorporated into the site and are Indigenous knowledges integrated?	○	○	○	○	○		Integration of Native Drought Resistant Species & Indigenous Knowledges	

Water Quality

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
WQ1	How would you rate the overall basic water quality in the site, considering factors like pH, temperature, electrical conductivity, dissolved oxygen and flow rate?	◯ Very Poor	◯ Poor	◯ Moderate	◯ Good	◯ Excellent	Environmental scientists or water quality technicians who perform water quality testing.	Drought vulnerability for irrigation	
WQ2	What is the level of nitrogen and phosphorus in the surface water?	◯ Very High	◯ High	◯ Moderate	◯ Low	◯ Very Low		Nitrogen and Phosphorus in Surface Water	
WQ3	How prevalent are metal pollutants in the surface water?	◯ Very High	◯ High	◯ Moderate	◯ Low	◯ Very Low		Metal Pollutants in Surface Water	
WQ4	What is the concentration of total suspended solids (TSS) in the water?	◯ Very High (visibly turbid water)	◯ High (above standard limits)	◯ Moderate	◯ Low clear water)	◯ Very Low (very clear water)		Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	
WQ5	How frequent is the discharge of pollutants to local water bodies?	◯ Very Frequent (daily or almost daily discharge)	◯ Frequent (weekly discharge)	◯ Occasional (monthly discharge)	◯ Rare (seasonal or less frequent discharge)	◯ None (no discharge or extremely rare)	Municipal environmental control or regulatory bodies that monitor industrial and residential discharges into water bodies.	Pollutant Discharge to Local Water Bodies	
WQ6	How would you describe the diversity and abundance of aquatic macroinvertebrates in the site's water bodies?	◯ Very Low (very few species)	◯ Low (Few species)	◯ Moderate (some species variety)	◯ High (rich variety of species)	◯ Very High (very rich species diversity)	Ecologists or biologists specializing in freshwater habitats or the actual maintenance staff.	Richness of Aquatic Macroinvertebrates	
WQ7	Does the site management plan include measures for remediation and restoration of water bodies on site? (e.g. stream/river bank stabilization, dredging, biomediation, flow restoration)	◯ No measures in place	◯ No measures in place	◯ Inclusion of reactive remediation measures but no restoration measures	◯ Inclusion of both remediation and restoration measures	◯ Proactive restoration and post-event remediation measures as part of water stewardship planning	Ecologists or biologists specializing in freshwater habitats, operations + facilities staff.	Water Remediation and Restoration Planning	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey									
ID	**Questions**	**1 More Recognition Needed** Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	**2 Emerging Awareness** Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	**3 Exploration & Learning** Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	**4 Community Engagement & Testing** Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	**5 Co-creation & Leadership** Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	**Actor/data to consult**	**Indicator**	**Notes**
R–WQ1	Are community water monitoring methods integrated into the site and do they weave together Indigenous and western scientific knowledge systems?	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous Knowledge Keepers and researchers, local water/land stewards Indigenous data sources, environmental engineers, landscape architects with expertise in Indigenous practices.	Integration of Indigenous Knowledges & Community Water Monitoring Methods	
R–WQ2	To what extent do water protection and restoration practices recognize and integrate the cultural and spiritual significance of water for Indigenous communities?	○	○	○	○	○		Protection and Restoration of Sacred Waters	
R-WQ3	Do water educational programs at the site teach, recognize and integrate the holistic significance of Indigenous water values and stewardship practices?	○	○	○	○	○		Integration of Indigenous Water Values and Stewardship in Educational Programs	

Biodiversity

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
B1	What is the size and quality of natural habitat patches within the site?	◯ Very small patches, highly degraded habitat	◯ Small patches, poor quality habitat	◯ Moderate-sized patches with some good habitat quality	◯ Large patches with mostly good habitat quality	◯ Very large, continuous patches with high-quality, well-preserved habitat	Local environmental agencies or municipal records for historical data, or stewards for anecdotal evidence	Proportion of natural areas habitat	
B2	How well connected is the site to other green spaces through corridors or stepping stones?	◯ No connectivity (site is isolated)	◯ Very limited connectivity (few stepping stones, no corridors)	◯ Moderate connectivity with some stepping stones or partial corridors	◯ Well connected through corridors or multiple stepping stones	◯ Fully connected within a network of green spaces with continuous corridors	Groundskeepers or maintenance staff who can provide insights based on their routine observations.	Structural and Ecological Connectivity	
B3	How diverse are the habitat types within the site?	◯ Single habitat type (e.g., only lawn or only shrubs)	◯ Two habitat types	◯ Three habitat types	◯ Four habitat types	◯ Five or more diverse habitat types (woodland, wetland, meadow, shrubland, etc.)	Soil scientists or local agricultural extension services for a precise analysis, or refer to regional geological surveys	Number of habitat types within site	
B4	How many native pollinator species (e.g., bees, butterflies) are observed?	◯ Less than 10 species	◯ 10 to 19 species	◯ 20 to 29 species	◯ 30 to 39 species	◯ More than 40 species	Topographical maps and design documents of the area.	Number of Native Pollinator Species within site	
B5	How many different native bird species are commonly observed within the site?	◯ Less than 1 species	◯ 1 to 11 species	◯ 11 to 30 species	◯ 30 to 50 species	◯ More than 50 species	Botanists experts, or maintenance staff who have specific knowledge about the health of plant species in the area.	Number of Native Species of Birds within site	
B6	How many native plant species are present?	◯ Less than 5 species	◯ 6 to 15 species	◯ 16 to 30 species	◯ 30 to 50 species	◯ More than 50 native plant species present	Maintenance staff who manage watering schedules and monitor soil.	Number of Native Plant Species within site	

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
B7	**Over the past years, how have the numbers of native plant and wildlife species within the site changed?**	◯ Significantly decreased	◯ Slightly decreased	◯ Remained stable	◯ Slightly increased	◯ Significantly increased	Site plan or from anyone who visits the site	**Trend in Biodiversity**	
B8	Is there any sign that this site might be acting as an ecological "trap" or a population sink, a place where wildlife struggles to survive and reproduce?	◯ Clear signs that animals or plants are choosing this place but not surviving or reproducing well	◯ Some signs that this might be happening, but not certain	◯ Uncertain, mixed evidence or no clear indication	◯ No signs of problems, but no strong proof the site is supporting healthy wildlife either	◯ Clear signs the site supports healthy, thriving wildlife populations without these problems	Municipal drainage plans, local infrastructure staff	**Species survival and reproductive success**	
B9	How effective are community actions in improving biodiversity outcomes?	◯ No community action	◯ Minimal effectiveness with limited participation	◯ Moderate effectiveness with some improvements	◯ High effectiveness with frequent, well-organized community activities	◯ Very high effectiveness with strong community engagement leading to measurable	Flood risk maps, historical flood reports	**Effectiveness of Community Engagement on Biodiverstiy**	
B10	How regularly and comprehensively is biodiversity monitored at the site?	◯ No biodiversity monitoring or data collection on any species or habitat aspects.	◯ Monitoring less than once every 5 years, covering few biodiversity aspects.	◯ Monitoring every 3–5 years, covering some key biodiversity types.	◯ Annual monitoring covering multiple biodiversity types (birds, plants, pollinators, soil, etc.).	◯ Monitoring multiple times a year, consistently covering a wide range of biodiversity indicators with standard methods.	Site maps, landscape architects, urban planners	**Biodiversity monitoring**	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	2 Emerging Awareness Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	3 Exploration & Learning Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	4 Community Engagement & Testing Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	5 Co-creation & Leadership Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
R-B1	Do methods for: biodiversity monitoring and conservation, species at risk, and land stewardship recognize and integrate Indigenous approaches?	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous Knowledge Keepers and researchers, local water/ land stewards, Indigenous data sources, environmental protection agencies, water science and protection resources.	Stewardship + Pedagogy	
R-B2	Do land stewardship practices for native plant and wildlife species recognize and integrate community-led monitoring and Indigenous stewardship approaches?	○	○	○	○	○		Monitoring of Native Species	
R-B3	Are natural landscapes and species that hold cultural significance for Indigenous Peoples protected and regenerated on site?	○	○	○	○	○		Protection and Regeneration of Sacred Natural Landscapes	

Air Quality

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Natoe
AQ1	How would you rate the air quality in the site regarding the presence of pollutants like particulate matter (PM10, PM2.1) and gasses (NO2, O3)?	◯ Very poor (frequent smog, visible pollution, strong odors)	◯ Poor (noticeable pollution and occasional smog or odors)	◯ Moderate (some days are better than others)	◯ Good (rarely notice pollution, mostly clear)	◯ Excellent (air is consistently clear and free from odors)	Local environmental agencies, academic institutions or public health departments that monitor air quality may have up-to-date data.	Level of Pollutants	
AQ2	How would you describe the level of canopy cover provided by trees in the site?	◯ Very sparse canopy cover (limited shade and coverage)	◯ Sparse canopy cover (some areas with shade)	◯ Moderate canopy cover (a balanced mix of shaded and open areas)	◯ Dense canopy cover (most areas are shaded)	◯ Fully connected within a network of green spaces with continuous corridors	Urban foresters or also maintenance staff	Level of Canopy Cover	
AQ3	What is the predominant type of tree(s) in the site, deciduous or evergreen?	◯ Predominantly evergreen trees	◯ Predominantly deciduous trees	◯ Predominantly evergreen trees with some deciduous trees	◯ Predominantly deciduous trees with some evergreen trees	◯ Balanced mix of deciduous and evergreen trees	Tree composition in terms of deciduous vs. evergreen species	Tree Composition	
AQ4	How close is the nearest major road or source of pollution to the site and what impact do you think this has on air quality?	◯ Very close (noticeable pollution and noise from nearby traffic)	◯ Somewhat close (some pollution from traffic is noticeable)	◯ Moderately close (slightly detectable traffic)	◯ Far away, no impact	◯ No major traffic roads nearby	Environmental planners or traffic analysts can provide data on traffic flow and pollutant emissions near the site	Traffic Proximity	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey									
ID	**Questions**	**1 Lack of Recognition** Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	**2 Emerging Awareness** Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	**3 Exploration & Learning** Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	**4 Community Engagement & Testing** Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	**5 Co-creation & Leadership** Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	**Actor/data to consult**	**Indicator**	**Notes**
R-AQ1	Does site environmental monitoring for air quality and respiratory health (outdoor/ indoor spaces) also utilize community-based methods based on holistic wellbeing factors?	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous environmental monitoring and climate researchers, Indigenous Knowledge Keepers, air quality researchers, site operations and facilities staff.	Community-based Monitoring Methods for Air Quality	
R-AQ2	Are there inclusive indoor spaces with functioning controlled ventilation for site users to seek refuge on days with poor outdoor air quality?	○	○	○	○	○		Inclusive Indoor Spaces for Improved Air Quality	

Heat Resilience

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
HR1	How would you describe the effectiveness of the site in reducing surface and air temperatures?	◯ Very ineffective (temperatures feel much hotter than surroundings)	◯ Somewhat ineffective	◯ Neutral / Not sure	◯ Somewhat effective	◯ Very effective (temperatures are noticeably cooler within the site)	Local site users, maintenance staff or climatologists for more precise studies.	Surface and Air Temperature Reduction	
HR2	How would you describe the level of canopy cover and shade coverage provided in the site?	◯ Very sparse canopy cover (limited shade and coverage)	◯ Sparse canopy cover (some areas with shade)	◯ Moderate canopy cover (balanced mix)	◯ Dense canopy cover (most areas shaded)	◯ Very dense canopy cover (almost complete coverage)	Urban foresters or also maintenance staff	Level of Canopy Cover & Shade Coverage	
HR3	To what extent does the site's surfaces (like paths, buildings, and open areas) contribute to cooling through reflecting sunlight (albedo effect)?	◯ Very minimal (most surfaces absorb heat)	◯ Minimal	◯ Moderate	◯ Significant	◯ Very significant (most surfaces reflect heat well)	Maintenance staff or architects and urban designers with expertise in materials	Albedo Effect	
HR4	Considering your personal comfort, how would you rate the thermal conditions in the site during warm months?	◯ Very uncomfortable (extremely hot and stifling)	◯ Uncomfortable	◯ Neutral / Acceptable	◯ Comfortable	◯ Very comfortable (pleasantly cool and refreshing)	Site users and visitors	Thermal Comfort Index	
HR5	What role do water bodies and features (like ponds, fountains) play in cooling the site?	◯ Very minimal (little to no cooling effect)	◯ Minimal	◯ Moderate	◯ Significant	◯ Very significant (noticeable cooling effect)	Management staff or hydrologists	Water Bodies and Water Features	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey									
ID	**Question**	**1 More Recognition Needed** Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	**2 Emerging Awareness** Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	**3 Exploration & Learning** Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	**4 Community Engagement & Testing** Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	**5 Co-creation & Leadership** Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	**Actor/data to consult**	**Indicator**	**Notes**
R-HR1	Do sites in shaded natural areas that provide heat absorption and protection against extreme heat, designed to be community gathering places?	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous Knowledge involves keepers and researchers, local stewards, Indigenous data sources, cultural heritage experts, landscape architects, and urban planners.	Creation of Gathering Places in Shaded Spaces	

Wildfire Resilience

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
WR1	How effectively is vegetation and fuel load (e.g., dry leaves, deadwood) managed in the open public space to reduce wildfire risk?	◯ No management; overgrown vegetation and high accumulation of flammable materials	◯ Limited management; occasional removal of flammable vegetation	◯ Some management; moderate fuel load with occasional thinning and clearing	◯ Proactive management; regular removal of flammable vegetation and use of fire-resistant plants	◯ Well-coordinated management plan; continuous maintenance, minimal fuel load, and native fire-resistant vegetation	Well-coordinated management plan; continuous maintenance, minimal fuel load, and native fire-resistant vegetation	**Vegetation and Fuel Management**	
WR2	How does the health, density, and age of vegetation contribute to fire risk in the open public space?	◯ Poor health, dense and younger vegetation dominate	◯ Limited healthy vegetation; some dense or younger vegetation	◯ Mixed vegetation health; dense or younger growth is partially managed	◯ Mostly healthy vegetation with reduced density and age-related fire risks	◯ Excellent vegetation health; density and age are actively managed to minimize fire risk	Excellent vegetation health; density and age are actively managed to minimize fire risk	**Vegetation Health**	
WR3	How does the space integrate with other natural areas to manage fire spread?	◯ Highly fragmented, increasing fire propagation risk	◯ Some connectivity but no firebreaks or protective zones	◯ Moderate connectivity; firebreaks in limited areas	◯ Mostly connected with well-placed firebreaks	◯ Fully integrated with continuous corridors and strategic firebreaks	Fully integrated with continuous corridors and strategic firebreaks	**Ecosystem Connectivity**	
WR4	How well do water features contribute to wildfire resilience in the area?	◯ No water features or irrigation system present	◯ Minimal water bodies with limited coverage	◯ Some natural or artificial water features present	◯ Regular use of water features as fire buffers	◯ Well-designed hydrological system actively mitigating fire risk	Well-designed hydrological system actively mitigating fire risk	**Hydrological Features**	
WR5	How vulnerable is the area to weather-related wildfire risks (e.g., drought, wind)?	◯ High vulnerability; frequent droughts and no mitigation measures	◯ Some vulnerability; occasional droughts, limited mitigation	◯ Moderate vulnerability; basic measures like watering during dry spells	◯ Low vulnerability due to climate-adaptive practices	◯ Minimal vulnerability with robust weather-adaptive systems in place	Minimal vulnerability with robust weather-adaptive systems in place	**Weather Risk Factors**	
WR6	How aware and prepared do you think the community is regarding wildfire risks?	◯ No awareness or preparedness among the community	◯ Limited awareness; few people understand the risks	◯ Some awareness; occasional educational activities	◯ Regular community programs and wildfire drills	◯ High awareness with active community engagement in fire prevention	High awareness with active community engagement in fire prevention	**Community Awareness**	

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
WR7	**How does the space's proximity to structures affect wildfire risk?**	◯ Direct contact with high-risk structures	◯ Limited buffer between open space and buildings	◯ Moderate buffer zones but improvements needed	◯ Good buffer zones reduce risk to buildings	◯ Well-maintained zones with no risk to the built environment	Well-maintained zones with no risk to the built environment	**Proximity to Built Environment**	
WR8	How effectively does the site minimize wildfire risk through fire-safe design, including fire-resistant infrastructure and the reduction of flammable materials?	◯ No fire-safe design or fire-resistant infrastructure; high fire risk from flammable materials	◯ Limited fire-safe design; most infrastructure and materi	◯ Some fire-safe design features and fire-resistant materials, but significant flammable elements remain	◯ Good fire-safe design with mostly fire-resistant infrastructure and minimal flammable materials	◯ Comprehensive fire-safe design, with entirely fire-resistant infrastructure and no significant flammable elements	Comprehensive fire-safe design, with entirely fire-resistant infrastructure and no significant flammable elements	**Fire-Safe Design and Infrastructure**	
WR9	How accessible is the space for evacuation during a wildfire and for emergency services?	◯ No access routes; difficult terrain and no provisions for evacuation or emergency services	◯ imited access; some routes exist but are poorly maintained or unsafe for evacuation or emergencies	◯ Moderate access; basic pathways suitable for evacuation but with limited emergency access	◯ Good access; well-maintained routes that support evacuation and emergency services	◯ Excellent access; multiple safe, clearly marked evacuation routes, with well-planned emergency service access	Excellent access; multiple safe, clearly marked evacuation routes, with well-planned emergency service access	**Accessibility and Emergency Access**	
WR10	How advanced are monitoring and early warning systems for wildfire detection?	◯ No monitoring or early warning systems in place	◯ Limited manual monitoring with delayed alerts	◯ Basic systems with some early warning capabilities	◯ Advanced systems with real-time monitoring and alerts	◯ Highly sophisticated systems with proactive detection and response	Highly sophisticated systems with proactive detection and response	**Monitoring and Early Warning Systems**	
WR11	How prepared is the area for post-fire recovery?	◯ No recovery plans or resources in place	◯ Limited resources for basic recovery efforts	◯ Moderate recovery plans but gaps in execution	◯ Well-prepared for recovery with plans and resources in place	◯ Comprehensive recovery strategy with full community and ecological support	Comprehensive recovery strategy with full community and ecological support	**Post-Fire Recovery Indicators**	
WR12	How well are preventative landscape design strategies (e.g., firebreaks, defensible spaces, grading, hydrology) integrated into the site to mitigate wildfire risk?	◯ No landscape design strategies in place	◯ Limited strategies; some consideration of fire risk in site design	◯ Moderate integration; basic fire-safe design elements are present	◯ Good integration; design actively reduces wildfire risk across the site	◯ Excellent integration; the site is comprehensively designed for wildfire prevention	Excellent integration; the site is comprehensively designed for wildfire prevention	**Preventative Landscape Design Measures**	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey									
ID	**Questions**	**1 More Recognition Needed** Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	**2 Emerging Awareness** Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	**3 Exploration & Learning** Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	**4 Community Engagement & Testing** Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	**5 Co-creation & Leadership** Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	**Actor/data to consult**	**Indicator**	**Notes**
R-WR1	Do wildlife mitigation and prevention plans incorporate Indigenous integrated sustainability approaches into wildfire stewardship?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Indigenous fire guardians and Knowledge Keepers, Indigenous and local land stewards, forestry and biodiversity experts.	Integration of Indigenous Wildfire Stewardship as a Means of Mitigation & Sustainability	
R-WR2	Do wildfire management plans for the site integrate Indigenous wildfire stewardship and prevention approaches?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯		Integration of Indigenous Wildfire Stewardship and Prevention	

Climate Change Mitigation

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
CM1	How would you describe the level of canopy cover in the site?	◯ Very sparse canopy cover – none to limited coverage (0% - 5%)	◯ Sparse canopy cover – some areas with shade (6%-15%)	◯ Moderate canopy cover – balanced mix (15%-30%)	◯ Dense canopy cover – most areas shaded (31%-50%)	◯ Very dense canopy cover – almost complete coverage (>50%)	Urban forrester or maintenace staff	Level of Canopy Cover + Carbon Sequestration Potential	
CM2	How well does the site implement waste management practices?	◯ No practice in place	◯ Minimal efforts (few recycling bins, no composting)	◯ Moderate (some waste management practices)	◯ Significant (regular recycling and composting, clear waste management systems)	◯ Very significant (comprehensive waste management practices with high community engagement)	Maintenance staff, waste management teams, local government or environmental consultants	Waste Management Efficiency	
CM3	To what extent do the site's lighting features and other infrastructure use energy-efficient technologies?	◯ Not energy efficient (high energy consumption)	◯ Somewhat inefficient (minimal energy-saving technologies)	◯ Moderate	◯ Somewhat efficient (partial use of energy-saving infrastructure)	◯ Very efficient (widespread use of energy-saving technologies such as solar power and LED lights)	Electricians, urban planners, local government, energy consultants	Energy Efficiency and Electricity Reduction	
CM4	How would you rate the site's infrastructure to support alternative transportation that reduce reliance on individual car use?	◯ Very minimal infrastructure or efforts supporting alternatives to individual car use; no shared transport options.	◯ Minimal infrastructure (few bike racks, no EV charging stations) and limited shared transport arrangements.	◯ Moderate infrastructure (some bike racks, limited EV charging stations) with occasional organised shared transport services	◯ Significant infrastructure (well-established bike racks, EV charging stations) and regular shared transport options such as shuttle vans for frequent users	◯ Comprehensive infrastructure supporting bikes, EVs, public transport access, and well-coordinated shared transportation services actively reducing individual car use.	Urban designers or local management team	Low-carbon Transportation Infrastructure	
CM5	Are there any programs for tree planting in the upcoming year?	◯ No tree planting programs planned or known	◯ Very limited or informal tree planting initiatives	◯ Some planned programs but limited scope or coverage	◯ Well-planned and funded tree planting programs with moderate community involvement	◯ Well-resourced tree planting programs with strong community engagement and monitoring	Local management and facilities team	Tree Planting Programs	
CM6	Are circular economy principles applied in the maintenance and operation of the public space to reduce waste and greenhouse gas emissions?	◯ Maintenance and operation do not incorporate circular economy principles; waste is generally disposed of in a linear manner	◯ Some attempts or small-scale waste reduction or recycling efforts exist but lack systematic approach	◯ Circular economy practices are implemented in parts of maintenance/operations, but inconsistently or incompletely.	◯ Circular principles (reuse, recycling, waste minimisation) are standard practice across most maintenance and operational activities	◯ Circular economy principles guide all aspects of maintenance and operations, including material sourcing, lifecycle management, and zero-waste goals	Local management and facilities team	Implementation of Circular Economy Principles	

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
CM7	Is the carbon footprint of the public space's construction and maintenance monitored and publicly reported?	◯ No efforts are made to measure or disclose the carbon emissions	◯ Monitoring planned but not yet implemented	◯ Carbon footprint data is collected occasionally or partially, with limited public sharing.	◯ Carbon emissions are measured consistently, and some data is publicly available, but reporting is not comprehensive or fully transparent.	◯ Carbon footprint is rigorously tracked, verified, and reported publicly in a transparent and accessible manner.	Local management and facilities team	Carbon Footprint Monitoring	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed	2 Emerging Awareness	3 Exploration & Learning	4 Community Engagement & Testing	5 Co-creation & Leadership	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
		Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.			
R-CM1	How well do site practices related to waste mitigation and using resources in ways that value and maximize their lifecycle recognize and integrate Indigenous knowledges? (e.g. circular economy practices, regenerative land use and renewable energies)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Knowledge Keepers, Indigenous and other climate + sustainability researchers, local land stewards, Indigenous climate and environmental stewardship and municipal data sources	Integration of Indigenous Knowledges in Waste Mitigation & Regenerative Land Use Practices	
R-CM2	Are (eco)forestry methods integrated as effective evidence based climate mitigation methods for sequestering carbon and providing sustainable green spaces, and do they recognize and integrate Indigenous approaches?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯		Integration of Indigenous Approaches in Ecoforestry & Site Sustainability	

Community Wellbeing

Urban Quality, Maintenance and Regeneration

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
UQ1	What is your perception of the balance between open public spaces and built-up areas in and around the site?	◯ Predominantly built-up with very little open space	◯ More built-up areas than open spaces	◯ Balanced ratio of open spaces and built-up areas	◯ More open spaces than built-up areas	◯ Predominantly open space with minimal built-up areas		Ratio of Open Spaces to Built-up Area	
UQ2	How do you feel about the proportion of the area devoted to roads or trails for motorized use within the site?	◯ Overwhelmingly large, detracting from green and open spaces	◯ Somewhat large, slightly detracting from green and open spaces	◯ Balanced, without detracting from the enjoyment of green and open spaces	◯ Minimal, enhancing the enjoyment of green and open spaces	◯ Almost non-existent, maximizing green and open space usage		Proportion of Area Devoted to Roads	
UQ3	To what extent do you believe the site preserves and showcases diverse forms of cultural heritage?	◯ Not at all: the site has no visible features or activities related to cultural heritage	◯ Barely: the site has minimal heritage elements, such as artwork, structures, with few or no cultural activities	◯ Moderately: the site includes some heritage elements (e.g., artwork, structures) and occasionally hosts cultural events, but they are not central	◯ Significantly: the site showcases cultural heritage through multiple physical features and hosts cultural events	◯ Exceptionally well: the site is a key space for preserving cultural heritage, with many landmarks, displays and regular cultural programming. It strongly reflects the community's identity	Urban planners and designers and/or site users	Preservation of Cultural Heritage	
UQ4	How successfully does the design of the site contribute to a unique and identifiable sense of place?	◯ Not successfully at all – the design lacks distinctive features; site feels generic and indistinguishable from other places, offering no sense of identity or character.	◯ Somewhat unsuccessfully – site has few unique elements, but overall feels uninspired or disconnected from its context, failing to create a meaningful sense of place.	◯ Neutral/It's adequate – site design meets basic expectations; some elements reflect local character but do not strongly evoke a distinctive or memorable sense of place.	◯ Successfully – the site features several well-integrated design elements that reflect its history, culture, or environment, contributing to a clearly identifiable and pleasant sense of place.	◯ Very successfully, creating a memorable environment – the design creates a strong, engaging identity that resonates with users, and fosters emotional connection and pride in the place		Design for Sense of Place	

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
UQ5	How would you rate the overall quality of green spaces in terms of cleanliness and the upkeep of facilities and plant life?	◯ Very poor (neglected and unclean)	◯ Poor (needs improvement)	◯ Moderate (adequately maintained)	◯ Good (well maintained)	◯ Excellent (meticulously maintained)		Quality of Open Space	
UQ6	Was this site established by transforming previously contaminated land (brownfields) or vacant land into its current state? If yes, how successful has the regeneration or revitalisation efforts been in improving site's function?	◯ No regeneration involved	◯ Regeneration attempted but largely unsuccessful – site was transformed from contaminated or vacant land, but efforts failed to significantly improve its function or condition.	◯ Somewhat successful regeneration – site shows partial improvement in function and appearance, but some issues from previous contamination or vacancy remain.	◯ Successful regeneration – site's function and condition have been notably improved, overcoming most challenges associated with previous contamination or vacancy	◯ Highly successful regeneration – transformation has fully revitalised the site, restoring or enhancing its function and contributing positively to the surrounding area and users.	Urban planners and designers and/or site users	Reclamation of Vacant or Contaminated Land (Brownfields)	
UQ7	How durable and resilient are the materials and installations to wear, weather, and vandalism?	◯ Very poor durability – materials frequently suffer damage or deterioration from normal use, weather conditions, or vandalism	◯ Poor durability – materials show regular signs of wear or weathering; osme vandalism occurs. Msintenance and repairs are needed occasionally	◯ Moderate durability – materials withstand everyday use and weather moderately well but may require periodice maintenace to address wear or minor damage	◯ Good durability – materials are robust and weather-resistand, withstanding typical use and environmental exposure well.	◯ Excellent durability and resilience – materials are highly durable, specifically chosen for long-term resilience to heavy use, harsh weather, and vandalism		Durability and Resilience of Materials	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	2 Emerging Awareness Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	3 Exploration & Learning Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	4 Community Engagement & Testing Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	5 Co-creation & Leadership Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
R-UQ1	If there are Indigenous cultural and sacred sites identified, how well are they acknowledged and protected within site interpretation and regeneration projects? (e.g. place names, historical use, archaeological and burial grounds)	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous Elders, Knowledge Keepers and historians, Indigenous data sources, Indigenous cultural organizations, historical preservation agencies and urban planners	Identification and Protection of Cultural and Sacred Sites	
R-UQ2	Do the site's placemaking and urban regeneration programming and installations also incorporate Indigenous art, cultural heritage and site interpretation?	○	○	○	○	○		Identification and Protection of Indigenous Cultural and Art Creations	

Participatory Planning & Governance

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
PG1	How open and accessible do you find the participatory processes for planning and decision-making regarding the site?	◯ Very closed and inaccessible (Public has no information or access to decision-making processes; opportunities for community input are not publicized or open to community members)	◯ Somewhat closed (Limited information available to the public and few opportunities for community input; participatory sessions are not publicized)	◯ Neutral / Unsure	◯ Somewhat open (Information on decision-making processes is available and there are some opportunities for community input; participatory events may be publicized but not accessible)	◯ Very open and accessible (Decision-making processes are transparent, with many opportunities for community input; participatory events are widely publicized and efforts are made to encourage and facilitate widespread participation)		Participatory Processes	
PG2	To what extent do you feel that community members have a say in the governance and ongoing management of the site?	◯ No say at all (Community members are not consulted and there are no mechanisms in place for public input into decision-making processes)	◯ Limited say (There are few opportunities for community input and some effort may be made to consult the public, though these do not cover all aspects of governance and management)	◯ Neutral / Unsure	◯ Considerable say (Community members are occasionally consulted and there are some ongoing opportunities for community input, including advisory committees or public consultations)	◯ High level of say (Community members are regularly consulted and there are established mechanisms for community input, allowing the community to influence many aspects of site governance and management)	Community leaders, local NGOs, site managers and/or urban planning departments	Governance Participation	
PG3	Are you aware of any innovative or new forms of financing being utilized for the development or maintenance of the site?	◯ Not aware of any innovative or new forms of financing being used	◯ Not aware of any innovative or new forms of financing methods, but nothing has been implemented yet	◯ Aware of some innovative financing methods being used, but not much discussion or implementation	◯ Yes, one innovative financing method is being used (e.g., crowdfunding, green bonds, public-private partnerships)	◯ Yes, multiple innovative financing methods are being used		Financing Methods	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	2 Emerging Awareness Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	3 Exploration & Learning Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	4 Community Engagement & Testing Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	5 Co-creation & Leadership Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
R-PG1	Does site planning and governance incorporate participatory engagement, and do they integrate Indigenous co-design and decision-making approaches?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Indigenous Knowledge Keepers, community leaders, municipal officials, urban planners, conflict resolution specialists	Integration of Participatory and Indigenous Co-design and Decision Making	
R-PG2	Do site planning and governance integrate Indigenous governance and conflict resolution approaches?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯		Integration of Indigenous Governance & Conflict Resolution	

Safety

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
S1	Are you aware of any incidents of crime or safety concerns reported on or around the site within the last year?	◯ Yes, multiple incidents reported	◯ Yes, a few incidents reported	◯ Neutral / Unsure	◯ No reported this year but aware of past incidents	◯ Not aware of a safety incident or crime ever on the site	Local police reports for incident logs and site management staff	Reported Incidents of Crime or Safety Concerns	
S2	As a user of this site, how safe do you generally feel?	◯ Very unsafe (Constantly concerned about personal safety)	◯ Somewhat unsafe (Occasional concerns but with minor reservations)	◯ Neutral (Neither safe nor unsafe)	◯ Somewhat safe (Generally feel secure but with minor reservations)	◯ Very safe (Feel completely secure at all times)	Site users	Perceptions of Safety	
S3	How would you rate the visibility and adequacy of lighting at the site during evening or early morning hours?	◯ Very inadequate (Dark areas present significant safety concerns)	◯ Somewhat inadequate (Adequate in some areas but lacking in others)	◯ Neutral (Neither adequate nor inadequate)	◯ Somewhat adequate (Well-lit, feels safe at most times)	◯ Very adequate (Well-lit, feels safe at all times)	Site users and/or maintenance staff	Lighting	
S4	Are there mechanisms in place for reporting safety concerns or incidents in the site and if so, how effective are they?	◯ No mechanisms in place (No way to report safety concerns, significantly impacting perceived safety)	◯ Mechanisms in place but very ineffective (Difficult to use or rarely addressed)	◯ Mechanisms in place and somewhat ineffective (Available but slow or inconsistent response)	◯ Mechanisms in place and moderately effective (Generally functional with some delays or issues)	◯ Mechanisms in place and very effective (Easy to use with quick and appropriate responses)	Site administration and management and also community members	Feedback and Reporting Mechanisms	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey									
ID	**Questions**	**1 More Recognition Needed** Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	**2 Emerging Awareness** Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	**3 Exploration & Learning** Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	**4 Community Engagement & Testing** Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	**5 Co-creation & Leadership** Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	**Actor/data to consult**	**Indicator**	**Notes**
R-S1	Do safety provisions include the particular needs of Indigenous and intersectional peoples (especially women, children, and two-spirit individuals) within the site?	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous and community leaders and advocates, child protection and social workers, public safety officials	Safe Spaces for Indigenous and Intersectional Peoples	
R-S2	Do site safety protocols include training on Indigenous cultural safety and sensitivity training for management, staff, and security personnel?	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous cultural trainers, community leaders, public safety training coordinators, law enforcement agencies	Cultural Safety & Sensitivity Training for Personnel	

Accessibility, Inclusivity & Belonging

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
AI1	Is the open public space accessible to a diversity	◯ Not accessible at all	◯ Slightly accessible	◯ Moderately accessible	◯ Well accessible	◯ Fully accessible	Community members from diverse backgrounds and local community organizations	Accessible to Historical Marginalized Communities	
AI2	What is the estimated average travel time to reach the open public space?	◯ More than a 1 hour walk (Difficult to access without vehicular transportation)	◯ Between a 30 to 60-minute walk	◯ Between a 10 to 30-minute walk	◯ Between a 5 to 10-minute walk	◯ Less than a 5-minute walk (Highly accessible)	Urban planners or GIS analysts who can provide measurements of distance using city maps	Proximity of Open Public Space to Residential Areas	
AI3	How well-equipped is the site with facilities and infrastructure accessible to individuals with disabilities?	◯ Very poorly equipped (Amenities are largely inaccessible)	◯ Poorly equipped (Some amenities accessible, but gaps remain)	◯ Moderately equipped (Some key facilities are accessible)	◯ Well-equipped (Most key amenities are accessible)	◯ Very well-equipped (Fully accessible amenities and infrastructure)	Accessibility auditors or site administrators	Accessible Facilities for Individuals with Disabilities	
AI4	How diverse are the amenities within the open public space, catering to different age groups and interests?	◯ Very limited (Mostly single-purpose amenities, e.g., a playground)	◯ Somewhat limited (Few diverse amenities, e.g., a playground and a few sports fields)	◯ Moderate (A reasonable variety of amenities catering to different age groups and interests)	◯ Diverse (A wide range of amenities catering to various needs, including specialized areas)	◯ Very diverse (A broad variety of amenities catering to all ages and interests, including specialized areas like community gardens, dog parks)	Urban planners and designers	Features Catering to Different Age Groups and Interests	
AI5	Reflecting on the types of activities available (e.g., recreational, educational, social, cultural), how would you describe the range of activities conducted in the public spaces?	◯ Predominantly recreational (Mostly limited to physical activities like jogging or cycling)	◯ Some diversity, but skewed (Includes some recreational and occasional educational or social activities)	◯ Moderate variety (Balanced mix of recreational, educational, and social activities)	◯ Diverse range (Wide variety of activities, including recreational, educational, social, and cultural)	◯ Extremely varied (Extensive range of activities, regularly updated to engage community)	Users, site managers and/or community leaders	Types of Activities Conducted	
AI6	How would you rate the diversity of users (in terms of age, gender, ethnicity) in the public spaces?	◯ Very homogeneous (Little diversity)	◯ Somewhat homogeneous (Limited diversity)	◯ Moderately diverse	◯ Diverse	◯ Very diverse (Reflects a broad cross-section of the community)	Frequent users, maintenance staff and/or observational studies	Diversity of Users	

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
AI7	To what extent do the amenities available aim to contribute to a sense of belonging and reduced marginalization?	◯ Very limited (Few collective activities, less frequent and diverse users)	◯ Somewhat limited (Some frequent and diverse users, with some collective activities)	◯ Moderate contribution to social cohesion and belonging	◯ Good contribution to social cohesion and belonging	◯ Very good contribution (High amount of frequent and diverse users, many collective activities)	Frequent users, community leaders, community wellbeing advisors, site managers	Sense of Belonging and Reduced Marginalization	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed	2 Emerging Awareness	3 Exploration & Learning	4 Community Engagement & Testing	5 Co-creation & Leadership	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
		Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.			
R-AI1	To what extent are sites designed to be barrier-free and accessible to all, including Indigenous and intersectional peoples, and differently-abled people?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Indigenous community leaders and planners, accessibility leaders, urban planners, individuals with disabilities	Indigenous Inclusive & Barrier-Free Design	
R-AI2	How well are site programs and services developed to be inclusive of diverse Indigenous community members?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯		Indigenous Inclusive Programs and Services	
R-AI3	To what extent are Indigenous people engaged to feel a sense of connectivity and belonging through active engagement and co-leadership?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯		Indigenous Belonging & Leadership	

Health

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
H1	How would you rate the opportunities for engaging in exercise activities within the open public space?	◯ Very poor (No facilities or suitable areas for exercise)	◯ Poor (Limited facilities or areas, making exercise difficult)	◯ Moderate (Some facilities or areas available for exercise)	◯ Good (A variety of exercise options are available)	◯ Excellent (Extensive facilities or areas dedicated to diverse activities)	Frequent public site users	Opportunities for Exercise Activities	
H2	How effective do you find the site in providing a sense of mental relaxation or restoration?	◯ Very ineffective	◯ Somewhat ineffective	◯ Neutral	◯ Somewhat effective	◯ Very effective	Frequent public site users	Mental Relaxation and Restoration	
H3	How do you perceive the level of noise pollution in the open public space and how does it affect your well-being?	◯ Very high noise pollution (significantly disturbing)	◯ High noise pollution	◯ Moderate noise pollution	◯ Low noise pollution	◯ Very low noise pollution (does not disturb)	Frequent public site users	Exposure to Noise Pollution	
H4	Is there an effective protocol in place to protect the public from exposure to contaminated flood waters, and how quickly can the site be fully cleaned and made safe?	◯ No protocol in place; site remains contaminated for an extended period, posing ongoing health risks	◯ Limited or delayed response; basic protective measures exist but site cleanup is slow and incomplete	◯ Moderate measures in place; partial protection and cleanup within a reasonable timeframe	◯ Clear protocol and timely response; most contaminants addressed quickly, reducing public exposure	◯ Comprehensive, proactive protocol with rapid cleanup; minimal exposure risk and swift site recovery	Toxicology and virology scientists (water, soil, vegetation), public health experts, public space managers.	Exposure to Areas Contaminated by Flood Waters (Pathogens and/ or Chemicals)	
H5	How adequate are the sanitary and hygiene facilities (toilets, handwashing stations) in the public space?	◯ No sanitary or hygiene facilities available on site	◯ Facilities exist but are very limited, poorly maintained, or frequently unusable	◯ Basic facilities are available, but maintenance is inconsistent	◯ Adequate facilities provided, generally clean and accessible, meeting most user needs	◯ Excellent facilities, well-maintained, easily accessible, with sufficient quantity to serve users comfortably	Frequent public site users	Quality of Open Space	
H6	To what extent does the public space promote social interaction that supports mental and social health?	◯ No opportunities or design features supporting social interaction; space feels isolating	◯ Very limited opportunities for social interaction; few seating areas or gathering spots	◯ Some spaces encourage social interaction; occasional events or informal gathering places exist	◯ Good opportunities with well-designed spaces, regular community activities, and seating arrangements	◯ Excellent support for social interaction with inclusive spaces, frequent organised activities, and strong community engagement	Frequent public site users	Provision of social interaction	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	2 Emerging Awareness Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	3 Exploration & Learning Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	4 Community Engagement & Testing Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	5 Co-creation & Leadership Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
R-H1	Do site features and programming designed to support community health and wellness also focus on Indigenous wellness?	○	○	○	○	○		Indigenous Wellness with Community Health	
R-H2	Are Indigenous holistic health perspectives integrated into the design and planning of the site? (e.g. physical, mental, emotional and spiritual health)	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous Knowledge Keepers and healers, Indigenous health practitioners, allied health practitioners, cultural advisors	Holistic Health in Site Design & Planning	
R-H3	Do food- and health-related activities and events on site also recognize and integrate Indigenous foodways and heal traditions?(e.g. wild foods and medicines, food sovereignty, healing practices)	○	○	○	○	○		Indigenous Foodways & Healing Practices	

Community Engagement & Social Cohesion

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
CE1	How would you rate the number and diversity of community events held in the open public spaces? (e.g., cultural festivals, environmental education programs, community gardening, art programs)	◯ Almost no events or very homogenous events	◯ A few events with limited diversity	◯ A moderate number of events with some diversity	◯ Many events with good diversity	◯ A wide range of frequent events covering diverse interests and cultures	Frequent public site users	Diversity of Community Events	
CE2	To what extent do users feel a sense of social cohesion in terms of shared agency, values and relationships when you are in the open public space?	◯ Do not feel a sense of shared values and relationships at all	◯ Rarely feel a sense of shared values and relationships	◯ Sometimes feel a sense of shared values and relationships	◯ Often feel a strong sense of shared values and relationships	◯ Always feel a very strong sense of shared values and relationships		Sense of shared values and relationships	
CE3	How common are volunteering or community-led initiatives in the maintenance and management of the site?	◯ Very rare or non-existent	◯ Uncommon, with few instances	◯ Occasional volunteering activities with some regularity but not embedded into the site's management practices. Efforts are project-based.	◯ Community involvement is common, with volunteers regularly contributing to maintenance and management.	◯ Volunteering and community-led initiatives are very common and form a core, integral part of how the site is maintained and managed.	Frequent public site users and/or maintenance staff	Volunteering or Community-led Initiatives	
CE4	To what extent are you able to mobilize and get support from volunteers, community partners and users of the open public space in the case of extreme event recovery efforts? (e.g., flooding, urban forest fire)	◯ No volunteer and/or community support and response	◯ Some volunteer and/or community support and response	◯ Occasional volunteer and/or or community support and committed response	◯ A lot of volunteer and/or community support and committed response	◯ Full volunteer and/or community support and committed response	Community volunteers and partners, frequent site users, partnerships and fundraising managers	Community support and mobilization in recovery efforts	
CE5	How good are relationships with the community and partner + collaborator ecosystem to enable requests for resource and financial support in the case of recovery and rebuilding from extreme events? (e.g., flooding, urban forest fire)	◯ Minimal relationships and unable to request substantial resource + financial support for recovery	◯ Some relationships and able to request minimal resource + financial support for recovery	◯ Moderate relationships able to request moderate resource + financial support for recovery	◯ Good relationships and able to request a good level of resource + financial support for recovery	◯ Great relationships and able to request substantial resource + financial support for recovery		Financial Support from Community and Org Ecosystem for Recovery and Rebuilding Efforts	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	2 Emerging Awareness Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	3 Exploration & Learning Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	4 Community Engagement & Testing Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	5 Co-creation & Leadership Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
R-CE1	Do site programming and visitor engagement activities recognize and support Indigenous-led cultural events and ceremonies? (i.e. a form of relationship & trust-building, and strengthening community bonds with the site)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	Elders and Knowledge Keepers, cultural and placekeeping advisors, community orgs, event organizers	Support for & Programming of Indigenous-Led Cultural Activities	
R-CE2	Does the children's and/or youth educational programming on site integrate opportunities for fostering intergenerational knowledge transfer and engagement across different age groups? (i.e. between elder and younger participants)	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯		Integration of Intergeneration al Lear	
R-CE3	Are the site's open public spaces established and utilized as hubs for Indigenous and other diverse cultural, social and educational activities?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯		Programing of Public Spaces and Support for Community Hubs	
R-CE4	To what extent are respectful and reciprocal relationships and partnerships with Indigenous communities being fostered at the pace of trust and prioritized and sustained?	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯		Building Long term, Reciprocal Partnerships with Indigenous Communities	

Direct Economic Benefits

ID	Questions	1	2	3	4	5	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
EB1	Would you be willing to pay more (through higher rental prices, higher purchasing prices, higher taxes, etc.) for a property located less than a 5-minute walk from this site?	◯ Certainly not willing to pay more	◯ Probably not willing to pay more	◯ Neutral	◯ Probably willing to pay more	◯ Definitely willing to pay more	Frequent public site users	Uplift in Property Values	
EB2	To what extent has the development and maintenance of the open public spaces contributed to job creation in the area?	◯ No jobs created (0 jobs)	◯ Few jobs created (1-3 jobs)	◯ A moderate number of jobs created (4-10 jobs)	◯ Many jobs created (10-20 jobs)	◯ A significant number of jobs created (More than 20 jobs)	Public site administration and/or maintenance staff	Green Job Creation	
EB3	How have local businesses been affected by increased foot traffic in areas adjacent to open public space?	◯ Negatively affected (Businesses have seen a decrease in customers or revenue)	◯ No noticeable effect (Business operations and customer flow have remained stable)	◯ Slightly positively affected (A small increase in customers or revenue observed)	◯ Moderately positively affected (A noticeable improvement in business performance)	◯ Significantly positively affected (A substantial increase in customers, sales, or revenue due to increased foot traffic)	Local business owners	Local Business Benefits	

Embedding Reconciliation Journey

ID	Questions	1 More Recognition Needed Value of Indigenous perspectives and approaches are not yet recognized or engaged in approaches.	2 Emerging Awareness Recognizing the need for Indigenous inclusive public spaces, with initial steps toward cultural awareness learning and relationship-building with Indigenous communities.	3 Exploration & Learning Deeper learning and integration of community-informed Indigenous perspectives are explored in experimental phases, but there is no broad integration or structured approach.	4 Community Engagement & Testing Broader integration of Indigenous perspectives and active engagement of Indigenous communities in the design, planning and testing of approaches.	5 Co-creation & Leadership Community-informed perspectives are integrated within approaches, driving a commitment to co-create with, and uplift, Indigenous community leadership in shaping public spaces.	Actor/data to consult	Indicator	Notes
R-EB1	Are Indigenous-owned businesses and social enterprises supported and procured within the site? (e.g., procurement of Indigenous advisors and vendors?)	○	○	○	○	○	Indigenous business owners and entrepreneurs, economic development agencies, community leaders, business support organizations	Procurement and Support of Indigenous Enterprises	
R-EB2	To what extent have urban regeneration projects and other site programming led to employment and entrepreneurship opportunities for Indigenous communities?	○	○	○	○	○		Indigenous Income Generation Opportunities	