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Executive Summary

0.1 Aims (Chapters 1.1 - 1.2)

The aims of the study were to explore the role of participation in ICZM and to recommend suitable procedures and mechanisms to achieve improved co-operation between all parties concerned.

0.2 Format (Chapter 1.4)

The report is divided into three broad sections:

- how it was carried out (Chapters 2, 3 and 4)
- criteria for evaluation (Chapters 5 and 6)
- recommended procedures and mechanisms, together with conclusions (Chapters 7, 8 and 9)

References are listed in Appendix 1.

0.3 Methodology and Study visits (Chapters 2, 3 and 4)

The study involved visits to 12 demonstration projects in the first phase and 5 in the second. The object was to record and assess the various approaches, at the start and towards the finish, both from the project leaders ’and stakeholders,’ perspectives. Two sets of questionnaires assisted in this process. Throughout, close contact with local projects was established and a series of Newsletters circulated.

0.4 Defining Participation (Chapter 1.3)

Participatory planning is seen to comprise both the co-operation and collaboration of administrative partners involved in different sectors and levels of government, and the participation of non-governmental bodies, organisations and individuals affected by the management of the coast. In practice participation was generally defined to include ‘all parties’, with public participation focusing on non-governmental bodies, community groups and individuals.
The range of collaboration possible is seen as part of a continuum ranging from simple forms of information exchange or consultation through to joint working and the sharing of decisions:

- the procedure of activation of the relevant bodies for their essential involvement, through tasks, actions, advice, opinion as a tool for the promotion of specific objectives, in the frame of sustainable management’  
  Strymonikos Project, Greece

0.5 Criteria and Assessment (Chapters 5 and 6)

To assist assessment, two sets of criteria were developed: one based on review of the participation process itself; and the other on the delivery of outcomes in so far as they have been influenced through participation.

For the process review the following criteria were developed, illustrated by comments from specific projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A CLEAR PROCESS</td>
<td>‘the process is moving forward in incremental steps, each designed to allow the maximum opportunity for input, comment and debate’</td>
<td>Firth of Forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULLY REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>‘whoever you’ve left out has the greatest potential for creating mayhem’</td>
<td>Kent Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN &amp; TRANSPARENT</td>
<td>‘with its open and friendly atmosphere, the Forum provides a neutral ground for discussion’</td>
<td>Dorset Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANT TECHNIQUES</td>
<td>‘decide on techniques which are appropriate to local circumstances’</td>
<td>Devon and Cornwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADEQUATE RESOURCES</td>
<td>‘the largest share of the budget will be used to employ full time staff who will assist the participation process’</td>
<td>County Down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘30% of locally allocated funds. Should have been 50%’</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING STYLE</td>
<td>‘members agree throughout the process to bridge gaps in understanding, to seek creative resolution of differences’</td>
<td>Bantry Bay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
0.6 Procedural Guidelines (Chapter 7)

From these criteria, which have been widely supported, the following procedural guidelines have been developed. They are developed in detail in Chapter 7.

**PROCESS CRITERIA AND SUB-CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear Process</th>
<th>Representativeness</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear strategy</td>
<td>core group</td>
<td>publicity</td>
<td>specific participation modes</td>
<td>core funding</td>
<td>vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific steps</td>
<td>political support</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>targeted audiences</td>
<td>partner support</td>
<td>diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient time</td>
<td>business commercial</td>
<td>accountable stakeholders</td>
<td>affordable/ reliable</td>
<td>relevant skills</td>
<td>interactive style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed rules</td>
<td>universities</td>
<td>information</td>
<td>promoting consensus</td>
<td>suitable training</td>
<td>holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexibility</td>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td>convenient venues</td>
<td>skilfully managed</td>
<td>adequate time</td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>targeted approach</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>collective consent</td>
<td>measurable results</td>
<td>succession</td>
<td>objective review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.7 Devising a Strategy (Chapter 7.9)

To translate these procedural principles into a strategy for participation, the following steps are recommended.

(a) scoping  
(b) involving the stakeholders  
(c) deciding on the degree of participation  
(d) defining the wider process  
(e) creating the participation strategy  
(f) choosing the right mechanism  
(g) publicising the programme
0.8 Considering the Mechanisms (Chapter 8)

A review of mechanisms and techniques used by the projects revealed a wide range of initiatives. A selection of these are listed in the table below, arranged according to the contribution they can make to different types of participation. The six modes represent a series of cumulative options, beginning with statutory requirements, forms of information exchange (i.e., consultation), through to more interactive forms of participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTATION</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MINIMUM LEGAL</td>
<td>4. JOINT WORKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. INFORMATION-GIVING</td>
<td>5. SHARED DECISIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. INFORMATION GATHERING</td>
<td>6. EMPOWERMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Publication notification**
- **Statutory procedures**
- **Right of information**
- **Access to committees**
- **Written observations**
- **Representation at hearings**
- **Networks**
- **Planning for real**
- **Topic groups**
- **Community mapping**
- **Multi-attribute analysis**
- **Simcoast**
- **Partnerships**
- **Consensus building**
- **Round Tables**
- **Future Search**
- **Citizen juries**
- **Conflict resolution**
- **Neutral Facilitation**
- **ADR**
- **Delegation**
- **Local Initiatives**
- **Capacity Building**

Appraisal of potential mechanisms should include consideration of:

- purpose
- advantages and disadvantages
- timing
- resources
- target groups
- reliability
- feedback value
- role in strategy

Examples of their use by four projects are shown below:-
0.9 Assessing Results (Chapter 9.1 and 9.2)

A final questionnaire to projects assessing their achievement was based on meeting criteria for the quality of the process and achieving progress towards:

- commitment to a sustainable coast (ICZM goals)
- shared information
- integrated policies
- collective actions
- focus on real issues
- political support

Response was limited, possibly due to being premature. Nevertheless those responding were generally satisfied with their progress, although stakeholders were more reticent. However, the need for all levels and sectors of public administration to engage with local initiatives was stressed if projects were to be successful. Plus more resources.

0.10 Key Principles (Chapter 10.2)

The following key principles are recommended for ICZM initiatives seeking to engage in intensive participation with all parties:

- **statutory rights and obligations on access to environmental information must be respected, applied, and upheld in the field of ICZM.**

- **there must be a clear strategy for participation, agreed, and simply set out, as an integral part of the overall planning and decision-making process.**

- **programmes should provide adequate opportunity for the active involvement of all stakeholders, direct and indirect, and the wider community.**

- **the process should be open and transparent, conducted in a fair and impartial manner on the basis of shared information, data, and knowledge, using all suitable media. Some conflict should be expected and managed.**
• wherever possible, stakeholders should participate responsibly in proceedings on behalf of their organisations, working towards collective agreements and actions. Good leaders are essential.

• every effort should be made to win political support and work closely with existing local institutions.

• suitable mechanisms should be tailored to local circumstances, issues, and the needs of all participants, focused on consensus building.

• respect the spirit of place = its special character and variety need to be protected and/or enhanced through close involvement of local people.

• adequate resources - finance, time and skills - should be sought or made available.

• participants should commit themselves to a long term vision for the sustainable coast, recognising their diversity of interests and working together in a process of shared learning.

• participation should not be focused on problem solving alone, but also at securing opportunities for economic prosperity and conservation compatible with wider sustainable development goals.

0.11 Conclusions (Chapter 10.3)

The following general conclusions are based on findings from study of the 35 demonstration projects.

• Participation is an essential ingredient of ICZM - the projects demonstrate the value of stakeholder involvement in moving towards improved co-ordination and concertation.

• It can take many forms from consultation to empowerment and self-mobilisation - it is difficult to be prescriptive, but approach should be clearly identified and relevant procedures agreed.

• It requires partnership at all levels, especially the commitment of national & regional government departments and agencies.

• Public participation at the community level needs special scrutiny and careful planning, using special mechanisms. It should be kept as simple as possible.

• Participation must be organised in conjunction with the main planning process for ICZM in order to ensure openness and transparency.

• National cultural differences do exist - some building on democratic tradition, others using ICZM to foster the local democratic process, but issues, scale and geography are also important elements.
• Conventional techniques are frequently sound and useful, but more innovative practices should be explored and assessed.

• ICZM is a good vehicle for implementing the EU goals of subsidiarity and integration, with many initiatives arising at the local level.

• Good information nourishes the participatory process - the practice of sound science remains essential, but needs to engage with assignment of political values.

• Professional skills cannot always cope with such wide ranging and diverse interests.

• Individual training, capacity building and institutional strengthening are a widespread necessity - for authorities, NGO’s and/or individuals.

• Participation is difficult to sustain in the long term, with risk of fatigue by stakeholders - regulatory bodies will be required to continue exercising their statutory functions for the coast in an integrated way.

• Resources - in skill, time + finance - will continue to be troublesome.

• Projects need to plan their exit or succession strategies at an early stage.

• Aspects of participation are now becoming a statutory requirement through EU and International Agreements such as the Aarhus Convention.

• Participation is not a panacea. In an interdependent world, ICZM requires institutional support at all levels:

  • From the EC through clear guidance and funding support to national government on the frameworks and procedures required for sustainable management of the coast and the supporting role of participation and access to information.

  • From the Governments of Member States through national strategies and guidelines with active support for collaborative actions at the regional and local levels with funding support.

  • and from NGO’s and their international bodies and partnerships by stimulating concern, awareness, involvement and collective action.
1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Report

This report was commissioned by the European Commission DGXI to explore the role of participation in Integrated Coastal Zone Management. It has been prepared as a result of a participative process involving visits to projects, workshops, questionnaires and discussions. It is being published in parallel with the release of a document compiled by the thematic experts of the Demonstration Programme for widespread discussion throughout Europe this summer, supported by publication of other commissioned reports on the following themes: legislation, technology, territorial and sectoral integration, EU policies and information. The authors hope it will contribute to this debate and stimulate thought on the role that participation may play in the sustainable management of the European coastline.

1.2 Study Brief

‘ICZM requires appropriate involvement and participation of all parties concerned with the future of coastal zones and their resources. This is needed at all stages of the processes, from policy making to the realisation of specific actions. The study will identify the mechanisms and procedures required to ensure such participation and the conditions of their proper functioning’.


‘Starting from their own background, each specialist will be expected to develop a draft conceptual framework, and to confront it to the expertise available with the relevant demonstration project teams, to illustrate and comfort (support) it or/and to amend it, and finally to produce documented evidence supporting proposals for action. The work will thus comprise both desk work and visits to demonstration areas, and participation at meetings of project leaders and national experts’.


The brief may thus be summarised as:

- to assess and evaluate the role of participation in the ICZM process;
- to identify appropriate mechanisms and procedures;
- to test hypothesis that delays in implementation of ICZM are largely due to lack of co-ordination/concertation; (p.11/DEMO 96-2).
- to contribute study findings towards development of a European Strategy for ICZM.
1.3 Terminology

Unsurprisingly the consultants found that the word ‘participation’ is frequently used in different ways, ranging from the involvement of ‘all parties concerned with the future of coastal zones and their resources’ (as in the study brief) to the more limited concept of public or community (i.e. non-governmental) participation frequently identified with the bottom-up or locally-based approach.

For clarification the definitions and use of the word (and other associated activities) contained in the document compiled by the thematic experts of the Demonstration Programme are reproduced here:

“In the context of the Demonstration Programme on ICZM and for the purposes of this document, two types of collaboration have been distinguished with the following definitions:

“Co-operation”: the involvement and collaboration of the administrative partners at different levels of government and in different sectoral branches of the administrations. One of the objectives of co-operation is co-ordination of policy. Mechanisms to achieve co-operation may include consultation and joint working groups.

“Participation”: the involvement and collaboration of the private sector, NGOs, citizens groups and other non-institutional organisations or individuals interested in or affected by the management of the coast. Structures to achieve participation may include core steering groups of key stakeholders, general forums that meet regularly, technical panels, newsletters and various topic or issue groups as required.

Although the structures for achieving them and the difficulties in implementing them may differ, both co-operation and participation are components of the fundamental process known as participatory planning. The degree of collaboration may range from information exchange through consultation to working together and ultimately to shared decision-making.”

Generally, therefore, participation is seen as part of a continuum ranging from simple forms of information exchange or consultation through to wider degrees of co-ordination, co-operation or collaboration. Unless otherwise specified in the text, participation implies involvement of ‘all parties’.

1.4 Reader’s Guide

This section provides advice on the content and structure of the Report for those who may not wish to read it through in its entirety, but may wish to dip into certain chapters for specific information or guidance. For these readers the Executive Summary should provide a succinct overview of the report. The main report is divided into three sections:

- how the study was carried out (Chapters 2, 3 & 4);
- development of ideas and criteria for evaluation of the role of participation (Chapter 5, 6)
• recommendations on appropriate procedures and mechanisms, with conclusions and key principles (Chapters 7, 8, 9 and 10).

References for useful further reading or source material are contained in Appendix 1.

1.5 Acknowledgements

Special thanks are due to Bruno Julien and Anne Burrill of DGXI for their guidance, support and encouragement; to our theme colleagues and to the leaders, staff and stakeholders of the 35 demonstration projects who managed to return questionnaires despite the pressures they were, and still are, under. We express special thanks to those projects we visited for their hospitality, presentations and discussions. We hope our findings fairly reflect the views of those who have given so freely of their time and that our recommendations will bear fruit and nourish the forthcoming debate.
2 Approach

2.1 Key Stages

The Key stages and themes of our approach were set out in our Inception Report (December 1997) and are summarised in Table 1: Evaluation Process (on page 14), which identified three main project phases for our study:

Stage 1. (November 1997 - April 1998) Project Starts
This would cover our initial research, and first round visits and questionnaires.

Stage 2. (May - Autumn 1998) - Process Evaluation
This would monitor emerging results, evaluate questionnaires and include preliminary findings with Interim Report. Further visits would be taken.

Stage 3. (Autumn - Winter 1998-9) - Outcomes
This would focus on outcomes and success of participation procedures as far as the project timetables permitted, and would include a further questionnaire.

The general approach adopted was a participative one, involving close dialogue with a range of identified projects. The development of our thinking was based on the action-research principle which entails the continuous nourishment and revision of findings through sharing the active experience of selected projects. We shared our progress through a number of Newsletters and presentations. As the study developed our criteria for assessing the role and quality of participation were constantly refined and reassessed. Also, through our Spanish and Greek advisers we were alert for cultural differences in practice.

An important principle of our approach was to seek discussions and responses not only from project leaders and/or their teams, but also from individual stakeholders, as it was clearly important for our assessment to discover their views and perspectives on the quality of their involvement in the participation process. While recognising the importance of their contribution, however, our findings are necessarily focused on the skills, procedures and mechanisms required by public bodies and agencies seeking to promote greater participation in their work. All 35 demonstration projects were led and managed in this way, in line with the principles of the European Union on subsidiarity, integration, and sustainable development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>I Project Starts</th>
<th>II Process Evaluation</th>
<th>III Outcomes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>Project Report/Programme</td>
<td>Emerging Plan &amp; Objectives</td>
<td>Criteria for Deliverables:</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ICZM Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Acceptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Real Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint Actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Purpose</td>
<td>To Establish Goals for Participation with mechanisms &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>To Gain Feedback &amp; Evidence on Participant Influence &amp; Involvement</td>
<td>Criteria of Effectiveness:</td>
<td>Adequate Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Openness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Suitable Techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adequate Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representativeness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Approach</td>
<td>Visits and Interviews</td>
<td>Stage 2 Visits &amp; Questionnaires</td>
<td>Progress Tracking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Visits and Interviews</td>
<td>· Stage 2 Visits &amp; Questionnaires</td>
<td>· Final Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Questionnaires</td>
<td>· Meetings with Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Review of Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Initial Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analysis</td>
<td>Initial Comparisons of Project Approaches &amp; Contexts</td>
<td>Review of Mechanisms &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>Final Assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Analysis of Questionnaires</td>
<td>· Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Development of Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other Theme Consultations</td>
<td>Solo Studies</td>
<td>Joint Seminar</td>
<td>Shared Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Solo Studies</td>
<td>· Joint Seminar</td>
<td>· Supportive Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Shared Reports</td>
<td>· Joint Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EU Consultations</td>
<td>Meetings of Experts</td>
<td>Meetings of Experts</td>
<td>Final Report to EU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings of Experts</td>
<td>· Interim Report &amp; Feedback</td>
<td>· EU Consultation 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>· Regional Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Inception Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. General Communication</td>
<td>Newsletter No.1</td>
<td>Newsletter No.2</td>
<td>Newsletter No.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Newsletter No.1</td>
<td>· Internet</td>
<td>· Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Internet</td>
<td>· Draft Findings</td>
<td>· Internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Our Team

Our team comprised the following members:

Graham King
(Coastal Zone Management Consultant with Hyder Environmental)

- Coastal Zone Management
- Participation Skills
- Environmental Management
- Networking Skills

Dr J Galloway
(International Business Development Manager)
Hyder Environmental

- Project Management
- International CZM Skills
- Information Technology

Prof Dr Juan Barragan Munoz
(Univ of Cadiz)

- Coastal Zone Management
- Mediterranean Specialist
- Participation

Euroconsultants SA
Thessaloniki, Greece

- Advisers on Greek CZM
2.3 Main Activities

A Paper on Initial Ideas (or working hypotheses) was presented to DGXI, Project Leaders and other experts, at a Workshop in Brussels in September 1997. The paper set out a series of searching questions on the nature of participation, the benefits and risks involved, together with some pointers for successful practice. These ideas, together with responses and a knowledge search, helped to frame the questionnaire and project assessment inventory, and also our subsequent evaluation criteria.

The Paper also summarised our main activities (or method) as:

1. study visit to Demonstration Projects with assessment of local conditions and characteristics;
2. dialogue with project teams, partners and participation (stakeholders) via roundtable discussions and questionnaires;
3. literature and knowledge review;
4. development of initial hypothesis and evaluation criteria
5. concertation with other theme specialists;
6. workshops and progress meeting with DGXI, XVI and other advisors including national experts;
7. preliminary assessments of findings, interim hypotheses and comparisons interim report;
8. further visits to assess progress between expectations and reality;
9. feedback through workshops, inter-theme discussions, further questionnaires;
10. final report and dissemination
3 Study Visits

3.1 First Round Visits

Initial visits completed by Graham King and team colleagues by July 1998 comprised the following:

1. Bantry Bay, Ireland - November 1997 (GK with JG)
2. Cyclades, Greece - Jan 1998
3. Magnesia, Greece - Jan 1998
5. Algarve-Huelva - Feb 1998 (with Prof. Dr Juan Barragan Munoz)
6. Ria Formosa (Algarve) - Feb 1998 (site visit only by GK and JBM)
7. Devon/Cornwall - March 1998 (GK with David Wilkinson, Theme Specialist on EC Policy)
8. Gulf of Finland - March 1998
10. Ria de Aveiro - April 1998 (visit by JG and JBM)
11. Visits to Greek Projects by sub-consultants Euroconsultant: Ipiros, Athens and Kavala
12. Abruzzi - July 1998 (in conjunction with DGXI/Theme Experts meeting)

Study visits were selected on the grounds of diversity of geographical, institutional and management characteristics, ensuring a reasonable spread of types of projects across the member states of Europe. Table 2 overleaf summarises the Key Characteristics of eight initial visits.

Later visits, from August 1998 to January 1999, included some return visits and other opportunities:
Gulf of Finland (August), Barcelona (September), Naples (November), Bantry Bay (November), Ria de Aveiro (January 1999).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>BANTRY</th>
<th>CYCLADES</th>
<th>MAGNESIA</th>
<th>STRYMON-IKOS</th>
<th>ALG-HUE</th>
<th>DEVON/CORNWALL</th>
<th>GULF OF FINLAND</th>
<th>BREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>48 x 12 km M</td>
<td>Extension L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30 miles L</td>
<td>Trans-nat L</td>
<td>400 miles L</td>
<td>Local Projects L with S</td>
<td>River Catchment/Bay M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Scattered Islands</td>
<td>Bay and Islands</td>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>Med Landscapes</td>
<td>Picturesque, rocky, harbours</td>
<td>Afforested Archipelagoes</td>
<td>Bay, City &amp; Rural Hinterland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Activities</td>
<td>Tourism, Port, Mariculture</td>
<td>Tourism, Agriculture Fishing</td>
<td>Industrial Tourism</td>
<td>Tourism Aquaculture Mining</td>
<td>Tourism, Fishing, Agriculture</td>
<td>Tourism, Fishing, Recreation</td>
<td>Tourism, Fishing, Recreation</td>
<td>Navy, Ind, tourism mariculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Consensus Building</td>
<td>Integrated Process</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Municipal Partnership</td>
<td>Dynamic, evolving support network</td>
<td>Statutory basis Consultative</td>
<td>Partnership Consultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Alternative Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>Consensus Building</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Consultation, Exhibition</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Bottom-up Networking</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>University Prefecture/ Consultants</td>
<td>Fisheries Institute</td>
<td>ANAS</td>
<td>County Councils</td>
<td>Govt Regional Office</td>
<td>Contrat de Baie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Innovative use of ADR</td>
<td>Professional Evolving approach</td>
<td>Strongly led</td>
<td>Evolving approach</td>
<td>Evolving approach</td>
<td>Evolving approach</td>
<td>Regional Co-ordination</td>
<td>Moving towards Agenda 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L = Large Geographical Extent  
M = Medium Extent  
S = Small Extent
3.2 Purpose of Visits

The purpose of the visits were to:

• familiarise ourselves with local conditions and sites;
• establish details of project procedures and mechanisms for participation;
• conduct dialogue via formal questionnaires to project leaders and/or teams and other participants.

For stage 1 visits we were particularly concerned about proposed procedures and expectations. The Questionnaire was designed accordingly. In stages 2 and 3 specific Questionnaires for project leaders and participant stakeholders sought to assess the success of the participation exercise in terms of outcomes (deliverables) and quality of the process.

3.3 Diversity of Factors

At the EC Workshop in Brussels, (September 1997) it was established through discussion that the variety of approaches to ICZM arose from the following factors:

• local and regional geography
• range and complexity of issues
• mix and status of local institutions
• method of political legitimisation
• authority enjoyed by the core group
• use of existing statutory frameworks
• available resources
• level and quality of leadership
• attitudes to participation generally
• mechanisms for linkage between stakeholders
• potential for sustaining the process.

It was considered important to assess the impact these factors might have on participation. An Inventory was drawn up accordingly.
3.4 Inventory for Project Assessment

Opportunity was taken on every visit to record important characteristics via a project assessment inventory in the following form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>Date of Visit by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Scale</td>
<td>Geographic Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent’s Roles and Status</td>
<td>Address/Contact Nos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Arrangements</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Issues</td>
<td>Key Stages of ICZM (with dates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims of Participation</td>
<td>Key Participation Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Benefits</td>
<td>Perceived Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Strategy</td>
<td>Key Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Sources for Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Success</td>
<td>Key Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for other Themes</td>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Summary of Findings

A summary of the information obtained is shown in Table 3 overleaf, an initial analysis which was undertaken to help develop criteria for evaluation. Generally, it confirmed that Projects are managed or steered by a variety of partnerships with wide variation in status or function of lead agency. An analysis of key aims, opportunities for participation, anticipated benefits, risks, key principles, strategies, resources and criteria for success follow the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF 1ST ROUND VISIT INVENTORIES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARTNERSHIP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BANTRY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CYCLADES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAGNESIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRYMON-IKOS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3 CONT - SUMMARY OF 1st ROUND VISIT INVENTORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNERSHIP</th>
<th>AIMS</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
<th>RISKS</th>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>SUCCESS CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALG-HUE</td>
<td>Mainly municipal</td>
<td>Transnational Network Promotion EU funds</td>
<td>Joint studies GIS/Intranet</td>
<td>Synergy Joint Strategy Democracy Tackle problems</td>
<td>Little participation Development before environment Little ICZM</td>
<td>Statutory basis</td>
<td>Personal touch Practical rather than theoretical</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVON/ CORNWAL L</td>
<td>Two counties + Steering Group</td>
<td>Enduring multi-sectoral partnership Info Network</td>
<td>Local empowerment</td>
<td>Integrated strategy Regional Voice Indicators</td>
<td>Long term funding</td>
<td>Gateways for local initiatives via networking</td>
<td>LA as enabler Diversity Evolving</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULF/ FINLAND</td>
<td>Government, Municipalities and Regional Councils</td>
<td>Broaden input Real issues Support</td>
<td>Direct contacts Public mtgs + exhibitions</td>
<td>Regional Plans Natura 2000 Guide</td>
<td>Landowners lobby</td>
<td>Extensive consultation</td>
<td>Information dissemination personalise</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREST</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Sustainable development Democracy Shared expertise Education</td>
<td>Consultation Suivi Groups Exhibitions Observatoire</td>
<td>Sustainable development Realise projects Water Quality</td>
<td>Political strife Complexity Failure of actions</td>
<td>Aspect of communicatio n programme</td>
<td>Strong pilot Sound management Conflict</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Preliminary Analysis

3.6.1 Key Aims for participation include:

- better co-ordination and co-operation
- multi-sectoral partnerships
- pooled resources
- improved definition of issues
- common goals
- shared expertise
- raised awareness
- commitment to sustainable development
- access to European funding
- fostering local democratic processes
- transnational co-operation

3.6.2 Opportunities for participate include:

- open meetings
- workshops and forums
- information and education centres
- focus groups
- exhibitions
- joint working
- community mapping
- electronic media
- ‘just dropping in’
3.6.3 Benefits of participation are seen as:

- greater commitment to sustainable development
- strengthening of institutions
- integrated strategies for ICZM
- better planning
- improved data base
- synergy for action
- transferable techniques
- codes of principle for action
- development of indicators
- accountability

3.6.4 Risks may involve the following:

- over expectation of results
- polarisation of interests
- sustaining momentum
- intervention of other political agendas
- weak participation cultures
- staffing difficulties
- dominance of narrow sectoral interests
- lack of national agency support
- mismanagement of conflicts
- medium and long term funding
- complexity

3.6.5 Key principles for guiding participation include:

- widespread involvement of direct and indirect stakeholders;
- the value of multi-disciplinary working;
- recognising the value of non-technical knowledge or local wisdom;
- practical rather than theoretical
- flexibility
- ability to handle conflict
- efficient distribution of information
• effective leadership (‘strong pilot’)
• the personal touch
• respecting diversity
• links with Universities and colleges

• sound science
• political backing and accountability

3.6.6 Comments on Strategy

Few projects had a participation strategy fully integrated with the ICZM process, with explicit targeted aims and review. Most were committed to extensive consultation and degrees of shared working with a range of partners, including NGO’s and/or community groups. Opportunities for dialogue and information exchange with the general public were generally well-publicised for key stages of the process. However, in some projects a deliberate decision had been made to allow the participation process to evolve in a dynamic and flexible way, using extensive networking. Ultimately, what is possible in Bantry Bay, or Cyclades, two projects with integrated innovative approaches towards facilitation and consensus building, may be neither appropriate nor possible elsewhere. What is important is commitment to a learning mode of practice, and the sharing of experience so that local practice may be well informed. A fuller description of the modes of participation is provided in 8.

3.6.7 Resources

Concerning resources for participation - time, money, skills, accommodation and venues - most projects were concerned about continued funding in the medium and long term. 10% of overall budget was regarded as hardly adequate for an extensive programme, and for some projects this sum would not be possible. Future resources will depend on the local valuation of the outcomes of the demonstration programme. Projects such as Magnesia in Greece, and Dorset in England, are already taking steps to develop mechanisms for sustaining the process.
3.6.8 Criteria for success

The following criteria for success were listed for participant response during study visits:

Greater commitment? Shared Expertise?
Data sharing? Consensus Building?
Focus on real issues? Assist concertation?
Avoid polarisation? Win-win solution?
Balance of interests? Representativeness?

These were generally supported as useful outcomes following extensive participation during the ICZM process. Other criteria suggested included: strengthened institutional structures, increased awareness, democratic support, attraction of further funding, better plans, implementation, long term viability, support for conservation goals, build-up of small successes, sustainable development goals. These findings suggest the need for a clearer focus on evaluation criteria, covering both the process of participation and its continuation to the wider outcomes.

3.7 Survey of Mechanisms and Techniques

Details were also collected of the proposed techniques or mechanisms intended to assist participation. To assess their utility it was recognised that their main functions could best be understood in relation to key modes or styles of participatory planning. A number of theoretical models were considered including the well known ladder of participation (see paper to EuroCoast Conference, Barcelona, Sept 1998 by Rachel Baylis of Devon/Cornwall Project), and the Wheel of Empowerment (in Planning, 3 April 1998). The approach chosen in Table 4 overleaf was based on the following classification:

- Information giving
- Information gathering
- Joint working
- Shared decision making
- Empowerment/local mobilisation

These categories were seen as a combination of cumulative options running from consultation through interactive forms of participation to degrees of empowerment and/or local mobilisation. At a subsequent stage of the study an initial category of minimum statutory requirement was also introduced.
### TABLE 4: STUDY VISITS - SUMMARY OF MECHANISMS AND TECHNIQUES IN USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism/Tech</th>
<th>BANTRY BAY</th>
<th>CYCLADES</th>
<th>MAGNESIA</th>
<th>STRYMÓNIKOS</th>
<th>ALGARVE HUELVA</th>
<th>DEVON/CORNWALL</th>
<th>GULF/OF FINLAND</th>
<th>BRES</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION-GIVING</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAFLETS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWS-LETTERS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXHIBITION</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIDEOS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN REPORTS/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATERIAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS-WEBSITE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION-GATHERING</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRES</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDITS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETINGS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKSHOPS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT OFFICERS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION-CENTRE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENTS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-MAIL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARED WORKING</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEES</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC GROUPS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUND TABLES/</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORUMS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING FOR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORKING</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPPING</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNET</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARED DECISIONS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSENSUS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIORITY</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEARCH</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMCOAST</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN’S JURIES</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPOWERMENT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITATION</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARGAINING</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEGATED DECISIONS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 First-Stage Questionnaires and Findings

4.1 The Purpose

The purpose of the first-stage questionnaire was broadly to discover for each Project Leader:

- their understanding of the role of participation in ICZM
- the range of participants expected to be involved;
- the mechanisms and procedures intended to be used;
- the principles upon which they are based;
- the results anticipated;
- the skills and funds available.

Responses were received from most projects. On the basis of their analysis, together with detailed discussions with project teams and partners, the literature and knowledge review, and other theme specialists, a set of evaluation criteria were developed to assess performance and provide guidelines for future practice. These are explained and presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

Feedback on the first-stage questionnaire was obtained through:

* prior circulation and discussion of questionnaire with project teams and partners during study visits (with Spanish and French versions as required);

* response to circulation of comprehensive sets of questionnaires covering all six themes sent to all 35 projects by DGXI;

4.2 Interim Observations

On the basis of the Inventory for project assessment and Analysis of Questionnaires received, the following observations were drawn at the interim stage:

- all projects are keen to win wide support and build consensus through extensive publicity, consultation, and various degrees of participation;
- there is a wide variation of interpretation of what full participation means and the skills required to support it;

- the range of approaches varies from forms of consultation to fully integrated participation strategies with innovatory forms of conflict resolution;

- a wide range of mechanisms are being used, but most projects rely on conventional techniques such as topic groups, roundtables, workshops and public forums;

- the value of shared working is widely acknowledged, but progress must continue to be assessed;

- results of more radical approaches involving neutral facilitation and conflict resolution must be widely disseminated;

- although limited at the moment, electronic forms of communication are likely to be widely introduced as the projects proceed;

- despite sophisticated techniques, considerable emphasis is placed upon personal communication and networking;

- while partnerships are widely adopted as a means of developing collective responsibility, their scope and responsibilities vary widely;

- most projects are committed to a collective learning approach;

- participation was invariably more complex and time-consuming than anticipated, and required more resources.
4.3 Key Issues

The following issues were also identified to assist discussion at the interim stage; each is illustrated by a key text

• Aims of Participation

- to have better knowledge of the problems of the coastal zone, to have the users’ opinion and trust at an early stage; (Ipiros)
- quality plans require detailed inventories and active participation of the inhabitants and landowners in the process; (Gulf of Finland)
- a consensus-based participatory process will have a better chance of developing co-ordinated meaningful plans; (Latvia)

• Is a Strategy needed?

The kind of strategy chosen will need to reflect local circumstances, including:
- local and regional geography (the scale and character);
- range and complexity of issues;
- the mix and status of local institutions;
- available resources;
- attitudes to participation generally;
- the technical process proposed;

• Who to Involve, When and How?

Particular difficulties may exist when involving the business community as:
- many ports have a long history of autonomous powers and action;
• the tourism industry is sometimes fragmented;
• marine industries are used to operating within very different sectoral guidelines and regulations;
• control may be remote or responsibilities diffuse;
• some activities are unauthorised;
• there is general suspicion of experts and controls;
• Audits of interests, questionnaires and interviews, and the personal touch, may help in breaking down these barriers.

• Which Mechanisms to Use?

The public meeting is underway to explain and discuss the Project, but a small but vociferous minority refuses to accept your agenda. So what's wrong - is it just a 'blip' to be skilfully managed, or is it the wrong mechanism in the wrong place at the wrong time?

Choosing which mechanisms to use should be worked out and costed as part of the strategy. Great care needs to be taken as mistakes in communication may be difficult to remedy.

• Handling Conflict

the coast is full of competing interests and conflicting pressure - so how does ICZM handle conflict? What mechanisms can be deployed? How can participation help?

Useful principles to guide the conduct of participants should include:
• confronting the problems and not each other;
• seeking ways to satisfy each others’ needs (win-win);
• seeking common ground or balance;
• isolating genuine from spurious conflict;
• allowing full discussion and feedback;
• avoiding unnecessary red-tape;
• the need for realistic expectations;
• drawing on experience elsewhere.

Assessing Participation

Why evaluation is important:
• To demonstrate whether you have used your resources - time and money - effectively;
• To identify strengths and weaknesses;
• As a basis for future planning;
• To check progress and reassess direction;
• To check whether what you are doing is still what local people want and need;
• To check that the work is benefiting the people who most need it;
• To involve users and participants more closely in project development.

Learning to Learn

Management of continuous change requires both organisational and individual learning:
• To foster transdisciplinary knowledge and studies;
• to encourage integrated responses and policy formulation;
• to develop inclusive institutional structures and processes;
• to seek ‘win-win’ solutions transcending narrow self-interest.

How important is Communication?
To communicate: to exchange information, usually by talking or writing, but today increasingly through electronic media. Good communication keeps people in the picture; provides opportunities for dialogue, for discussing and resolving problems; and helps to attract and sustain interest to get things done. As ICZM depends so much on voluntary co-operation, project leadership requires first-class communication skills to win and sustain the trust and mutual confidence of a wide range of coastal stakeholders. Stakeholders, too require the capacity to present and defend their points of view.

- **Sharing Information through Participation**

A world of perfect information will never exist. Uncertainty grows not only as the environment becomes more turbulent but also because it is impossible to predict the cumulative impacts of organisations acting at the same time. Nevertheless through collaborative working the gaps between in-forming each other and formulating action may be reduced.

- **Resourcing Participation.**

Assistance can be forthcoming from a range of sources, including:

- steering group partners;
- EC funding;
- National funding sources;
- Lotteries;
- Local commerce and industry;
- tourist boards;
- environmental and countryside agencies;
- sponsorship;
- voluntary assistance by NGOs;
- local communities;
- Universities and colleges;
5 Literature and Knowledge Review

5.1 Introduction

This section contains:

- summaries of key texts on environmental management philosophy;
- a review of current reports and manuals of good practice;
- main findings.

5.2 Management Philosophy

Key texts consulted included:

A  • ‘Managing Sustainable Development’, Michael Carley and Ian Christie (Earthscan 1994)
C  • ‘Strategic Management and Organisational Dynamics’, Ralph Stacey (Pitman 1992)

A  Managing Sustainable Development’, Michael Carley & Ian Christie

1. Carley and Christie’s central contention is that good environmental management is not a technical exercise separate from everyday economic and political life. They make the following points about institutional systems:

- In modern political systems, particularly democratic ones, an enduring tension exists between top-down and bottom-up aspirations, and between specialisation and integration;

- In many cases sustainable development has no hope of realisation where the problem is defined at the wrong scale, or where relevant stakeholders are excluded from participation;
• Except at the highest level of generality, there is no unitary public interest - both
the meaning and method of sustainable development will be vigorously and
continually debated, with campaigning NGO’s playing an important role.

2. The authors also note two important factors to the limits of governance:

• one is the dynamic or turbulent nature of the modern world system which gives
rise to endemic uncertainty, requiring innovative forms of management and the
appropriate skills to engage;

• another limiting factor is fragmentation, in policy and institutional terms, in
societies which have become and remain largely compartmentalised.

3. Carley and Christie’s conclusion is that management systems depending on rigid,
deterministic control are likely to fail. Their remedy, action-centred networks, work
with uncertainty and conflict and develop strategies to manage it.

Five types of conflict are identified, of which three are unnecessary:

• relationship conflicts - misperceptions, stereotypes and miscommunication

• data conflicts - through lack of information or disagreements on relevance or
validity

• value conflicts - incompatible belief systems which need not lead to genuine
conflict

The final two are genuine and difficult to avoid:

• structural conflicts - shaped by external forces, such as disadvantage

• interest conflicts - occur over substantive, procedural or psychological issues
(such as trust)

Carley and Christie propose the organisation as a learning system, in contrast to traditional
bureaucratic approaches, summed up as follows:
In this model, management of complexity is a continual process of innovation rather than a product, a search for consensus through collaboration.

B Impact Assessment and Sustainable Resource Management, L Graham Smith

1. Smith makes the following points:

   • purpose of institutional analysis is to identify and assess leverage points at which it is possible to improve resource (coastal) management;

   • institutional policy analysis tends to emphasise procedural elements and values - they are more measurable as policy outcomes become harder to predict;

   • reliance upon coercive controls should be balanced by adoption of catalytic controls which provide an impetus but do not limit capacity for creative problem solving within the policy process, eg impact assessment provisions;

   • policy analysis criteria need to be more clearly and precisely defined: analyst should use more than one method;

   • analysts should pay attention to actors and their stakes; the resources they have at their disposal; biases of the decision-making arenas;

   • to overcome impediments to effective institutional arrangements, solutions might include new legal definitions and practices, policy frameworks, institutions, or mechanisms to resolve allocative settlements eg market forces, negotiated settlements, or use of information sources.

2. To describe projects studied Smith uses Mitchell’s (1990) framework which has six components, each representing a leverage point:

   - context: environmental, economic, legal, administrative, financial
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- legitimation: legal status, statutory powers, etc
- functions: generic and substantive
- structures: efficiency, accountability, flexibility
- processes and mechanisms: eg, bargaining, participation
- culture and attitudes: eg, towards sustainability

3. Conflict is inherent within environmental planning. To be effective it must provide for bargaining among the interested parties involved, using:
   - real and regular consultation
   - a common database
   - action plans involving multiple stakeholders
   - a variety of flexible mechanisms

4. Three main approaches to interest representation are: lobbying, public participatory, and dispute resolution. Public participation refers to a group of methods and procedures designed to consult, involve, inform and empower lay citizens and interested groups regarding environmental issues. Criteria include: the legal right, access to information, resource provision and representativeness. Good participating design involves a blend of approaches balancing the intent with the role of information and type of public to be involved.

5. The outcome of participation can be evaluated using the following criteria:
   - Focus on issues
   - representativeness
   - appropriateness of process
   - awareness achieved
   - impact and influence on decision
   - time and cost (efficiency)

C Strategic Management and Organisational Dynamics, Ralph Stacey

- organisations need managers primarily to handle the surprises that all organisations must inevitably encounter as they move through time when techniques, procedures, rules, structures turn out to be inadequate;
- the real management task is creatively encountering unpredictability, clashing cultures, contention, conflict, and inconsistency;
• the evidence suggests that organisations succeed in highly uncertain environments when they sustain states of instability, contradiction, contention and creative tension in order to provoke new perspectives and continued learning;

• an organisation is a dynamic feedback system involving chaos and self-organisation; this will require a sacrifice of precision and logical rigour to gain qualitative insights and images into how the system evolves;

• it is impossible to develop general sets of prescriptions: managers have to develop unique responses to each unique strategic situation they face.

D Mintzberg on Strategy

• dynamics of context defy efforts to force process into pre-determined schedule or track: expect blips/discontinuities

• strategies frequently emerge from or adapt existing practices

• strategies are often less formally planned than presentation suggests, often vision-led and more informally-based

• always expect the unexpected both in and during the plan preparation phase and after

• remember: challenges provoke learning

• creativity and skills of synthesis are as important as analysis

• data frequently has limitations:
  it may be too late
  lacks richness
  can be too aggregated
  may be unreliable or disputed

• tactics may gain significance and become strategy

• turbulence is growing in both natural and human systems: requires learning, communication skills, and umbrella strategies with freedom to react fast

• action-research required to link scientists with users

• inflexible, formal procedures can destroy innovation
• the formal analysis and social interactive processes in organisations are closely intertwined.

5.3 Review of current reports and good practice manuals

The following table (Table 5) summarises recommendations for successful participation practice from a wide range of studies and reports based on the evaluation criteria for effective participation described in Chapter 6, viz: process, representativeness, openness, techniques, resources and learning. The literature review provided a further test of the value of the criteria in describing and judging the participation process. References are set out in Appendix 1.
TABLE 5: REVIEW OF PRINCIPLES FOR SUCCESSFUL PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Process</th>
<th>B. Representativeness</th>
<th>C. Openness</th>
<th>D. Techniques</th>
<th>E. Resources</th>
<th>F. Learning/Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm Statement</td>
<td>• Clear aims</td>
<td>• Widespread, open</td>
<td>• Early publicity</td>
<td>• Adequate</td>
<td>• Develop together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to each stage</td>
<td>• All Government levels</td>
<td>• Clear languages</td>
<td>• Help for NGO’s and needy</td>
<td>• Fair and transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Objective review</td>
<td>• Audit of stakeholders</td>
<td>• Any comments considered</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Protection for ‘whistle blowers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minutes done promptly</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sufficient time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Apply to E.I.A’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Right to information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessible registers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay &amp; Alder</td>
<td>• Integral</td>
<td>• Recognise diversity</td>
<td>• Comprehensive</td>
<td>• Specialised</td>
<td>• Diversity of values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Balanced</td>
<td>• Tailored</td>
<td>• Handling controversy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tailored</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accurate</td>
<td>• Conflict resolution</td>
<td>• Two-way process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>• Clear objectives</td>
<td>• Identify target consultees</td>
<td>• Distinguish between</td>
<td>• Adequate funds</td>
<td>• High degree of commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sufficient time</td>
<td></td>
<td>consultation and participation</td>
<td>• Skills</td>
<td>• Accept uncertainties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information for potential</td>
<td>• Time</td>
<td>• Honest and understandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consultees</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only give commitments you can keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Specialised techniques for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>information, consultation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>techniques for information,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consultation and participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Target scarce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn from experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gain commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offer options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Target scarce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn from experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gain commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Process</td>
<td>B. Representativeness</td>
<td>C. Openness</td>
<td>D. Techniques</td>
<td>E. Resources</td>
<td>F. Learning/Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| University of Westminster | • How do we get there?  
  • Strategy and plan  
  • Indicators  
  • Opportunities for early actions  
  • Succession | • Clarify roles  
  • Don’t ignore elected representatives  
  • Accept newcomers  
  • Clear responsibilities | • Where are we now?  
  • Where are we going?  
  • Where do we want to go?  
  • Equal opportunities despite skills, funds, confidence | • Future search  
  • Innovative democracy  
  • Good facilitation  
  • Time for training | • Acknowledge limited resources  
  • Citizen’s rights: access  
  • Skilled facilitator: presence positive  
  • Experts on tap  
  • Learning opportunities  
  • Ownership |
| World Bank | • Scoping  
  • Emerging issues  
  • Seek convergence | • Scoping  
  • Allow individual conversations | • Scoping  
  • Publicity  
  • Public meetings  
  • Impartial hearings  
  • Women, minorities | • Scoping  
  • Information-sharing | • Scoping  
  • Right to know process, legalities, opportunities  
  • Win trust, avoid secrecy |
| - | • Allow diverse outcomes  
  • Specific recommendations  
  • Interactive and flexible  
  • Succession  
  • Let plan evolve | • Political accountability  
  • Institutional support  
  • Targeted groups | • Clear information  
  • Shared accessible data | • Networking  
  • Appropriate  
  • Consensus building | • Relevant skills  
  • Fairness  
  • Sound research  
  • Diversity  
  • All views |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Representativeness</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Learning/Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action on the Coast (LGMB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect different timescales</td>
<td>• Who does what?</td>
<td>• Familiarise with current state of play</td>
<td>• Think through resource implications</td>
<td>• Acknowledge wider context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus carefully on issues</td>
<td>• Work with private and voluntary sectors</td>
<td>• Be selective with information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diverse outcomes</td>
<td>• Respect different agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop targets and indicators</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy (Thames)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared realisation of impending problems</td>
<td>• Overcome fragmentation</td>
<td>• Improve communication</td>
<td>• Estimate costs and time</td>
<td>• Respect/understanding for other professional/organisational cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scope real issues</td>
<td>• Establish partnerships</td>
<td>• Joint fact finding</td>
<td>• Allow contingency</td>
<td>• Build trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define limitations</td>
<td>• Links with other plans</td>
<td>• Reality testing</td>
<td>• Group dynamic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Succession</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Manage conflict</td>
<td>• Management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Living document</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scoping issues (assessment)</td>
<td>• Scoping links</td>
<td>• Brainstorming</td>
<td>• Accept what is offered</td>
<td>• Express ambitions and frustrations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiate process</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint fact-finding</td>
<td>• Help in kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree ground rules</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reality-testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criteria/options</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mediators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5 Contd
5.4 Some Broad Findings

- there is widespread experience of participation over 30 years, particularly in the field of urban planning, in some European countries;

- partnership and participation are now key principles in other fields, including health, urban regeneration, countryside management, often with strong political support;

- it is important to distinguish between consultation and participation;

- participation if poorly managed, can fail, and should not be seen as a panacea;

- it is wise to focus on those most willing to be involved, but making sure key interests not excluded;

- genuine participation needs a high degree of commitment and leadership which is difficult to sustain;

- the most satisfied participants are likely to be those with clear objectives;

- it is important to remain adaptable and flexible;

- source of participation impulse may be ‘bottom-up’ or ‘top-down’ or mix;

- important to manage conflict through building consensus;

- when ‘total’ approach impossible, start with immediate opportunities and allow process to evolve;

- training, or capacity building, may be required by both professionals and other participants;

- strong support for taking decisions as locally as possible, based on locally determined issues.
6 Evaluation Criteria: Assessing Participation

6.1 General

To assist assessment of participation in the projects, two sets of criteria were developed: one based on the review of the quality of the participation process itself; and the other on the delivery of outcomes in so far as they have been influenced through participation. They point the way to the recommendations on procedures and mechanisms in Chapters 7 and 8. Process criteria are considered in this Chapter and project outcomes in Chapter 9. This chapter then concludes with some case studies.

6.2 Quality of the Participation Process

The process criteria have been derived from our findings of the study visits and questionnaires, from the literature review, and from experience elsewhere. They propose that successful participation should comprise:

- a clear and intelligible process
- fully representative
- open and transparent
- using relevant techniques
- with adequate resources
- and a commitment to shared learning

These criteria are set out in Table 6 overleaf together with sub-criteria which help to amplify the principles involved. A useful way of clarifying their use is to focus a key question on each in turn. This stimulates thought about the appropriate procedures and mechanisms. The checklists which follow Table 6 take the main criteria in turn, pose questions, and suggest suitable indicators of achievement. These were used in the survey to assess individual projects. It was from this system of interrogation that the recommendations on suitable procedures and mechanisms in Chapters 7 and 8 emerged.
### TABLE 6 - QUALITY OF PROCESS CRITERIA AND SUB-CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear Process</th>
<th>Representativeness</th>
<th>Openness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear strategy</td>
<td>core group</td>
<td>publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific steps</td>
<td>political support</td>
<td>communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient time</td>
<td>business commercial</td>
<td>accountable stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed rules</td>
<td>universities</td>
<td>information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexibility</td>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td>convenient venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>targeted approach</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>collective consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific participation modes</td>
<td>core funding</td>
<td>vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>targeted audiences</td>
<td>partner support</td>
<td>diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affordable/reliable</td>
<td>relevant skills</td>
<td>interactive style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting consensus</td>
<td>suitable training</td>
<td>holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skilfully managed</td>
<td>adequate time</td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measurable results</td>
<td>succession</td>
<td>objective review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUALITY OF PROCESS CRITERIA: POsing THE QUESTIONS - IDENTIFYING THE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. A CLEAR PROCESS</th>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>IS THERE A CLEARLY PRESENTED AND ENABLING PROCESS FOR PARTICIPATION?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A CLEAR STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Is there a clear and explicit strategy for participation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mode of participation described; strategy indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIFIC STEPS</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Have specific steps been identified as opportunities for involvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of steps/key opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUFFICIENT TIME</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Has sufficient time been allocated for response?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time allocated; number of opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGREED RULES</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Have the rules of procedure been generally discussed and agreed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timing and representativeness of decisions; open discussion opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLEXIBILITY</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Is the procedure sufficiently flexible to allow for unforeseen events, delays, conflict, new members?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledged in strategy, flexible in practice; rules for conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TARGETED</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Are the procedures and mechanisms appropriately designed to encourage and assist participation by all stakeholders, direct and indirect?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representativeness; mode of participation; response; impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITY OF PROCESS CRITERIA: POSING THE QUESTIONS - IDENTIFYING THE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. REPRESENTATIVENESS</th>
<th>Q. ARE THE STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED FULLY REPRESENTATIVE OF ALL KEY INTERESTS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE GROUP</td>
<td>Does the Core Management Group include all significant partners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><em>Degree to which following are involved; Lead Agency, Government Partners, other Agencies, etc</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>Do the projects have full political backing and institutional support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><em>Formal documentation; involvement of political bodies and politicians; arrangements for accountability; expressed support</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS/COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>Are the business and commercial sectors involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><em>Formal documentation; involvement in arrangements; expressed support; financial assistance</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITIES</td>
<td>Do Local Universities/Colleges have a major role?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><em>Degree of involvement, involvement in studies; commitment of staff and know-how</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td>Do NGO’s and other stakeholders have a fair chance to participate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><em>Level of involvement; convenience; attendance; expressions of interest; satisfaction with process</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Are there sufficient opportunities for the wider community, individuals and the general public?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td><em>Degree of feedback, appropriate mechanisms, expressed support.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUALITY OF PROCESS CRITERIA: POSING THE QUESTIONS - IDENTIFYING THE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. OPENNESS</th>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>IS THE PROCESS OPEN AND TRANSPARENT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLICITY</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Is the publicity effective in alerting stakeholders to their opportunity to participate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeliness, clarity, targeted, selected media, omissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Is good communication encouraged between and within organisations, and between the project and the public?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation skills, procedures, expressed satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Are stakeholders accountable to their constituencies on a regular and efficient basis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Records of project leaders, delays, monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Are data, reports, minutes, formal guidance, information as required, freely available and accessible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures, requests and responses, expressed satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONVENIENT VENUES</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Are meetings held in convenient and comfortable venues at reasonable times? Is assistance available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance levels of various groups; expressed satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMED CONSENT</strong></td>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Are decisions taken in an open and transparent way, through collective consent whenever possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction of participants; records of formal decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>ARE APPROPRIATE TECHNIQUES (PROCEDURES AND MECHANISMS) SATISFACTORILY EMPLOYED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC MODES OF PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>Are the techniques designed to assist specific modes of participation? If so, which?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Constructive response by Groups targeted; attendance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGETED GROUPS</td>
<td>Are the techniques designed for specific groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Response rate, expressed satisfaction by target audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFORDABLE RELIABLE</td>
<td>Are the techniques used affordable and reliable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Response rate, sustained interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSENSUS BUILDING</td>
<td>Do the techniques contribute to consensus building?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Shared working, shared decisions, win-win solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKILFULLY MANAGED</td>
<td>were the techniques skilfully managed and effective?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Expressed satisfaction, meeting targets, keeping to programme, quality of delivery and response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURABLE RESULTS</td>
<td>Are indicators available to measure success of techniques?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Check lists, counts, feedback, quantitative and qualitative indicators, monitoring systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUALITY OF PROCESS CRITERIA: POSING QUESTIONS - IDENTIFYING INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. RESOURCES</th>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>ARE SUFFICIENT RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO ACHIEVE EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORE FUNDING</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have all main sources of funding been tapped?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Levels of grant, % of overall budget, quality of programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have key partners and others contributed adequately and fairly to participation budget? % contributions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Assistance with staff, accommodation or equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELEVANT SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the core team have the relevant skills in facilitation and consensus building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Qualifications, experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do core team and key participants have access to training or induction courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Courses available locally or arranged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADEQUATE TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is adequate time available to plan, prepare and implement participation programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Duration of programme, opportunities to take part, response times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICIENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is there efficient use of resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Comparative statistics, matching costs with results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUALITY OF PROCESS CRITERIA - POSING QUESTIONS - IDENTIFYING INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. LEARNING</th>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>ARE ALL PARTICIPANTS, INCLUDING CORE GROUPS, FULLY COMMITTED TO LEARNING FROM EACH OTHER?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VISION</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have all participants committed themselves to securing the goals of ICZM?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Charters, contracts, memoranda of understanding, briefs.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING TOGETHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are all participants prepared to work together in a multidisciplinary manner, pooling their skills to develop mutually beneficial outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Structures and processes, integrated reports and studies, networking</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do the participants fully respect the wide diversity of interests and expertise within the coastal zone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Comprehensive focus on real issues, audits of interest, managing conflict.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACTIVE STYLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the process reflect the interactive nature of discovery, learning and response?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>A fluid, dynamic, evolving approach, action-oriented.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLISTIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the process acknowledge the holistic nature of environmental, economic and social issues and the need for an integrated approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Study reports, policies and solutions to problems, networking.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has the project developed and sustained an atmosphere of trust and commitment between partners, participants and the public?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Expressed satisfaction, supportive networks, management conflict?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does the process enable explicit review of its success to assist learning and improve performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Measurable results, indicators, expressed satisfaction, adjustments</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.3 Some Case Studies

As an example of the variety of approaches, the seven linked initiatives in the Gulf of Finland derive their legitimacy from the existing institutional framework for statutory land-use planning and have a clear focus on devising new policies along the coastal strip and among the archipelagos to harmonise the requirements of Natura 2000 designations with the growing demand for holiday homes among the tranquil waters. Participation in this case is an of the extensive consultation procedures which have been traditionally used. There is strong reliance on professional judgement and close political support.

Bantry Bay is the other side of the coin, an innovative approach which draws on the principles of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) to look especially at marine issues which have previously been handled (or ignored) in a somewhat remote fashion by sectoral agencies. Using a neutral facilitator, and extensive public participation, the project aims to develop a set of integrated policies based on the real needs of the community. A strong partnership led by the County Council provides the momentum for this approach.

A very different transnational project has been devised along the Algarve-Huelva border of Spain and Portugal, where 30 municipalities have formed together to devise innovative ways to tackle local issues with European funding. Less focused on the coastal zone as such, the process is very much an evolving flexible one with a strong lead from the project team working closely with the political alliance. Public involvement will grow out of the variety of issues as they emerge.

On the Dorset Coast a planning-led team has set up a wide range of topic groups crossing the traditional land-sea divide, drawing on the experience and knowledge of a wide range of expertise. Extensive consultation is taking place thorough well-designed topic papers which provide questionnaires for any response. A Coastal Forum with an independent chairman meets regularly to provide an opportunity for public discussion.

In Greece the Cyclades Project, comprising a group of islands in the Southern Aegean Sea, is led by the University of the Aegean. The management programme clearly relates the participation opportunities to the technical process, and places great emphasis on the direct experience of the island communities and their aspirations. Isolation and difficulties in communication have proved a major challenge to this project.

In the Ricama Project, on the Adriatic, it was decided that full involvement of all stakeholders was not possible at the start. Technical studies conducted in the first phase of the project will be used to provoke local debate with municipal authorities at a later stage.
7 Recommended Procedures

7.1 General

The following recommendations deal with the role of participation in the ICZM process. They are presented as a set of procedures or key principles based upon the survey findings, the literature and knowledge review, and the six key criteria for quality of process developed in Chapter 6. In Chapter 8 more specific mechanisms (or techniques) are reviewed with a view to their suitability for different tasks or stages in the process. Procedures are meant as general guidelines and are not intended to be prescriptive. The art of management is the ability to translate them into the appropriate mechanisms and techniques to suit particular local circumstances. How this may be done - drawing up a strategy - is discussed in para. 7.9. The chapter begins with a discussion on statutory procedures and legal requirements which underpin participation and access to information.

Definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURE</td>
<td>a formalised process, a series of steps to be followed, a way of doing something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANISM</td>
<td>a way of getting something done within a system, a proven technique for a specific purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNIQUE</td>
<td>a particular method of doing something, requiring a skill developed through training and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPLE</td>
<td>a general rule which guides how something should be done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Following Statutory Procedures

It is important to recognise that procedures and mechanisms may have a statutory basis either through European directives or national legislation. For example, there is a legal right to environmental information held by public authorities and other bodies under EC Directive 90/313. A forthcoming Directive is likely to establish public participation as an important component of Environmental Assessment. The European Community has also resolved to support the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, agreed at Aarhus, Denmark in June 1998.

Generally, law can encourage participation in a variety of active or passive ways, including:
1. Ensuring that laws and procedures that affect the public are clearly worded and well publicised.

2. Ensuring that laws which provide for participation do so at a sufficiently early stage in the decision-making process for the views of the public to be influential.

3. Providing statutory rights of public access to information (e.g. the EC Directive 90/313 on Access to Information on the Environment). However, the effectiveness of this depends on people taking the initiative to exercise their rights.

4. Imposing statutory duties on authorities or developers to publish information (e.g. the EC Directives 85/337 and 97/11 on Environmental Impact Assessment).

5. Imposing statutory duties on authorities or developers to consult specified parties and/or the public (e.g. the EC Directives 85/337 and 97/11 on Environmental Impact Assessment, and UK planning legislation on development plans and planning applications).

6. Establishing statutory advisory committees with a wide representative membership (e.g. some UK harbour legislation, such as the Chichester Harbour Conservancy Act).

7. Requiring the appointment of public representatives on decision-making bodies.

8. Imposing statutory duties on authorities to give reasons for their decisions (which should help to promote public understanding and also facilitate appeals against inappropriate decisions).

9. Providing statutory rights for third-parties to appeal against the decisions of authorities. (Although third-party rights of appeal are often legally limited to points of law, they are more effective if they can be used to challenge the policy merits of a decision).

The proposal for a Model Law on Sustainable Management of Coastal Zones prepared for the Council of Europe (1997 draft) contains proposals for public information and participation for the following circumstances:

- preparation of plans and general rules
- implementation of specific projects
- appeals
- information, education and research.
The European Union for Coastal Conservation (EUCC) have also published a European Coastal Code (1997 draft) embracing similar principles and opportunities.

Table 7 of this report summarises the key mechanisms that should be underpinned by statutory requirement as:

- public notification
- correct legal procedures
- right to information (including inspection of documents)
- freedom to provide written observations
- access to committees
- representation/appearance at formal inquiries.

The practice of these requirements varies throughout Europe. It is proposed, therefore, that future European guidance should ensure adherence to best practice.

7.3 A Clear Process

Opportunities for participation must be devised, agreed, and clearly set out, as an integral part of the overall planning and decision-making processes; wherever possible:

- a clear strategy for participation should be produced, with the support and agreement of key stakeholders;
- specific steps should be identified with appropriate mechanisms at each stage;
- sufficient time should be allocated for each stage to win trust and enable constructive response (‘the pace must suit the participant’)
- agreed rules should be established that explain the degree of involvement envisaged, the method of working, and the role of lead agencies and partners:
- flexible and realistic attitudes towards timing, unexpected events, unforeseen conflicts, admission of new members, political changes, etc are crucial to win and sustain trust;
- carefully target stakeholders, with both direct and indirect interests, to ensure fully representative involvement and suitable forms of communication.
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“The practice of sustainable development requires the full and systematic application of the principles of integration and subsidiarity. This can only be achieved with the active participation of all the players (political authorities, administrations, economic operators, scientists, the general public). Sectoral attitudes have to give way to co-operation. The most appropriate instruments, in particular information and co-ordination machinery, have to be devised”.

7.4 Representativeness

Programmes should provide adequate opportunity for the active involvement of all stakeholders, direct and indirect, in the overall process; in particular:

- The core group, or partnership, should include all significant stakeholders from the start;

- Clear lines of accountability and responsibility should be established with national local and regional political institutions;

- The active involvement of the business and commercial sectors should be encouraged, including ports, tourism, landowners, and the development sector;

- Universities and local colleges should be encouraged to take part;

- Every encouragement should be given to NGOs (non-governmental organisations) to play an active role;

- Sufficient opportunities should be provided for the wider community, including those indirectly affected, disadvantaged groups, and individuals.

The reluctance of certain stakeholders to get involved may reflect their distrust of the process, or the fact they do not see any need to get involved. Stakeholders may also be reluctant to invest their spare time and effort in ICZM if they fear that their views will not be heard, or will not have any impact on decision makers. To overcome this reluctance, it is important to open a dialogue, illustrate the commonality of long term interest (real or political) in sustainable management of the coastal zone, and demonstrate a real commitment on the part of the institutional partners to listen to the concerns of all stakeholders.
7.5 Openness

Good information, communication and publicity are crucial factors in open governments;

- the process should be open and transparent, and conducted in a fair and impartial manner on the basis of shared information, data, and knowledge;

- effective publicity, using all suitable media, should be skilfully used to alert local stakeholders, other agencies and community interests to the opportunity to participate from the earliest stage;

- good communication, using personal and electronic modes, should be encouraged between and within organisations and between the project, the media, all participants and the community;

- stakeholders of all kinds should be accountable to their organisations while retaining responsibility to actively participate in project activities on their behalf;

- minutes of meetings, agendas, reports and discussion documents and other information should be widely circulated and freely available in suitable forms for all participants;

Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development.

“Environmental issues are best handled with the participation of all concerned citizens, at the relevant level. At the national level, each individual shall have access to information concerning the environment that is held by public authorities, including information on hazardous materials and activities in their communities, and opportunities to participate in decision-making processes. States shall facilitate and encourage public awareness and participation by making information widely available”.

In the UK the National Planning Forum has issued guidance on the people’s need to know:

- What is being proposed, updated as amendments occur;
- How and when to comment in order to influence decisions;
- What has been decided and why.

They recommend that authorities should publicise in a local planning charter their arrangements to make information publicly available. Style, content, language, form, publicity, availability and timing should all be considered, together with scales of charges if at all.
• meetings should be held in convenient and comfortable venues at reasonable times;

• decisions should be taken in an open and transparent way through collective consent whenever possible.

7.6 Mechanisms and Techniques

Suitable techniques should be tailored to local circumstances, issues and the needs of all participants; in particular:

• relevant techniques should be devised and used to suit specific modes of participation: information-giving and information-gathering (as forms of consultation); shared working and/or decision making; degrees of empowerment;

• techniques should be designed with specific groups of Stakeholders in mind, and targeted to encourage their involvement;

• techniques should be both affordable and reliable, thereby sustaining trust in the process and avoiding breakdown in communication;

• techniques should assist and encourage consensus building by helping to develop co-operative relationships through a structured programme of involvement;

• participation opportunities must be skilfully managed by keeping to programme and promises, quality of organisation, and conduct of activities;

• measurable outcomes (indicators) must be sought in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

Effective communication is needed to prevent:

• unnecessary misunderstandings and conflict.

• confusion over responsibilities.

• difficulty in keeping to programme.

• frustration and uncertainty for participants.

• delays and extra cost.

• a poor image for the project.
Good communication, in turn, depends upon a successful mix of procedures and style involving:

- a clearly set out and intelligible process.
- a fully representative structure and organisation
- skilfully managed opportunities (mechanisms) for debate and discussion focused on building consensus
- sufficient resources for all participants to take part
- recognition of genuine diversity of interests and the need to listen and learn from each other.

7.7 Resources

Adequate resources - finance, skills, time - should be made available to ensure adequate provision for effective participation opportunities; it is important to:

- Tap all main sources of funding, national and international, using research capacity and sponsorship skills;
- Ensure key partners provide appropriate share of assistance in direct funding, staffing or accommodation and other assistance;
- Make sure that core team has all necessary technical and management skills, with effective leadership;
- Provide training and/or induction courses for both professionals and other participants;
- Allocate sufficient time in budget to plan, prepare and implement participation programme;
- Finally, to collectively ensure the continuation of the project and/or to develop a succession strategy.

A key principle is well expressed by the Isle of Wight: “it is difficult to ‘sell’ to politicians and others the concept of ICZM and to obtain funding for development and implementation unless key local issues of concern can be raised to provide examples of the way that ICZM can make a difference........we will be providing clear evidence of how significant environment, financial and political advantages can be obtained”.
7.8 Learning

Participants should acknowledge the need to fully commit themselves to shared learning, working to resolve conflicts, and building consensus; in particular:

• Committing themselves to a long term vision for the coastal zone, based on ICZM principles, which is strategic, flexible and non-prescriptive;

• recognising the diversity of coastal interests and associated expertise, experience and perspectives, including local experiential knowledge;

• working together in a multi-disciplinary manner recognising the interactive nature of discovery, learning and response;

• acknowledging the uncertainties of turbulent environments - complex problems, inconsistent and ill-defined values, with many players - and relish the challenge of continuous learning and adaptation in the search for holistic solutions;

• working to establish and sustain trust and ‘ownership’ throughout the exercise;

• finally, reviewing the process to ensure collective satisfaction with procedures and mechanisms and means for resolving conflicts.

7.9 Preparing a Strategy

Circumstances vary so much that there is no one specific way to develop a participation strategy. However, there are some general principles and steps which may be recommended for general guidance. Key principles include the need to:

• Consider the participation strategy at the same time as the technical programme so the two may be interwoven (see Cyclades Project Management Diagram);

• Involve as many stakeholders as possible at the beginning and win general agreement for the approach;

• Inform the wider community of their opportunities to participate when the planning process is ready to start;

• Be realistic, focus on what is essential, and be clear about what you intend to do. Remain flexible, but keep stakeholders informed;
Be aware of the procedural principles for process, representativeness, openness, techniques, resources and learning outlined in Sections 7.3 to 7.8. Following basic activities should be carried out. They do not necessarily run in sequence, and may overlap, and will need to be continually revisited:

(a) Scoping

(b) Involving all Stakeholders

(c) Type of Participation

(d) Defining the Process

(e) Creating the Participation Strategy

(f) Choosing the right Mechanisms

(g) Publicising the Programme.

(a) Scoping

Key proponents of the project need to have an early idea of the issues and stakeholders involved, likely costs and time frame. Meetings can then be held to win support and plan the programme (technical and participation).

(b) Involving the Stakeholders

To win and sustain trust it is important to involve all key stakeholders at the earliest possible stage. This can be achieved through the scoping study audit or through networking and contacts. A core group may wish to collaborate as funding partners. Alternatively a large forum of stakeholders may decide to elect a management committee to establish and supervise the programme.

(c) Degree of participation

It is important to discuss and agree the type and style participation at the earliest stage. Modes of participation may vary between minimal consultation through shared working to shared decision-making and degrees of empowerment. Different approaches may require different mechanisms. Various models exist which help to explain the options and around which programmes may be designed and mechanisms for involvement selected. As a result of the findings of this study a ‘partnership’ model has been adopted, acknowledging the following styles of participation:

- minimum legal requirements
• information-giving
• information-receiving
• shared working
• shared decisions
• empowerment/self-mobilisation

These are not to be rigidly separated, but to be seen as cumulative options, each stage dependent on those prior. Thus together information-giving and information-receiving comprise conventional consultation, while genuine participation builds on these while moving towards joint working and shared decision-making.

Most of the demonstration projects were sharing the middle ground with varying degrees of involvement using a variety of conventional mechanisms. Devon/Cornwall has explicitly adopted a revised version of the model known as the ladder of participation extolling the virtues of the ‘bottom-up’ approach to local empowerment. In practice both ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ approaches will be required; indeed a recent study stresses the important factors are the linkages established and the quality of the networks. It is also important that decisions should be taken at the appropriate scale. It is for these reasons that this study prefers to stress the need for a partnership approach between all sectors, national, regional and local, breaking down the hierarchical terminologies implied by the ‘bottom-up’ approach. An alternative model is the ‘wheel of participation’ which avoids the concept of the ladder, noting that different types of participation will be equally valid for different situations. The important thing is to be clear about what is required so the appropriate mechanisms can be used.

(d) Defining the wider process

Once the degree of participation has been resolved (although it may have to be re-addressed as the project proceeds and future demands are made), the steps of the process can be defined in concert with the technical programme. To assist this process, the Bantry Bay project, for example, has devised a series of inter-connected Work Programmes with Key intersections between Stakeholder Roundtables, Alternative Dispute Resolution procedures and technical studies. A simple but effective programme is the one devised by the Cyclades project, previously illustrated, which highlights a series of opportunities for wider participation at various stages.

(e) Creating the participation strategy
This step entails defining the overall objectives and approach to the participation programme. This should involve:

- identifying key stakeholder groups and the mechanisms for their involvement;
- key factors or cultural/social challenges associated with target groups;
- locations and settings for public participation activities;
- suitable mechanisms for specific activities/events;
- assembly and allocation of budget/staff skills and time;
- extent of publicity;
- description of programme, which might include:
  - introduction and aims
  - study area and project description
  - decision-making framework
  - range of stakeholders
  - information needs/key issues
  - participation mechanisms to be employed
  - milestone dates and schedule of main activities
  - budget and financing plan.

For a complex project, sophisticated programming techniques may well be used as a management tool for the Steering Committee, core partnership, and key stakeholders; however, a simpler version, such as the MARIA leaflet for the Ria de Aveiro Project, will be necessary for more general circulation.

(f) Choosing the right Mechanisms/Techniques

There are a wide range of possible mechanisms, classified according to the form of consultation/participation envisaged. Key issues to be considered include:

- Level/degree of participation considered appropriate (by whom?);
• Type and number of stakeholders, levels of environmental awareness, education, technical knowledge, social status, level of interest;

• Nature of the project - complexity and technical nature of the information to be disseminated, and discussed;

• Available resources - including finance, time, staff and skills.

These can be expressed in tabular form in terms of the issues expressed. Equally, a schedule can be drawn up ensuring adequate time to solicit views at various stages.

Chapter 8 presents and evaluates many of the mechanisms in use and provides a series of frameworks to assist choice. A useful technique is to draw up your own criteria and use a grid to score each mechanism against them. This can provoke discussion - selection is not a science and frequently emerges from informed discussion.

(h) Publicising the Programme

Once the strategy and programme have been agreed by key partners, and initial scoping work on issues and basic information have been completed, a Project launch may be held, providing an opportunity to alert the general public to the project through the various organs of the media, including press releases, TV opportunities, public meetings, leaflets and summary reports. The show is now on the road, and will require skilful management of all resources to deliver the promised programme.

A good strategy encouraging participating should:

• be more than a piece of paper - it should convey the style and tone of the process intended;
• it should set out the general ground rules for co-operation;
• be fully representative of all stakeholders;
• be open and transparent in proceedings;
• be flexible in operation;
• have sufficient budget for what is intended.
8 Choosing the Right Mechanisms

8.1 General

It was recommended in the previous chapter, para 7.6, that techniques/mechanisms for ICZM should be:

- appropriate for a specific mode of participation
- tailored for specific groups/occasions
- reliable and affordable
- focused on consensus-building
- skilfully managed
- with measurable results

Building on these principles, this chapter seeks to:

- present and evaluate individual mechanisms that may be used for various purposes in the strategy (8.2).
- provide a series of frameworks to help select the appropriate mechanism (8.3)

8.2 Review of Mechanisms

The review summarises most of the mechanisms used by projects in the demonstration programme, and some which could be. They are presented in the same order as the classification in Table 7. For each of five modes, six possible mechanisms/techniques are described and evaluated using the following criteria: purpose, method, target audience, advantages/disadvantages, reliability, feedback potential, resources, and relation to the overall strategy. Examples of case studies are also given.

8.2.1 Mechanisms for Information Giving

Newsletters

Purpose: to provide regular information on project progress for partners, key stakeholders, and general public.
Method: organisation acts as editor and publishes at Key Stages of process, explaining project details, opportunities for involvement, key issues and stakeholders, details of meetings, web sites, etc. Distributed to interested parties, libraries, town halls, Post Offices, etc. Can also be displayed electronically on homepages. Must be punchy and well written.

Target Audience: direct partners, key stakeholder organisations, general public, whoever registers an interest. Content must be targeted and relevant. Bi-lingual requirement if necessary.

Advantages: sets scene for dialogue, opportunity for all to contribute, strong image for project, can be co-ordinated with web-site.

Disadvantages: open-ended commitment, can suffer from ‘fatigue’ if process extended, may use too much professional terminology.

Reliability: needs composite policy on content, style, circulation and continuity, mailing list helpful.

Feedback: information should raise awareness and encourage participation if presented imaginatively. Can invite feedback.

Resources: regular input for editors (time); production costs cheaper with desk-top publishing (money); requires professional communicators to design and write (skill); bi-lingual presentation can be expensive (e.g. Wadden Sea - 4 languages).

Comments: a useful tool of communication used by many projects, but must be attractive, relevant, accessible and clear.

Case Studies: well-designed, imaginative newsletters are used by:

Rio de Aveiro: Boletim Informativo do Projecto MARIA

On the Wadden Sea the Newsletters are available electronically on their homepage.

Exhibitions

Purpose: to provide information about project and stimulate interest in key issues, especially to general public and schoolchildren.

Method: presentation of material through display, including boards with photographs, sketches and plans of proposals and the current situation, leaflets on how to participate, models, films and video. A static
exhibition may have a permanent base or project office and house a small lecture theatre. Mobile exhibitions may locate in libraries, shopping centres and village halls. Care needs to be taken on timing.

**Target Audience:** general public, but can be adapted for various groups.

**Advantages:** can be seen by whole community, opportunity to imaginatively present context and issues, useful for distributing newsletters, leaflets, and questionnaires or as back cloth to meeting, staff can directly answer questions and attract interest.

**Disadvantages:** may be poorly attended, not all venues equally attractive, can use up a lot of project time.

**Reliability:** difficult to match targeted audience with suitable venue, can be poor attendances.

**Feedback:** probably produces few additional responses.

**Resources:** can be expensive according to quality.

**Comments:** a useful resource when co-ordinated with wider programme.

**Case Study:** Strymonikos Project has an exhibition housed in Information Centre near popular beach as a focus for educational role and local awareness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Purpose: dissemination of information to public from project drawing attention to need for action, opportunity for involvement, stages of process, key issues, significant events.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Method: provision of information for relaying to public via newspapers, local radio or TV, including press releases and advertisements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Target Audience:</strong> general public or young people, key stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advantages:</strong> large potential audience, relatively easy/cheap, good for public relations, raises awareness, provides information, can be associated with launch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Disadvantages:</strong> uncertainty over how media will use material; may not use it at all, get story wrong, or stress conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reliability:</strong> unreliable, especially TV and radio, placing advertisement is one option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback: depends on approach and design adopted: with newspapers best to use special supplement with cut-out requesting further information; also with TV/radio, phone-ins or studio discussion.

Comment: good PR skills required with experience in exploiting opportunities, results may be disappointing, e.g. scatter gun.

Case Study: Bantry Bay have nominated officer to undertake this work. Algarve-Huelva have public relations officer.

Summary Reports

Purpose: while full planning documents - on key issues, topic reports, options, draft plans - may be made available for key stakeholders, summary reports are a useful way of disseminating information about the Project, and may evoke responses from the wider community.

Method: summary reports should be written in simple non-technical language, be relatively short and attractively produced. They can be made available through postal distribution, by request, or collection in public places.

Target Audience: general public and participative groups.

Advantages: useful to identify key issues and easy to produce, useful public relations, wide coverage.

Disadvantages: takes time and money to produce, may over-simplify, may encourage responses of various quality.

Reliability: can ensure access to chose group(s) by mail.

Feedback: likely to be mixed quality, can include questionnaire.

Resources: varies with degree of detail e.g. number of topic reports. One estimate of distribution suggests £40 per 1,000 by mail. Needs good writing skills.

Comment: probably works best with targeted groups on specific issues, otherwise very expensive, stakeholders likely to want full documents.

Case Study: Dorset Coast have produced Topic Reports including questionnaires. Rade De Brest have produced useful summaries of information. Firth of Forth have also distributed summaries.

Videos
Purpose: to support presentations at meetings, to circulate to interested parties or the media. Can be designed to provide imaginative illustration of key issues and current situation.

Method: film taken to illustrate key issues, with suitable commentary for target audiences.

Target Audience: usually for general public and schoolchildren.

Advantages: effective at stressing particular messages; can cover issues e.g. marine, rarely seen by public; familiar medium - can have different voice-overs; can reach people with reading difficulties; can be seen at home; can be made by any local group or school children.

Disadvantages: inflexible once made, likely to be expensive, may be superficial.

Reliability: proper targeting essential, important to provide clear brief to film-maker/editors.

Feedback: mainly for awareness-raising.

Resources: time needed for briefing, tendering, assistance to film-maker requires special skills.

Comment: must be part of wider procedures, not stand-alone; probably dates quickly; cheaper and more flexible to use traditional slide presentations, can be linked to CD-ROM.

Case Study: the Clyde, Loire, Severn, Tyne and Wear have co-operated to produce a CD-ROM on Estuary Management (Contact: Sunderland City Council).

G.I.S.

Purpose: GIS (Geographic Information Systems) electronic processing allows Projects to set up their own Websites providing information on relevant issues in a form which allows direct access or interrogation by individuals or organisations. Thus it is an electronic alternative to collecting or delivering reports and documents in their traditional form.

Method: a Website is set up by project containing various datasets, e.g. protected areas, which may be printed as required. Access will be direct or via PCs installed in public places within the community.

Target Audience: the growing number of people with access to the Internet, especially schoolchildren and organisations.
Advantages: large potential audience, raises awareness and provides open access to data, positive image.

Disadvantages: intimidating medium for many sectors of population, needs constant updating to remain relevant, can be expensive and impersonal.

Reliability: system can crash.

Feedback: direct dialogue can be established via E-mail.

Resources: can be expensive to set up and maintain.

Comment: fashionable to pursue, but user satisfaction requires validating.

Case Study: many projects are establishing GIS, including a community-based one at Bantry Bay, based on local libraries. For Wadden Sea the Tourism projects has its own homepage (http://cwss.www.de).

8.2.2 Mechanisms for Information Gathering

Information Centres

Purpose: to provide convenient access point for the exchange of information with the general public; to raise awareness through physical presence in community. May be run by full or part-time or seasonal staff. Can be housed in shopping centres, libraries or with project office. May have exhibitions, including models, video films.

Target Audience: general public, group representatives.

Advantages: provides focus for discussion, good PR, raises profile in community, good base for networking, opportunity for education role.

Disadvantages: only reaches a percentage of public, expensive and time consuming for unreliable rewards, may intimidate public.

Reliability: variable.

Feedback: intermittent, possibly through questionnaires.

Resources: potentially expensive depending on duration, premises, staffing and extras.

Comments: more valuable if focused on specific short term action, can have wider education role such as Strymonikos.
Case Study: Strymonikos.

Questionnaires

Purpose: to provide comments and feedback on a range of information including details of consultee, their prime concerns, views on issues and/or baseline information. An audit of interests may use a questionnaire to help start the participation process.

Method: Surveys are normally topic based, focused on issues, with specific targets. The Severn Estuary Strategy used a questionnaire to invite responses to their Issues Report. Questionnaires may be designed for self completion or with the help of an interviewer. Questions can be framed in a range of forms, eg. ticks in boxes or yes/no, or open. They should be drawn up with analysis and sampling in mind.

Target audience: tends to be general public, but may include any/all stakeholder interests. Can accompany other opinion testing.

Advantages: easy to target, but using interviewers may produce better results, good basis for discussions and decisions if well devised - which is specific skill.

Disadvantages: to be effective questionnaires must be skilfully prepared and executed, will need pilot testing, analysis my be time consuming.

Reliability: varies

Feedback: good, as long as well structured with sensible questions.

Resources: time and money considerable.

Comment: a good technique at any stage if carefully designed for specific purposes.

Case Study: A questionnaire used by the Severn Estuary Strategy is shown overleaf.

Audit of Interests

Purpose: sometimes known as Stakeholder Analysis, the Audit is to establish who the key stakeholders are, their aims and interests, networks, statutory powers, and key concerns. This will ensure the Project does not omit anyone and will have a basic understanding of the broad range of concerns involved in the area. It is sometimes made part of the Scoping Study.
Method: stakeholders are identified through existing contacts and networks, and are usually interviewed to establish key details and concerns. This may include a questionnaire. The process intended can also be explained and initial observations received. At this stage key partners who wish to fund the project may be identified. Reluctance to join in can also be addressed at an early stage.

Target Audience: all those with a genuine interest in the coastal zone.

Advantages: provide initial contact, winms confidence, contribute to scoping report.

Reliability: systematic survey with good questionnaires is required.

Feedback: excellent, prepared way for conveying stakeholder’s committee.

Resources: moderate

Comment: A very helpful starting point for any project

Case Study: Clyde Estuary, Devon and Cornwall, Wadden Sea.

Public Meetings

Purpose: to provide information to a wide cross-section of the population, to develop support for a project, to provide feedback from public.

Method: usually an open meeting in a convenient location, suitable for presenting material and also holding discussion. Provides an opportunity for questions, responses, and agreement on procedures. Objectives must be clear, meeting well-publicised and managed, possibly with a neutral chair. Seek circular seating arrangements and other means to reduce barriers and encourage people to participate. Important to let people know what will happen afterwards.

Target Audience: general public

Advantages: if goes well is good PR, genuine opportunity for genuine exchange of views, can lead to topic groups and other more suitable mechanisms.

Disadvantages: conflicts may get out of hand, requires skilful handling, discussions can be dominated by strong personalities, many people intimidated by numbers, difficult to keep to agenda, poor vehicle for introducing new ideas.

Reliability: very unreliable and depends on who turns up.
Feedback: usually mixed and not representative.

Resources: needs careful presentation, provision of venue, handling of agenda, time-consuming but sometimes necessary.

Comment: other mechanisms such as Stakeholder Forums, Round Tables, Topic Groups, organised to assist consensus building, are preferable mechanisms.

Case Study: most projects, sometimes with workshops.

Workshops/Focus Groups

Purpose: to involve relatively small numbers of people in discussions on particular topics, to obtain views via open discussion. May require facilitators or reliable chairpersons. Sometimes used at public meetings to ‘break the ice’ and encourage wider discussion, sometimes as a ‘one off’.

Method: a number of approaches are possible with various degrees of formality. Always best to explain and reach agreement on aims, agenda and procedure.

Informal: sessions may entail circular seating arrangements or rearranging chairs from a general public meeting or round table session, following outline of procedure from chair. Feedback may be required on issues, opportunities and/or priorities, possibly by appointed rapporteur. Membership of groups may be allocated or volunteered.

Formal: sessions may involve techniques to brainstorm ideas such as SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) to consider priorities or foster exchange of experience. High-trust-level groups may be initiated using trained facilitators with group members working in threes (triads). Here, two persons interview the third and after 5 minutes switch roles, allowing each individual to articulate issues and so on. Eventually priorities are struck between all groups to enable priorities for open discussion to be decided, possibly returning to groups to do so. Wall charts or notice boards can be helpful for recording decisions.

Target audience: those who turn up are chosen, or volunteer.

Advantages: encourages ‘grass roots’ to express views; people feel views are valued; can be very creative; flexible, targeted debate, possibly less
confrontational, involves interested and well informed; helps start common outlook.

Disadvantages: a ‘one-off’ may arouse expectations that can’t be met; needs careful management, continuity and follow-up, depends on quality of facilitation; doesn’t necessarily represent a balanced point of view.

Reliability: variable, depending on range and selection of those available.

Feedback: depends on ‘people’ involved and arrangements.

Resource: staff time, skills, venues.

Comment: useful in a range of contexts, e.g. smaller community sessions, to break up larger meetings, sometimes known as scenario workshops.

Case Studies: Severn Estuary Strategy used this technique at public meetings; also Bantry Bay found it worked well at Stakeholders’ Round Table.

Conferences

Purpose: meeting usually held over one or two days to enable detailed study of issues and practice in a structured way, often involving outside experts or emissaries from other projects.

Target audience: open meeting, but generally attracts professionals, key stakeholders, informed campaigners.

Method: may be considered under five main headings, showing shift towards participation in conference planning and management:

• planning the conference: participants to be involved from the start; spread responsibility; devise flexible programme based on soundings.

• delegate approach: based on interactive participation, formal and informal, emphasising vision not problems, consensus-based.

• managing the conference: be fluid, take risks, assist creativity and response.

• conference procedure: foster pooling of knowledge, assist networking, work towards consensus, provide information boards for displays.
other developing approaches are known as Consensus Conferences where a citizens panel is the main actor throughout, deciding key aspects of debate, selection of witnesses and formulating its own conclusions (see Citizen Juries).

Advantages: can promote links between public, experts and politicians; enables study in depth; puts information into public domain; helps learning from experience elsewhere.

Disadvantages: not always structured to help resolve differences, sometimes too formal, passive; may be too expensive for NG0’s, speakers may be dull.

Reliability: depends on quality of speakers, venue, content and procedures.

Feedback: can be self-financing, otherwise expensive, involving expenses, fees, venue, equipment, printing.

Comments: important way of putting project on national or international map.

Case Studies: Solent Forum Science Conference, Greek Projects Conference December 1998

8.2.3 Mechanisms for Joint Working

Networking

Purpose: the process of making contacts through meetings and conversations, the printed word, or increasingly through electronic media such as the Internet. It is self-organising, prompted by concern to get to know how an area works by involving all relevant interest Groups and Agencies through direct personal contact, rather than through normal bureaucratic channels. Electronically it can also assist the sharing of experience at any scale whatsoever, eg. global, European.

Target Audience: evolves, as more is learnt about community of interest

Method: networking may be informal adjunct to normal professional working practice, or may have distinct roles such as:
• maintaining data-bases of known individuals and other networks (as with Wadden Sea)

• telephone trees whereby groups of people have responsibility for building up contacts.

• searching out information

• regular forum meetings by network members, inc. video conferencing.

It is important to be clear about requirements and focus on priorities.

Advantages; it encourages sharing of information and concern
it exploits enormous potential of electronic communication
it may reach contacts that would otherwise be missed
it can enhance importance of personal contacts
it taps into existing networks that already exist
it is dynamic and flexible and encourages learning
it supports Agenda 21 and calls for ‘jointed Government’

Disadvantages: it may increase reliance on non-physical contact and impersonal modes of communication
its success may depend on outward-going personalities
does not necessarily lead to structural information gathering
information may rapidly grow out of date

Reliability: provides access to a wide population but responses need treating with caution as contacts may provide mis-information particularly on complex issues with which they are not fully conversant. Care needs to be taken, for example with E-Mail contacts.

Feedback: can be excellent stimulus to collaborative working and greater synergy but needs discretion.

Resources: Partly an attitude, also exploits opportunities provided by electronic media already available.

Comment: networking may be seen as a tool of communication, an organisational philosophy or as new life style emerging at the millennium.

Reference: M Carley and I. Christie’s ‘Managing Sustainable Development, Earthscan 1994.'
Case Study: A networking approach has been adopted by the Devon and Cornwall project. Following an analysis of existing networks, the Wadden Sea Project decided to establish Net Forum with the aims of securing cross-border communication, stable contacts vertically, and integration into existing democratic structures.

Planning for Real

Purpose: to discover and discuss community aspirations.

Method: people are encouraged to identify issues of concern, with facilitators on hand to assist as necessary. The information is then recorded on flip charts so everyone can see what has been suggested. Participants are then given coloured spots to spend on the issues most important to them, two spots per category. This visual record is used by staff to prompt discussion on the key issues.

Target audience: general public

Advantages: face to face discussion, awareness raising, platform for community ideas, wide involvement.

Disadvantages: risk of raising expectations, may require lots of local meetings, expensive in officer time, publicity etc., difficult to achieve consensus.

Reliability: tends to attract the articulate and professionals only.

Feedback: quality of ideas may be mixed, with unresolved issues; works best on specific, geographically defined problems.

Resources: considerable time in organising, setting up, managing, and analysing, plus hall hire, basic materials. Needs good management/communication skills.

Comment: a suitable technique for local community involvement in wider issues. Useful at early stage of process. Similar to community mapping.

Case Study: Used by Magnesia Project. Similar to community mapping

Topic Groups

Purpose: to bring together invited stakeholders to discuss topics or issues of common concern and help develop policies to deal with them. May arise from needs identified in wider forum with requirement to report back after a series of meetings.
Method: to encourage open discussion, ideally with aid of neutral facilitator. Key steps might be to agree agenda and membership; explore key concerns and issues; elaborate broad objectives; assess further information required; decide work programme for individual reports and discussion at next stage; analyse results and make recommendations for draft policies to be considered in wider forum.

Target Audience: specific stakeholders and/or those with concerns, especially competing interests.

Advantages: Strong body of expertise able to explore issues and differences in detail in atmospheres conducive to problem solving:

- dispels fears of ‘hidden agenda’
- regular contact allows for continuity of discussion
- if successful builds ownership and commitment to outcomes.

Disadvantages: may become a talking shop

may exclude those with less direct interests

difficult to ensure fair representation over time.

Reliability: reaches those invited who have time and capacity to respond

Feedback: good quality discussion over time - given good facilitation and programming.

Resources: time: organising meetings, minutes, reporting back.

Money: extra staff time, facilitators fees.

skills: facilitation experience.

Comment: a valuable tool for projects with complex issues and many stakeholders. Develops partnership working. Need to ensure groups have mixed interests.

Case Studies: Dorset Coast Forum has successfully used this technique (see overleaf).

Community Mapping
Purpose: special meetings arranged to involve local people in describing and mapping their local environment, recording natural or historic features, needs, opportunities for action, etc.

Usually organised at start of planning process to involve local communities and encourage discussion.

Target Audience: all local residents and interested parties

Advantages:
- uses local expertise, may include schools and colleges
- simple and attractive way of recording information.
- increases local awareness of issues.
- focus for discussion.

Disadvantages:
- may be seen as an end in itself.
- needs confidence to participate.
- requires skilful handling.

Reliability:
- variable information may need checking

Feedback:
- useful record that may guide future work

Resources:
- relatively inexpensive.

Comment:
- Sometimes called community profiling. May lead to expectation of continuing involvement.

Case Studies:
- Technique used by Cyclades Project for mapping resources of each island with local inhabitants.

Multi-Attribute Analysis

Purpose:
- to provide a means for aggregating disparate information on environmental impacts into a single, common measure, working with relevant stakeholders.

Method:
- comprises four steps
  - problem structuring and identification of interested parties.
development and application of a scoring or rating system to predicted impacts.

application of a weighting system to indicate the importance of one impacted category as compared to another;

the aggregation of weighted scores into an overall measure of impact.

In order to aggregate scores across impact categories a three-stage approach can be adopted: normalisation of impact scores to a common base of, say, 100; specified weights are then applied; followed by another round of weighing relating to a wider range of criteria, such as sustainability of statutory duties.

Target Audiences: informed stakeholders and relevant professionals.

Advantages: Often used as an alternative to cost-benefit analysis, allows weights reflecting different viewpoints to be examined explicitly.

Disadvantages: difficulties surround which weights are to be used, who decides and how to develop a consensus. Can mystify rather than illuminate.

Reliability: danger of technical experts imposing views;

Easy to manipulate scores, or create spurious objectivity.

Feedback: Aggregated scores may obscure genuine difference of opinions.

Resources: considerable time and expertise to prepare, explain and organise key interests to provide time to respond.

Comment: not suitable for wider discussion on complex issues, but may provide guidance if carefully focused.

Case Study: used by Environment Agency (England and Wales), for example, to assess impacts of water quality benefits arising from different water quality improvement schemes for a particular estuary or coastline. Categories affected might include informal recreation, bathing, pleasure boating, shell fisheries, conservation and amenity.

Simcoast

Purpose: transfer of information relating to management of coastal zone between resource managers scientists and resource users, using PC-based
format to provide guidelines for coastal development programmes in order to minimise conflicts.

**Method:**

the sustainable management model involves analytical techniques based on an information database, coupled with a computer programme to monitor impacts and decisions. It uses neural networks, expert systems and genetic algorithms. Using fuzzy logic, outcomes can be expressed in natural language.

**Advantages:**
draws together expert knowledge from different fields within one system to show impacts and information which can be used in policy decisions. Catalyst for thinking?

**Disadvantages:**
focused on experts and users, could oversimplify, requires high management/technical expertise to operate.

**Reliability:**
unlikely to be of sustained use ‘in house’, more likely a ‘one off’.

**Feedback:**
information can stimulate consideration of key issues in new perspective.

**Resources:**
could be expensive.

**Comment:**
pilot use needs examination and review

**Case Study:**
proposed use by Cornwall/Devon, similar to model used by The Algarve Project (Ria Formosa).

### 8.2.4 Mechanisms for Shared Decision-Making

**Consensus Building**

**Purpose:**
a participation process where stakeholders work together to try to reach a result which has benefits for all, known as win-win. It is an alternative to adversarial confrontation, and an approach to decision-making and implementation which must permeate all stages of the process.

**Method:**
the approach generally is one where:

- all parties are committed to finding consensus if this is at all possible
- a clear open and transparent process enables all to participate
• the group is fully representative of key stakeholder interests

• information is shared

• a common vision is devised and agreed

• special techniques to foster consensus are used, e.g. planning for real, future search.

Within this framework a process for preparing a plan or strategy may be devised which builds on mutual trust at all stages.

Target Audience: all stakeholders in ICZM process

Advantages: • can break down blinkered professionalism and narrow sectoral interests.

• people confront the problem and not each other.

• participants seek ways to satisfy each others needs.

• can develop new solutions to old problems, builds on common sense.

Disadvantages: • procedure may collapse amidst acrimony.

• can led to polarisation.

• may over formalise procedures.

• key interests may withdraw.

• may evoke over ambitious expectations.

• can lead to mediocre comprises, may require specific conflict resolution

Reliability: techniques must be appropriate to issues and skilfully managed. Durability under voluntary agreement questionable. May require Charter or Contract.
Feedback: depends upon first-class communication and good information sustained throughout process including implementation.

Resources: dialogue and participation may account for 30% - 50% of expenses.

Comment: underlying philosophy of many voluntary projects, sustained results need monitoring and evaluating.

Case Study: the Cybestuaries model based Project, on the Clyde, Loire, Severn, Tagus and Wear Estuaries Project, recommends the following steps inter-relating technical and consensus building processes:

- Intervention (Gaining Commitment)
- Description (Sharing Information)
- Analysis (Using Topic/Issue Groups)
- Planning (Seeking Consensus)
- Implementation (Acting Together)

References: The Cybestuaries CD-ROM is available from:

Sunderland City Council, Environment Department, P O Box 102, Civic Centre, Sunderland, SR2 7DN, UK

e.mail: cybestuaries.sund@dial.pipex.com

website: http://dspace.dial.pipex.com/cybestuaries.sund

Partnerships

Purpose: partnership are set up to run things, and their form will reflect the purpose of the project and the nature of the task. They may be formal or informal, may embrace all those contributing in some way, or may refer only to those formally comprising a core group responsible for overseeing the management of the project. Sometimes the partnership principle - a collective of organisations and persons working closely together towards agreed goals - may be expressed in the form of a Roundtable of Stakeholders (Bantry Bay), or Contract (Contrat de Brest), as a Forum (Wadden Sea), with its associated structures and processes: possibly an executive board, a representative steering committee, topic groups, and an Annual Meeting.

Target Audience: key players in project.
Method: generally the arrangements will be developed and agreed through discussion by key parties and ultimately through wider discussions with community groups and their representatives. Regeneration programmes will usually require the establishment of formal structures, but for smaller, simpler tasks, informal structures may be appropriate. Three key factors should determine approach:

- purpose of the partnership, e.g. representative, managerial, executive
- need for partnership, e.g. multi agency approach to key issues
- powers, e.g. responsibilities of key statutory bodies, inc. funding

Advantages: builds commitment to project and process at start, helps develop consensus-building and shared decision-making, provides clear image for community, springboard for wider networking, identifies clear structures and responsibilities for action, useful vehicle for attracting and bidding for funds, should provide framework of support for implementation, encourages collective decision-making.

Disadvantages: requires good managerial skills to sustain momentum, may be difficult for statutory bodies to share powers, core partners may become too inclusive, over-reliance on good-will and compatible personalities, may require extensive training for community representative, can become unwieldy and lead to power vacuum.

Reliability: depends on commitment, expertise and adherence to principles.

Feedback: depends on successful interaction at all levels and between:
- Members of core group; core group and steering committees;
- working groups and the wider community; politicians, experts and general public.

Resources: a key expenditure upon which hangs successful project.

Comment: form of partnerships in EC demonstration project vary enormously, depending on local institutions, national framework, scale, type of issues, and distinct cultures.

Case Studies: Rade de Brest, Wadden Sea, Dorset Coast, Strymonikos.


Roundtables
Purpose: ongoing meetings of a representative group which steers project, develops ideas, explores issues, seeks consensus, usually led by independent facilitator who provides guidance.

Target Audience: stakeholders and key interests/agencies faced with conflicts and wishing to build consensus.

Method: operates through a consensus building process initiated by lead body confronted with conflict. Members are appointed by the sectoral bodies which they represent and are expected to actively participate:

- members must keep their bodies informed.
- members and alternates may participate fully in any working groups.
- technical advisors may assist with information
- observers may attend if it is so wished
- facilitators assist in building consensus, prepare summaries of each meeting for ratification
- and ensure compliance with Ground Rules of Roundtable which may:-

  seek agreement by overwhelming number of members without formal vote.

  allow for facilitators to explore avenues to reach agreement with dissenters, known as Alternative Dispute Resolution.

Advantages: wins support of stakeholders to process and outcomes, ensures everyone’s views are heard and given equal consideration, provides avenue for resolving disputes outside courts, helps develop networking between organisations, dispels fears of ‘hidden agenda’.

Disadvantages: can be lengthy business, can be disproportionate to issues encountered, may be unable to attract all key stakeholders or agencies, continuity of membership may be difficult, may become a talking shop, some issues beyond remit of those involved.

Reliability: outcomes may be challenging to authority with unforeseen consequences; needs skilful facilitation.
Feedback: clear recorded statements by Forum should assist suitable action.

Resources: an expensive process possibly stretching over years, requiring experienced skills and management.

Comment: a mechanism being increasingly used, particularly in North America. Still innovative and experimental.

Case Study: Bantry Bay Project is using procedure seeking multiparty agreement as basis for Bantry Bay Charter. Main issue concerns conflict between mariculture interests and other stakeholders around the bay. Dorset Coast Forum assembles all stakeholders to discuss and confirm recommendations for strategy prepared by topic groups.

Citizen Juries

Purpose: a way of involving informed citizens in judging on public policy issues of their choice. Usually conducted as part of a forum or consensus conference.

Target audience: informed citizens representing broad social and scientific spectrum.

Method: a citizens panel is selected from the general public, questions witnesses (or ‘experts’) on a chosen topic, assesses the responses, discusses the issues raised, and reports conclusions to a press conference. Key Stages might include:

• set up advisory committee to oversee whole process
• select a pool of witnesses from scientific, social and ethical fields
• recruit representative citizens panel following widespread advertisement
• preparatory weekends for panel to identify key questions and witnesses
• consensus conference for actual event
• final report, press conference and dissemination

Advantages: encourages public interest in public issues, fosters local democracy, provides broader context for narrow expertise, opens up new channels of communication between politicians, experts and public, attracts wide media coverage.
Disadvantages: complex to organise, may lead to greater polarisation, takes considerable time to execute, possibly 9-12 months, next step not always clear, may exclude disadvantaged groups.

Reliability: requires skilled facilitation

Feedback: may be clear or equivocal, but still requires response from key public agencies.

Resources: expensive: skills, time, venues, publicity.

Comment: pioneered by Danish Board of Technology, a body of growing experience now exists in the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, France and UK. The UK’s Second National Consensus Conference will be held in 1999 (contact UK CEED on FAX 44(0) 1223 367794 or E-mail: bulletin@ukceed.org)

Future Search/Open Space Technology

Purpose: to enable organisation and communities to improve operations through ‘high energy’ participation, learning and commitment to action in situations of complexity and uncertainty.

Method: an appropriate theme is set, invitations issued, facilitator chosen, with suitable venue. Participants gather in a circle, write their individual issue down and pin it to bulletin boards. Next, they sign up for topics they wish to discuss. Results of this are placed on Newsroom wall, for discussion on appropriate action and commitment.

Target audience: general community, organisations, specific tasks.

Advantages: fast results with short lead times, can delivery action proposals, shared visions, secure wider resources, enhanced networking.

Disadvantages: need professional facilitation, raises expectations, difficult to secure continuity.

Reliability: encourages wide involvement, good track record.

Feedback: needs careful analysis and follow up for ICZM.

Resources: considerable time in organising, setting up, managing and analysing, plus venue hire, basic materials. Need good communication skills.

Need: a great stimulus to community involvement at early stage, but outcomes will need careful managing.
8.2.5 **Mechanisms for Empowerment**

**Conflict Resolution**

**Purpose:**
To resolve conflicts, existing or potential, by reaching agreement, or consensus, through voluntary collaborative problem-solving; thus reducing delay and cost of alternative legal procedures; also to overcome facilities, build trust and develop win-win solutions. It is a generic term to describe a mechanism regarded as an aspect of consensus building.

**Methods:**
A range of approaches exist which can be classified along a continuum from little or no intervention by third parties towards special assistance or formal arbitration. Specific technique/skills for each are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• topic groups</td>
<td>• conciliation</td>
<td>• facilitation</td>
<td>• dispute panels</td>
<td>• arbitration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• community mapping</td>
<td>• capacity building</td>
<td>• mediation</td>
<td>• policy analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• audit of interests</td>
<td></td>
<td>• negotiation</td>
<td>• juries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• multi-criteria analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ADR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first two approaches, stakeholders communicate directly with each other, jointly diagnosing problems, exploring solutions and opportunities, and moving towards their own agreements. Procedural Assistance (3) may involve a neutral facilitator who actively assists conflict resolution by steering the negotiation process or through direct mediation on the substantive issues. Other approaches usually involve...
third party experts or arbitration. Mechanisms for neutral facilitation and ADR have separate entries overleaf

**Target audience:** depends on analysis of conflict and stakeholders; stage in project cycle; stage of conflict; legal and institutional context; resources available; political realities.

**Advantages:** if managed well, at the appropriate stage, it can free energies towards a more collaborative approach; if not, then more formal arbitration will be required. It can be a flexible tool, and reduce polarisation of issues and resources to long legal wrangling with associated costs.

**Disadvantages:** technique can exacerbate local difficulties and may be a sledge hammer to crack a nut. The work ‘conflict’ needs to be used with care, as conflict is a normal process in society and is not something necessarily to be eliminated. All change poses challenges and may be welcomed as an opportunity by some, feared as a threat by others.

**Reliability:** not guaranteed, depends on depth of conflict, skill of facilitators, and desire to reach agreement.

**Resources:** expert, or experienced, skills; time; money.

**Comment:** most projects rely on goodwill of stakeholders and their own communication skills; conflict may be avoided where projects prepare a framework strategy to provide a context for key decision-makers through normal processes, thus avoiding direct conflict.

**Case Study:** Bantry Bay is only project employing ADR (Alternative Dispute Resolution), using consultants, a decision taken early on in the light of long-standing dispute over mariculture consents.

**Neutral Facilitation**

**Purpose:** Professional facilitators must ensure impartiality in creating opportunity for constructive dialogue between all participants, helping to clarify points and issues, and seek ways to resolve conflicts, encourage creativity. A trained technique or skill which some other professionals may master.

**Target Audience:** all stakeholders with direct or indirect interest in resolving issue.

**Method:** Facilitator will normally steer a series of open meetings at different stages of the ICZM process, gradually developing trust by:
• maintaining neutrality (no expressed preferences).

• keeping meeting focused (on time, clear, following agenda.)

• using active listening techniques (relating ideas).

• acknowledging feelings as valid communication.

• stating problems in a constructive way

• suggest procedures or mechanisms which may help resolution.

• summarising and clarifying (seeking agreement)

• preparing and circulating minutes

She/he will remain non-judgemental + maintain positive attitude.

Advantages: as an ‘outsider’ should be able to develop collective trust.

brings experience

allows genuine expression of ideas and feelings from all sections.

Disadvantages: as an ‘outsider’ may be unclear about context and nuance of some issues.

may not always be available when required.

if process fails, who picks up the pieces?

regulatory bodies often suspicious of loss of control and may not join in.

Reliability: depends on quality of skills and complexity of issues.

Feedback: should be clear and useful, on the record.

Resources: can be expensive.

Comments: facilitation is a growing professional field - its relevance to ICZM issues require monitoring and assessment. Success is reliant on many factors, not always within control of process.

Case Study: Bantry Bay Charter involves ADR (Alternative Dispute Resolution) based on neutral facilitation. Facilitators steer Stakeholders Roundtable.

ADR (Alternative Dispute Resolution)

Purpose: a process by which a neutral third party seeks an acceptable solution to a dispute. It is different from negotiation which seeks compromise between the parties through confrontation.

Methods: there are four variants:

- **mediation** where both parties agree to use a neutral third party who suggests ways to reach agreement over three stages: Statements of cases; the caucus where separate confidential discussions are held with each party and the review where the mediator suggests possible courses of action.

- **conciliation** where the third party evaluates the cases, takes a view as to the ‘best’ solution and seeks to lead parties towards that solution.

- **adjudication** where the disputants present their facts on each issue in turn and the adjudicator makes a series of recommendations.

- **early neutral evaluation** where parties agree to be heard before an appointed judge who gives an unofficial verdict

Target Audience: parties to the dispute

Advantages: it can resolve long standing conflicts and save the time and money that full legal action would cost.

Disadvantages may make problems worse in genuine interests. Cannot always handle political values and process.

Reliability: can be useful in well-defined dispute, but still an innovative process in public fields such as ICZM.

Feedback: can be clear results that enable progress in other spheres.

Resources: extended discussions can be time-consuming and expensive, but may be a worthwhile risk compared to full-scale litigation.
Comment: still a highly innovative process outside traditional areas such as the building industry, but nevertheless being tested in certain aspects of planning disputes in UK. Conflict habits and disputed issues can be confronted within Projects in other ways.

Case Study: ADR being tested through neutral facilitation in Bantry Bay Project over issue of disputed mariculture rights.

Delegation

Purpose: to empower local projects and their staff.

to organise, manage and implement activities within prescribed boundaries, rules or agreements; in effect, a transfer of power on the lines of subsidiarity principle to where action and responsibility is best located.

Method: local empowerment through memoranda of understanding, legal agreements or through budget control, specifying delegated powers and duties.

Target Audiences: specific projects, local agencies, key staff and personnel.

Advantages: reduces bureaucracy and remote management; enhances responsibilities of local offices, creates greater synergy at local level if sufficient freedom is granted.

Disadvantages: may encourage parochial view and narrow sense of delegated tasks; may create tensions at strategic level.

Reliability: depends on terms of agreement and quality of staff.

Resources more expensive, but may enhance local accountability.

Comment: in line with trend towards devolution, decentralisation, and more flexible organisations.

Case Study: -

Local Initiatives (Bottom up)

Purpose: often generated by NGO’s or local action groups, local initiatives frequently challenge a response from the regulatory bodies charged with statutory responsibilities working at higher levels of authority. Such initiatives may provide a powerful challenge to formally constituted Projects and to central and local government because they
seek empowerment to resolve their own problems through active involvement of local Stakeholders. The concept of ‘bottom up’ challenges the traditional hierarchy of centralised control and the idea that professionals always know best.

Method: Action committees are generally formed to explore problem, scope issues, and seek involvement of statutory bodies, either to join them or to resolve problems with or without their help. Finance, via grant aid bids or shared funding may then assist.

Target Audiences: Formal statutory organisations, local stakeholders and wider public.

Advantages: Locally based enthusiasm may be channelled into creative project with support of public bodies.

Disadvantages: Power and responsibility may be a stumbling block, with increasing polarisation and entrenched hostilities. Raises the question as to who is in charge, participation on whose terms? May be seen as a threat to authority.

Reliability: If consensus on approach and management can be achieved, positive outcomes are possible. Dependent on quality of leadership and sustained interest.

Resources: mostly for voluntary sectors possibly topped up by public money.

Comment: NGO’s are increasingly working closely with Governments, the trick is to fuse their passionate concern with formal processes. This is not always possible, but can be done successfully, as in Ceredigion below:

---

**CASE STUDY : CEREDIGION HERITAGE COAST, WALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marine Heritage Coast</th>
<th>Special Area of Conservation (SAC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-statutory</td>
<td>Habitats Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community led</td>
<td>External influences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EC Demonstration Programme on ICZM
Participation in the ICZM Processes:
Mechanisms and Procedures Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Bureaucratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best practice/local experience</td>
<td>Scientific Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area-based</td>
<td>Species-based (dolphins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Both arrangements operate in parallel, with inter-relations skilfully managed by Ceredigion County Council, and local forum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity Building

Purpose: to enhance institutional capacity in field of ICZM; also to provide information and training for stakeholders and community interests to empower them to participate more fully with trained/articulate professionals and politicians in order to improve decisions. May also provide professional training on ICZM, sustainability and participation.

Method: provision of training courses on specific topics, including public procedures, public speaking, group dynamics, conflict habits, marketing etc.

Target Audience: professionals and volunteers, possibly all stakeholders on specific issues. Institutional training will increase local capacity for effective ICZM in both professional and voluntary spheres.

Advantages: also helps create a more level playing field for the articulation of issues, particularly for disadvantaged or inarticulate; helps to reduce tension.

Disadvantages: conflict habits may be endemic in all sectors and discussion may be resisted.

Reliability: depends on quality and skills of educators and facilitators.

Feedback: should raise quality of discussion and debate.

Resources: time and money can be considerable; possible role for local colleges, other stakeholders; also requires major commitments in time from disadvantaged, and costs of travel, etc.

Comment: needs to be done with diplomacy and tact. Could be self-organised by voluntary groups using NGO support.
Case Studies: Thames Estuary Strategy devised strategy to reduce conflict habits. Magnesia Project arranged training for relevant professionals in all departments of local government.
8.3 Frameworks for Choice

Five frameworks are presented below to stimulate thinking about which mechanisms are best to use for different purposes, and in different circumstances.

(a) Mechanisms by Modes of Participation (Tables 7)

This framework categorises mechanisms according to the type of participation/consultation it is intended to use, based on whether the key function is:

- information giving or gathering (consultation)
- joint working
- shared decision - making, or
- degrees of empowerment

To these have been added a list of key requirements in meeting statutory obligations.

(b) Involvement of Groups for different Modes (Table 8).

Table 8 indicates how different modes of participation imply different types of group investment. Different mechanisms maybe selected for each situation. The table is not prescriptive, each project must decide its own pattern of communication.

(c) Modes and Mechanisms for Key stages (Table 9).

Again different mechanisms may be required at different stages of the process. Table 9 prompts thought as to which type of mechanism might be suitable for particular modes.

(d) Mechanisms for different Scales of Plan (Table 10).

Scale of plan is also important for the selection of mechanisms as the final table, Table 10, taken from ‘Coastal Planning and Management’ by Kay and Alder, demonstrates. This shows that the same techniques are not necessarily applicable at all scales.

These frameworks are presented as learning tools. In practice the decisions on which mechanisms to use, will also be based on the merits of each mechanism as discussed in the next section, and their function within the strategy.
TABLE 7: TECHNIQUES - MECHANISMS BY MODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 MINIMUM LEGAL</th>
<th>2 INFORMATION-GIVING</th>
<th>3 INFORMATION-GATHERING</th>
<th>4 SHARED WORKING</th>
<th>5 SHARED DECISIONS</th>
<th>6 EMPOWERMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Public notification</td>
<td>• Newsletters</td>
<td>• Information Centres</td>
<td>• Networking</td>
<td>• Consensus building</td>
<td>• Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Statutory procedures</td>
<td>• Exhibitions</td>
<td>• Questionnaires</td>
<td>• Planning for real</td>
<td>• Partnerships</td>
<td>• Neutral Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Right to information</td>
<td>• Media</td>
<td>• Audits of interest</td>
<td>• Topic groups</td>
<td>• Round tables</td>
<td>• ADR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to committees</td>
<td>• Summary reports</td>
<td>• Public meetings</td>
<td>• Community mapping</td>
<td>• Citizen Juries</td>
<td>• Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Written observations</td>
<td>• Videos</td>
<td>• Workshops/focus groups</td>
<td>• Multi attribute analysis</td>
<td>• Future Search</td>
<td>• Local Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Representation at hearings</td>
<td>• GIS</td>
<td>• Conferences</td>
<td>• Simcoast</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8: INVOLVEMENT OF GROUPS FOR DIFFERENT MODES OF PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE OF PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>DIRECT PARTNERS</th>
<th>OTHER REGULATORY BODIES &amp; NGO's</th>
<th>INDIVIDUAL STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>GENERAL CONSULTEES/PUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Legal</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information-Giving/-Receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Together</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding Together</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Should do  
** Possible  
*** Likely  
**** Essential  
? Questionable
### Table 9 - MODES AND MECHANISMS FOR USE AT KEY STAGES OF ICZM PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY STAGES</th>
<th>TARGET GROUPS</th>
<th>KEY MODE</th>
<th>POSSIBLE MECHANISMS/TECHNIQUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Description</td>
<td>Direct Partners, Regulatory Bodies</td>
<td>Information Giving</td>
<td>Newsletters Media Releases Exhibitions/Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGO’s</td>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audit of Interests Public meetings E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Analysis</td>
<td>All including general consultees</td>
<td>Information Sharing</td>
<td>Workshops Community Mapping Topic Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working Together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletters GIS Round Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus - Building</td>
<td>Direct Partners Regulatory bodies</td>
<td>Shared Decisions</td>
<td>Networking Conflict Resolution Planning for Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Community Groups NGO’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus Building SIMCOAST Citizen Juries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Implementation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Information Giving and Gathering</td>
<td>Suivi Groups Partnerships Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Key stages in heavy print involve participatory involvement, lighter print signifies the essentially technical nature of the process, although regular information flows are required between the two.
### TABLE 10 MATRIX OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION TECHNIQUES IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Regional scale plan</th>
<th>Local scale management plan</th>
<th>Specific development Proposal</th>
<th>Discussion/background paper</th>
<th>Policy statement</th>
<th>Technical paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUP TECHNIQUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Consultative Committee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Consultative Committee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Conferences</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Forum</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Meeting</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design-In</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUAL TECHNIQUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Submission</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Discussion</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with affected Residents</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Contact</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Office</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys and Questionnaires</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Polls</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Hotline</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: R = recommended; O = optional; NA = considered not applicable

Table taken from ‘Coastal Planning and Management’ by R Kay and J Alder (E & FN Spon 1999).
8.4 General Comments

The survey of demonstration projects showed that the most widely used mechanisms were the more conventional ones, such as topic groups, working parties and public meetings. Most innovatory has been Bantry Bay, using Alternative Dispute Resolution, a Stakeholders Roundtable and neutral facilitation. This approach has won widespread commitment to the project, and has allowed detailed conciliation to proceed. Generally, many new approaches are being devised and need to be assessed for their relevance. These include:

- deliberative polling
- people’s panels
- co-operative discourse
- mediation groups
- new forms of public meeting
- tele democracy
- team syntegrity
- Imagine!
- participating theatre
- guided visualisation
- community indicators

Innovations will continue to develop and spread. A useful reference is ‘Participating Works’, by the New Economics Foundation.
9 Second-Stage Questionnaire and Findings

9.1 General

Two questionnaires, A and B, were sent or handed to 20 Project Leaders in October/November 1998 with a request to complete A directly and to seek support of key stakeholders in completing B. The purpose of this was to assess both project and stakeholders’ perspectives on the quality of the participation process and its success in achieving or moving towards a range of deliverables or outputs:

- commitment to ICZM goals
- focus on real issues
- integrated policies
- information sharing
- commitment to joint action
- political support

Replies were received from 8 projects including a number of stakeholder’s responses. The limited response may be due to the intensive stage of work within the projects who may be felt it was too early to assess outcomes or to language difficulties, or problems of communication over a distance. However, the responses received have proved illuminating and a general summary of main points based on the original questions are presented below. The projects responding were Bantry Bay, Cyclades, Dorset, Down, Firth of Forth, Gulf of Finland, Kent and Strymonikos. These findings have also been corroborated from a number of further visit to projects, including Gulf of Finland (return visit August), Barcelona (September), Naples (November), Bantry Bay (return visit November), and Rio de Aveiro (return visit January 1999).

9.2 Findings

Generally

- most projects were satisfied with their management of the process, although stakeholders were more cautious, preferring to await outcomes.

- widespread involvement was generally achieved, but there were difficulties in involving industry/commerce, tourism, key regulators, isolated participants, and indirect stakeholders.
Without any participation I am sure we would not have got this plan ready at all. Specially the landowners have been very active - Project Consultant, Gulf of Finland

- projects value need for participation of all parties, but stress importance of involving key agencies particularly at national or regional levels.

- while valuing widespread involvement, community-based groups also stress need to take regulatory agencies fully on board.

- there was concern over available resources for the project stage and for the prospect of continuation and implementation.

- positive attitudes to learning were expressed, but it will inevitably take time to overcome professional barriers and develop community capacities.

- it was too soon to evaluate outcomes although there was good support for general ICZM goals, realistic focus on key issues, and sharing of information.

- critical issues remain support for integrated policies, political and interagency interest, and resulting commitment to joint programmes of action.

- conventional mechanisms such as committees, topic group and workshops seem to work well but required considerable commitment of resources.

- public meetings and opportunities for local involvement in working groups and projects had been well received.

- few projects could specify tangible results in problem-solving

- cultural and/or physical circumstances could strongly influence results and needed special attention.

Because of particular constraints - distance, number of islands, stakeholders not represented on a regional level, insufficient communication, transportation etc., it was not possible to hold many and frequent meetings - Cyclades Project

Problems

Amongst the difficulties encountered were:

- Historic legacy of bureaucratic and legal incompetence.
• major local issues going through decision processes that the project was unable to influence.

• unwillingness of some regulators or government departments to become involved or empower their local representatives to participate.

• sectoral attitudes of EC programmes and need for guidance on participation and integrated strategies.

‘EU could perhaps promote carrying out of strategic management plans for coastal zones. Participation of all levels, sectoral administration and NGO’s should be emphasised’ - Rolf Nyström, Gulf of Finland

• professional skills cannot always cope with the sheer diversity of issues that need to be understood, presented, discussed and evaluated.

• it is relatively easy to sign up to and support a broad vision before detailed implications are known.

• size of committees, distinguishing key players to keep steering group to manageable size.

• difficult to sustain involvement of local stakeholders if progress is limited.

• discovering what information is held.

Stakeholders:

• welcome opportunity for involvement, recognise aspirations of participation, but some wish to await results before evaluating.

• have difficulty in securing continuity of attendees, feedback to their organisations, and commitments over the long haul.

• are aware that initial enthusiasm may be replaced by participation fatigue.

• that all their efforts may be of no avail if the variety of government agencies at all levels do not fully support, help to sustain the process and commit themselves to outcomes
‘Ensure ‘bottom up’ community ownership and that ownership is integrated with statutory actions’ - Down Stakeholder.

- Should be encouraged to network with stakeholders from other demonstration projects and share their experiences.

‘Encourage visits of all partners of the network to different sites which have specific problems’ - Community Leader, Cyclades

- have difficulty with terminology and jargon and sometimes find Newsletters too dull.
- find that what is clear and intelligible to project managers may appear complex, intermittent and confusing to ordinary stakeholders and lay people.
- welcome opportunity for capacity building through training, workshops and financial support for their own initiatives and involvement.
- advice to other stakeholders: get involved, get up to speed!

Lessons:

- get commitment of all key agencies/partners at the very start, and keep it that way.

‘Meaningful participation by the relevant regulatory bodies is necessary to convince stakeholders to stay in process’ - Bantry Bay Project Leader

- focus on opportunities as much as problems, but be realistic about expectations.
- remember that sustainable development applies not only to environmental protection but communities’ well being and jobs as well.
- leadership is a valid and valued commodity from whatever source.
- do not underestimate the capacity of environmental awareness of the general public and contribution their experience may make.
The Kent open forum on indicators showed the value of local experience and how indicators can relate goals to reality, that is legitimise the vision - Kent Project Officer

- value electronic media but do not underestimate the importance of ‘the personal touch’
- take care about confidentiality of stakeholder information.
- a discrete package of action, at an early stage, can increase commitment and public visibility.

The establishment of our Information Centre in the area increased confidence of the local people to the project, and gave an impulse to the local authorities - Strymonikos Project Officer.

- remember that producing a strategy is only the first step, its the action that follows that counts.
- conflicts of various kinds in the process must be expected and conflict managed sensibly without panic.
- Well-focused capacity building exercises for both institutions and individuals may be required.
10 Conclusions

10.1 General

This final Chapter bring together the various threads of the study - the visits, the questionnaire responses, the research, the discussions - to a set of key principles and general conclusions. The Key Principles provide specific advice to project teams, stakeholders, national government and the European Union on best practice for participation arising from the conduct and experience of the 35 demonstration projects on ICZM. The final Conclusions seek to distil the diverse experience into a set of general findings.

10.2 Key Principles

The following key principles are recommended for ICZM initiatives seeking to engage in intensive participation with all parties:

- statutory rights and obligations on access to environmental information must be respected, applied, and upheld in the field of ICZM.

  these include public notification; compliance with statutory procedures; right to document inspection; access to committees; opportunity to express views orally or in writing; attendance at public hearings.

- there must be a clear strategy for participation, agreed, and simply set out, as an integral part of the overall planning and decision-making process.

  this will set out specific opportunities for involvement; mechanisms/techniques to be used; a flexible timetable; agreed rules; and clearly target relevant audiences/groups.

- programmes should provide adequate opportunity for the active involvement of all stakeholders, direct and indirect, and the wider community.

  relevant stakeholders will normally include a core group of partners; other national or regional administrative agencies; the business and commercial sector; education; NGO’s; and the wider community. More specific interest groups can be involved in relevant working parties or topic groups.
• the process should be open and transparent, conducted in a fair and impartial manner on the basis of shared information, data, and knowledge, using all suitable media. Some conflict should be expected and managed.

• *The medium is the message* - good publicity and communication are essential, both electronic and personal. To develop ownership and commitment to supportive actions by all parties needs trust and co-responsibility.

• wherever possible, stakeholders should participate responsibly in proceedings on behalf of their organisations, working towards collective agreements and actions. Good leaders are essential.

• for many hierarchical and sectoral agencies, and for municipalities, this can be a difficult requirement; the process may need to be flexible to accommodate delays in communication with superiors. Extensive training may be required.

• every effort should be made to win political support and work closely with existing local institutions.

  some initiatives are set up by agency partners, with NGO’s or universities, and are not closely related to local political institutions. Political support may be crucial for sustaining the momentum and securing implementation.

• suitable mechanisms should be tailored to local circumstances, issues, and the needs of all participants, focused on consensus building.

  for successful participation, attention to detail is critical: a suitable time, a convenient venue, a welcoming layout, access for the disabled, a skilled and enthusiastic chairperson, a clear procedure, officers used to public speaking and listening, plenty of time for participants to respond, with refreshments before and after.

• respect the spirit of place; its special character and variety need to be protected and/or enhanced through close involvement of local people.

  Policies ultimately impact upon places - landwards, marine or inter-tidal; from chalk cliffs to muddy estuaries, from wetlands to wide waterways. Places are where people live, work, visit and play, and to which they attach enormous affection.

• adequate resources - finance, time and skills - should be sought or made available.
there are many sources to be tapped, including: key partners, EU programmes, local commerce, lotteries, public agencies, sponsorship, colleges, voluntary assistance by NGO’s. Encourage lead agency to act as a magnet, gain political support, devise a fund raising strategy, draw on local ideas, devise competent bids, disseminate news of progress.

- participants should commit themselves to a long term vision for the sustainable coast, recognising their diversity of interests and working together in a process of shared learning.

over-riding passionate concerns, professional blinkers, and narrow scientific interests, can all prevent shared learning. Management of change in a world of growing uncertainty demands transdisciplinary study, integrated responses and innovative action. This can create anxiety so strong creative leadership will be required, plus the ability to reflect on progress.

- participation should not be focused on problem solving-alone, but also at securing opportunities for economic prosperity and conservation compatible with wider sustainable development goals.

Projects should not merely be re-active to problems, but pro-active in securing greater economic, social and environmental benefits. Many people work in coastal areas - in the fishing industry, in tourism and leisure, in industrial installations and maritime urban areas - ways must be found be found to sustain both jobs and environment, and to hear their voices.

10.3 General Conclusions

Current practice is varied and complex due to a host of local, regional, national and international factors and circumstances. Nevertheless, study results do suggest the important role that participation has to play in establishing a foundation for the improved co-ordination/concertation that is essential to ICZM. But as the findings below make clear, participation in turn will require effective institutional support at all levels and through all sectors.

PARTICIPATION IS ESSENTIAL TO ICZM

So long as ICZM is a voluntary process, multi-stakeholder collaboration through participation will be the pre-requisite for integrated solutions. ‘Without participation it is an academic exercise’ - Magnesia. Through participation is it possible to proceed improved co-ordination and concertation
IT COMES IN MANY FORMS - IT IS DIFFICULT TO BE PRESCRIPTIVE

According to scale and complexity of issues and the institutional context, participation may range from forms of consultation through joint working to shared decision-making and various degrees of empowerment. Structures of organisation and approach will vary greatly, evolving from local circumstances and best practice.

IT REQUIRES PARTNERSHIP OF STAKEHOLDERS AT ALL LEVELS

Evidence strongly suggests that without the commitment of national and regional public bodies, the goodwill of local partnerships may evaporate. Representatives from these bodies must be encouraged to exercise their responsibilities as partners of the project. Charters, Contracts, Protocols, or Memoranda of Understanding may be useful ways of doing this.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AT COMMUNITY LEVEL NEEDS CAREFUL SCRUTINY AND SKILFUL MANAGEMENT

At certain scales of activity public participation at the local community level may not be cost-effective. Other forms of representation may suffice, as was the case on the Firth of Forth project. Where it is considered important suitable mechanisms must be chosen such as topic groups, working parties, well-conducted public meetings, or other more innovative techniques. It should be kept as simple as possible.

IT MUST BE PLANNED AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE ICZM DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

To ensure openness and transparency, and the interchange of information at appropriate stages, the project must incorporate the participation element into a carefully devised procedure and timetable.

NATIONAL CULTURAL DIFFERENCES DO EXIST AND MUST BE RESPECTED

Some projects build on traditional land use planning practices through extensive consultation and involvement with stakeholders. Elsewhere, where local participatory democracy is not practical and NGO’s sometimes few in number, local projects have been keen to use ICZM to foster new democratic practices.
CONVENTIONAL TECHNIQUES ARE MOST FREQUENTLY USED AND FOUND TO BE SOUND AND RELIABLE METHODS OF ACHIEVING PARTICIPATION

However, innovative ways of securing greater interest and involvement do exist, especially to involve the public, and are being introduced by some projects. These should be monitored closely for their success.

ICZM IS A GOOD VEHICLE FOR IMPLEMENTING THE TWIN EU GOALS OF SUBSIDIARITY AND INTEGRATION

Many initiatives have been prompted by concern at local levels that coastal issues are not being addressed in an integrated fashion. The Demonstration Programme projects already show the value of joint working at local level and the need for integrated policies at national and European level.

GOOD INFORMATION NOURISHES THE PARTICIPATORY PROCESS

The practice of sound science based on empirical investigation remains essential, but in many cases outcomes are uncertain. A recent Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution report in the UK points out that in many cases science must engage with the wider community to allow political values to be assigned. Participation may play a key role in this respect.

PROFESSIONAL SKILLS CANNOT ALWAYS COPE WITH SUCH WIDE RANGING AND DIVERSE INTERESTS

Coastal management, to be effective, needs to cover an enormous range of topics and interests, and it may be difficult both for professionals and other stakeholders to understand the issues.

INDIVIDUAL TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING WILL BE REQUIRED

A range of options may be required from individual training, professional capacity building, through to the courses in ICZM and related topics. Serious consideration may also need to be given to institutional strengthening.

PARTICIPATION IS DIFFICULT TO SUSTAIN IN THE LONG TERM

There is always a risk of fatigue by Stakeholders once key issues and actions have been determined. Regulatory bodies will always be required to monitor and operate their respective functions to sustain the process.

PROJECTS MAY NEED TO PLAN THEIR EXIT OR SUCCESSION STRATEGIES AT AN EARLY STAGE AS A PRECAUTION
Depending on the purpose of the project and its long term funding, early consideration on how the process may be sustained in the future must be considered at an early stage. Both Magnesia and Kavala projects have strategies to assist and encourage the local authorities and other agencies in continuing their work.

RESOURCES ARE LIKELY TO BE LIMITED

Statutory duties usually attract a high priority for public spending. If ICZM remains a voluntary commitment there will undoubtedly be difficulties in attracting finance. Sources of finance are summarised on page 32 and principles in paragraph in 7.7.

ASPECTS OF PARTICIPATION ARE NOW BECOMING A STATUTORY REQUIREMENT THROUGH EU AND NATIONAL ACTIONS

A range of legal instruments exist at European level which can be used to promote participation in ICZM, including Directives, Council Resolutions and Decisions.

The Aarhus Convention of June 1998, signed by the European Communities as well as by all of the individual Member States of the EU, now will ensure access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters. It will come into force as soon as it has been ratified by at least 16 of its signatories.

PARTICIPATION IS NOT A PANACEA: IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD, ICZM NEEDS INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AT ALL LEVELS

• from the EC through clear guidance and funding support to national governments on the frameworks and procedures required for sustainable management of the coast and the supporting role of participation and access to information;

• from the Government of Member States through national strategies and guidelines with active support for collaborative actions at the regional and local levels with funding support;

• and from NGO’s and their international bodies and partnerships by stimulating concern, awareness, involvement and collective action.
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