

FOR PROJECTS developed based on the RUFOPOLY model (pre-RUFkit/PARTICIPOLOGY)

PROFILE	Description
1. Project Title	South Downs National Park Green Infrastructure Framework Development
2. Organisation	South Downs National Park Authority
3. Contact name	Ray Drabble
4. Email address of contact	Ray.Drabble@southdowns.gov.uk
5. Website (if available)	www.southdowns.gov.uk also: https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/national-park-local-plan/evidence-and-supporting-documents/access-network-and-accessible-natural-green-space-study/
6. What was the aim of the project?	The sub-project was to develop and trial SDNPA's own version of RUFOPOLY to use in a workshop hosted by SDNPA as a means of communicating the need to consider ecosystems services in planning decisions.
7. Start date (and end date if applicable)	The original workshop was held on 13 October 2014; the tool has been used on at least 2 occasions since this date.
8. Where is the location and setting of the project?	The South Downs National Park, the UK's newest National Park that encompasses 1600km ² and which has subsumed part- areas of 3 county authorities, 1 unitary authority and twelve Districts.
9. How and why did the project come about?	Through earlier work with University of Brighton supporting the incorporation of an Ecosystems Services approach to SDNPA's Local Plan and the recognition by SDNPA that we need a strategic sub-regional approach to planning of GI.
10. Participants. Who played the game?	Representatives from 15 LPAs, NE, the EA, Historic England, the Forestry Commission, Sussex WT, the NT, Arun and Rother Rivers Trust, and South Downs Local Access Forum.
11. What is the long-term aspiration for the project / What next?	Specifically, the RUFOPOLY tool itself has not been exploited as much as potentially it may have been; this probably relates to the priority for consultation being the Local Plan over the past 12 months.
12. Funding, cost	It took at least 2 days fte to develop the questions for the game (36 questions); in addition, the GIS work amounted to a further day fte.
13. Key documents, publications and further resources (Please provide weblink where available)	These have been sent via separate email.
14. Photos, videos or podcasts (Please provide web addresses for these)	None held.
EVALUATION	Description
15. Who developed the game? Project lead and partners (organisations) – How well did	Ray Drabble with support of colleagues at SDNPA and Birmingham City University. The project did not work well inasmuch as it was a very busy time for the authority and, therefore, while the tool development was a priority for me

that process work? (e.g. in terms of time, costs, logistics, skills)	(since I was running the workshop) it did not represent the same priority for colleagues. As specified in answer to Q12. It was very time-consuming developing 36 questions that constituted realistic scenarios across a range of different spatial scales.
16. What parts of RUFopoly did you use/copy in the design <i>and</i> play of your game? (board, questions, rules, facilitation etc.)	Very much copied the 'monopoly' type layout of the game; I also used some of the Rufopoly questions tailored to our own situation.
17. Did you vary your own game (e.g. board, rules, entry/exit question) or always use the same format? Please outline the version(s) of boards, cards, rules etc. chosen and explain the reasons for your adaptations.	SDNPA developed its own version of Rufopoly using actual sites for the Local Plan. We simplified the game having just a 6 coloured die and regular die, 6 sites across the NP specially selected for the range of issues that they address at different spatial scales, and 6 numbered questions per site. Players rolled both die and the colour determined the site and the number the question within the site category. We applied a time limit of 15 mins to come to consensus in responding to the question.
18. What would you say were the principal problems with following the RUFopoly format? (in order of significance, starting with the most significant)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It wasn't tailored to our own situation which was deemed a priority by our project team; 2. It seemed slightly more complex and inflexible compared with the version that we developed. 3.
19. Do you have any comments on the value of having developed your own game?	It did serve its objective both on a simplistic level in terms of an enjoyable and appropriate workshop exercise and in the more philosophical sense of requiring participants to think in terms of ecosystem services.
20. Are there any parts of your game design that would like to change / improve? (Please provide examples of specific changes)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some of the focus areas for questions covered a large area; given this and a limitation of using of aerial photography print outs for additional interpretation, it would have been nice to have this material on laptops so that each table could have zoomed in and looked at areas in greater detail. 2.
21. How cost-effective would you say was producing this resource?	It achieved the desired result and because we used in house resources and a lot of overtime on my part it could be argued that it was cost effective. To have commissioned consultants to develop a tailored game in this fashion would not have been cost effective; particularly as we have not really gone on to use the tool on a regular basis.
22. Do you have any other evaluation comments on the DESIGN?	No.
Evaluation of the PLAY	
23. How did you play the game? (rules, entry/exit questions)	Answered by Q.17.
24. Please provide an overview of the events at which you trialled the game(s). Did the game sessions go as planned? What, if any, unexpected issues did you encounter?	<p>We trialled it at a GI Workshop. The game did go largely as planned although from feedback received we know that the success of the exercise as viewed by groups was dependent upon the strength of the facilitator and their understanding of the issues.</p> <p>It was also trialled at a South Downs Partnership Meeting. The South Downs Partnership is made up of representatives from different sectors, all with an</p>

	<p>important stake in the future of the South Downs National Park. The Partnership members work closely with each other, and with the South Downs National Park Authority itself, in order to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. use the specialist background of individual members to provide strategic advice to the SDNPA, forge new high-level collaborations and play an active role in reconciling conflicting perspectives amongst wider stakeholders; 2. help shape the development and implementation of the Partnership Management Plan and Local Plan, monitoring their delivery and working in task and finish sub-groups when appropriate; 3. act as ambassadors for the National Park, working for its success. <p>The feedback received from the Planning Policy Manager who facilitated the session was as follows:</p> <p><i>The main point of using the game was to get the partnership thinking about the issues to consider in a local plan. The feedback was positive. It was important to give plenty of time to the activity. As there was a lot on the agenda the rufopoly activity was rather rushed.</i></p> <p>A scaled down variation of the game was used in a Neighbourhood Planning Workshop although it principally used just the colours and dice as a basis for selecting questions, and did not involve planning scenarios. The feedback received was:</p> <p><i>The localised mapping exercise did not allocate sufficient time to enable a thorough job to be done well. However, the principle of the exercise was good and certainly ought to be one that Steering Groups should as a matter of diligence be prepared to conduct themselves at varying points throughout the drafting of their NP's, in order to keep issues in broader perspective</i></p> <p><i>The proposed exercise did not work. Far too elaborate for doing in just a few minutes, but it was useful in stimulating discussion.</i></p>
<p>25. Did you ask participants to provide feedback? If so, what were the key positive/negative points raised?</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>26. Which key issues emerged from the debrief session(s) with the facilitator(s) / organiser(s)? Summarise any strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, challenges.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially allocated more time for game play; • Improve the resolution of the accompanying interpretative aerial photography - potentially with use of laptops for each group; • Ensure each table has an effective facilitator with a good understanding of the issues.
<p>27 Are there any parts of playing the game that would like to change / improve? (Please provide examples of specific changes)</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>28 Do you have any other evaluation comments on PLAYING the game?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>Evaluation of the OUTCOMES</p>	

<p>29. In terms of meeting your project aims, what would you say were the main strengths of using a game-based approach?</p>	<p>1 Scenarios can be selected and specifically written to draw out particular issues; 2 Offers a less threatening environment in which opinions that may be quite polarised can engage in a constructive discussion; 3 It is less engineered than role playing and yet engages participants and requires them to consider others' perspectives.</p>
<p>30. In terms of meeting your project aims, what would you say were the main weaknesses of using a game-based approach?</p>	<p>I don't consider that there were any main weaknesses in meeting the project aims using a game-based approach. 1 2 3</p>
<p>31. What lessons did you learn from developing and playing the game?</p>	<p>It requires considerable investment of time to develop the game but it can be a very effective tool in demonstrating the challenges faced by planners in considering ecosystem services.</p>
<p>32. What, if anything, was the 'added value' of the game? (e.g. in terms of engagement, process or outcomes)</p>	<p>It required participants to explore planning issues in terms of multi-functionality and different stakeholder perspectives.</p>
<p>33. Do you have any other evaluation comments on the OUTCOMES</p>	<p>No.</p>