Table 5. *Semi-structured interview guide used in the interviews within all six municipalities. In bold are the questions covered in this article.*

Theme	**Questions**
Intro	- Can you start out by briefly describing your role and the character your work here in the municipality? - Throughout the interview, we will refer to ecosystem services (ES) and the Swedish milestone target for their integration in governance and political decision-making (Naturvårdsverket 2016): "*The importance of biodiversity and the value of ecosystem services are, by 2018, to be generally known and integrated into economic positions, political considerations and other decisions in society, where it is relevant and reasonable to do so*". **- Can you give a brief overview of how the municipality have integrated the ES approach in practice?** **- Can you give an example of an ES that you have been explicitly working with here in the municipality? Or one that is urgently lacking?**

Rational Choice	**If we look at the list of ES…:**
	- **Which ES are highly prioritized in your work here in the municipality?**
	  o **Probes about how they work with specific services mentioned.**
	- **Which ones are less prioritized in your work here in the municipality?**
	- **Which ES do you find are often combined, or are you trying to work with in combination in your work here in the municipality?**
	  o **Probes about to concrete ways they work with combinations of services in planning and management of urban green structure.**
	- **Which, if any, ES are in conflict with each other in your work in the municipality?**
	  o **Probes about how/why they conflict.**

Knowledge-use and integration	- **Where are ES integrated in municipal planning?** - **In which municipal documents are ES explicitly mentioned?** - **How is it translated between various levels of planning?** - **Which guidelines, tools, or systems do you refer to when working with ES?**

	- Are you experiencing any particular lacks of expertise or knowledge in your work with ES?
	  o Does the municipality hire consultants for any particular tasks related to ES?
	- Which other staff or departments are working with ES?
	  o Which other staff or departments would you like to see engaged in working with ES?
	- Is the ES approach integrated into any management and maintenance-work of urban green structure?

ES distribution and needs	Referring to an overall map of the municipality, and a more detailed map of the main city/town… - How do you see the geographical distribution of ES in the municipality? o Are there any specific areas you would point out as important for- and lacking in ES-provision? - How are different preferences and needs for ES addressed in your work in the municipality? - Are there any examples of public engagement processes related to ES?

Table 6. *Overview of the reviewed Swedish literature.*

AUTHOR	YEAR	TITLE	TYPE			SCALE								PROCESS				
			Good example	Guidance	Overview	Multiple	Regional	Municipal	Neighbourhood	Block	Building/object	Undefined	Evaluation/Mapping	Planning	Desing	Construction	Maintenance	Unclear - broader
Andersson et al.	2012	*Where, when and how – weak correlations in the Stockholm region's green patches*	X			X	X	X	X					X	X			
Andersson et al.	2017	*Biological diversity in built-up areas - tips and experiences on green solutions*		X							X				X		X	
Andersson-Sköld et al.	2018	*Methods for assessing and evaluating ecosystem services in cities (VEKST)*		X					X	X			X	X				
Ask et al.	2015	*Mapping ecosystem services in Upplands Väsby municipality*	X					X					X	X				
Bergström et al.	2015	*Ecosystem analysis for planning programmes – Lilljansberget in Umeå municipality*	X						X				X	X				
Bokalders and Block	2014	*Urban ecosystem services: Let nature do the work*		X		X		X	X	X	X			X	X			
Boverket	2017	*Nature's services in the city – for benefit and pleasure*		X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	
Brunsell et al.	2015	*Ecosystem services in Sollentuna*	X					X					X	X				
Brunsell et al.	2014	*MKB for Mörby part 5: Scrutiny of detailed plan*	X						X					X				
Börje et al	2015	*Visualising and evaluating ecosystem services in municipal societal planning – Nacka*	X						X					X				
Capener et al.	2017	*Green Roof Handbook – Guidelines*		X							X				X		X	
C/O City	2017a	*Green solutions give living cities*		X		X			X	X	X			X	X		X	
C/O City	2017b	*Green space factor in public spaces*		X					X					X				
c/o City	2017c	*Nature in cities - tips and advice on increasing ecosystem services*		X		X			X	X	X			X	X		X	
Colding et al.	2013	*Ecosystem services in the Stockholm region*			X							X						
Dahl et al.	2017	*Contribution of ecosystem services to good urban environment*			X	X		X	X	X				X	X		X	
Eriksson et al.	2016	*Resilient single-occupancy housing*		X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			
Formas	2015	*Analysis of research on biological diversity and ecosystem services*			X							X	X					
Granath et al.	2012	*Combined information on ecosystem services*			X	X	X	X	X				X					
Görlin et al.	2017	*Arguments for more ecosystem services*			X							X						X
Hamrén et al.	2016	*Development plan for ecosystem services in Upplands Väsby municipality*	X					X						X				
Hanson et al.	2016	*BEST– do ecosystem services receive sufficient support in planning and building legislation?*			X	X		X	X	X				X				

Hellström et al.	2016	*Ecosystem services in planning and building regulations*		X		X	X	X	X		X			X			X	X		
Hilding-Rydevik & Blicharska	2016	*Ecosystem services in practice*			X	X						X		X						
Jansson et al.	2013	*The whole city – arguments for green-blue urban development*			X	X		X						X		X		X		
Jönsson et al.	2017	*Implementation of the ecosystem services concept in municipal operations*			X	X		X	X	X				X						
Keane et al.	2014	*Ecosystem services in urban planning - guidance*		X		X		X	X	X	X			X		X				
Klingberg et al.	2017	*Evaluation of ecosystem services from urban greening –Kungsparken and Skansen Lejonet*	X							X			X							
Leonette-Lidgren et al.	2016	*MEST_plan: Project report, phase 2*.	X					X	X	X				X						
Lidgren et al.	2015	*MEST_plan: Project report, phase 1*	X					X	X					X						
Malmaeus et al.	2015	*Ecosystem services in environmental impact reporting and socioeconomic impact analyses*			X				X					X						
Malmö stad	2014	*Mapping and evaluation of ecosystem services – experiences of using the TEEB method*	X							X			X	X						
Naturvårdsverket	2015	*Guide for evaluating ecosystem services*		X		X							X							
Naturvårdsverket	2016	*Integrating ecosystem services into official practices – guidance*		X								X								X
Pedersen et al.	2017	*Evaluating cultural ecosystem services based on contribution to quality of life*			X				X	X			X	X				X		
Persson and Smith	2014	*Biological diversity in urban environments – preconditions, advantages and management*			X	X		X	X	X				X						
Seffel et al.	2014	*Ecosystem services from a green patch perspective*			X		X	X					X	X						
Sikander and Capener	2014	*Green climate rating – condensation conditions, energy use and experiences*		X							X					X				
SCB	2013	*Mapping data sources for quantification of ecosystem services*		X		X	X	X	X	X			X	X						
Stockholms stad	2011	*Norra Djurgårdsstaden – green space factors*	X						X					X		X				
Thoni	2017	*Ecosystem-based climate adaptation: A review of knowledge*			X							X		X						
Van Noord and Winkler	2014	*Ecosystem benefits – from consultation to co-funding of ecosystem services*		X					X					X		X	X			

Table 7 *continued. Overview of the reviewed Swedish literature.*

AUTHOR	YEAR	ECOSYSTEM SERVICES																																				
				Provisioning					Regulating															Supporting						Cultural										
		No specific services	Multifunctionality	Food	Water	Medicine	Material	Energy	Locale climate regulation	Air quality regulation	Noise regulation	Carbon storage and sequestration	Extreme weather regulation	Water quality regulation	Water flow regulation	Pollination	Biological control	Erosion protection	Seed dispersion	Nutrient uptake/cycling	Light regulation	Habitat	Biodiversity	Ecological interconnections	Soil fertility	Genetical resource	Natural water cycle	Recreation	Health	Social interactions	Nature pedagogic and experience	Sensoric experience	Spiritual inspiration	Place attachment	Tourism	Property value
Andersson et al.	2012		X	X					X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X				X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
Andersson et al.	2017		X						X						X	X						X	X					X			X						
Andersson-Sköld et al.	2018								X	X	X				X	X												X	X			X						
Ask et al.	2015			X	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X					X			X			X	X	X	X	X	X		X		
Bergström et al.	2015			X									X		X							X						X			X							
Bokalders and Block	2014		X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X		X			X	X		X	X			X	X		
Boverket	2017	X	X																																			
Brunsell et al.	2015			X					X	X	X			X	X			X			X											X						
Brunsell et al.	2014			X			X			X				X	X	X	X						X	X														
Börje et al	2015		X												X								X					X			X	X			X	X		
Capener et al.	2017								X		X				X								X					X										
C/O City	2017a		X	X					X	X	X	X			X	X						X	X	X				X		X	X							
C/O City	2017b		X						X		X				X	X							X					X	X									
c/o City	2017c	X																																				
Colding et al.	2013								X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X							X		X	X	X								
Dahl et al.	2017		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Eriksson et al.	2016	X																																				
Formas	2015	X																																				
Granath et al.	2012	X																																				
Görlin et al.	2017								X				X	X	X								X							X	X							
Hamrén et al.	2016		X	X										X	X	X	X						X															
Hanson et al.	2016	X	X																																			

Hellström et al.	2016	X																																		
Hilding-Rydevik & Blicharska	2016	X	X																																	
Jansson et al.	2013	X	X																																	
Jönsson et al.	2017	X	X																																	
Keane et al.	2014		X		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X						X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X			
Klingberg et al.	2017								X	X	X				X	X												X	X			X				
Leonette-Lidgren et al.	2016	X	X																																	
Lidgren et al.	2015	X																																		
Malmaeus et al.	2015		X	X	X		X		X		X							X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X			X	
Malmö stad	2014												X	X	X					X		X														
Naturvårdsverket	2015	X																																		
Naturvårdsverket	2016	X																																		
Pedersen et al.	2017	X																																		
Persson and Smith	2014	X	X																																	
Seffel et al.	2014	X	X	X	X		X	X						X	X	X	X	X		X			X					X	X	X		X	X		X	
Sikander and Capener	2014	X																																		
SCB	2013						X	X	X		X					X									X	X		X	X							
Stockholms stad	2011								X				X		X								X					X								
Thoni	2017	X	X																																	
Van Noord and Winkler	2014	X	X						X				X											X					X			X				

Figure 5. Visual prompt of urban ecosystem services used in the interviews.

Keane et al. 2014. Ekosystemtjänster i stadsplanering – en vägledning. c/o City.