

# Stakeholder Mapping Tool Review

## Public Engagement Tools

TABLES Project 2012: Mini reviews	
<b>Guidance</b>	<i>Using your experience and expertise, consider the following tasks in relation to the tool. It may not be possible to complete all tasks for each tool due to a lack of available information, the task not applying to the tool, etc. <b>Please note where this is the case by writing in the reason in the space provided.</b> Please use a maximum of 6 pages of A4 (excluding diagrams and appendices). <b>Your responses are required in the white spaces.</b></i>
<b>Task 1: Basic information</b>	
<b>Name of the tool</b>	Stakeholder mapping
<b>Type of tool (list all that apply)</b> <i>Learning and skills (pedagogic); participatory; regulatory; collaborative; mapping; valuation; modelling; decision; futures; financial; ecosystem services</i>	Financial/economic, valuation, decision, ecosystem services
<b>Group members</b> <i>(minimum size 3 members, must include a BCU rep)</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mark Everard</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Please provide a brief synopsis of the tool</b>  <i>This may include: background context, development (and ownership if appropriate), current use and applications etc.</i>  <i>Please also note any desired outcomes of the tool so that you can make reference back to these in Task 7: SWOT analysis</i>	<p>Policies or practical decisions are only as robust, and serves all of society, as the quality of engagement in its development. Our historic approach to making decisions has been to defer it to 'experts' or political leaders. Breaking with this 'top-down' tradition, and as reflected in the ecosystem approach, as well as inherently more equitable to engage stakeholders early in the process of decision-making; merely announcing predetermined decisions or 'consulting' on a few options with associated sunk political and economic costs and consultant preferences tends to marginalise wider potential benefits.</p> <p>Using an ecosystem services framework to identify these different facets of the ways in which ecosystems function, and their associated beneficiaries or victims, provides a systemic approach to assess potentially affected stakeholders. This includes both the 'usual suspects' but also those historically omitted from consideration of impacts.</p> <p>Bringing that greater breadth of forms of knowledge and value systems into the decision-making process helps ensure that the outcomes of decisions reflect the interests of more in society, and thereby may be more robust and deliver more benefits per unit investment, as well as better-accepted.</p> <p>Stakeholder mapping using the ecosystem services framework is therefore a valuable tool that should ideally be applied right from the problem identification stage through to options identification, options appraisal and selection, and right through implementation and adaptive management throughout the life of the scheme or decision.</p>

Task 2: Use of the tool			
<b>Position / Use</b> <i>If you can, please indicate which stage(s) of the decision / policy making process your tool is / could be used in (these stages were identified in the specification document)</i>	<b>Stage</b>	<b>Currently used</b>	<b>Could be used</b>
	Ideas	Rarely, and rarely on ES basis	Yes
	Survey	No	Yes: different service users
	Assess	Rarely, and rarely on ES basis	Yes
	Policy / decision	Rarely, and often bluntly consulting with ‘usual suspects’	Yes
	Implement	Rarely, and rarely on ES basis	Yes
	Evaluate	Rarely, and rarely on ES basis	Yes, to inform adaptive management
<p>As highlighted in the table above and the introductory description, stakeholder engagement should occur throughout the decision/policy-making process. Mapping of the stakeholders on an inclusive basis, using the framework of ecosystem services, should therefore take place in the first (Idea) stage.</p>			
Task 3: Existing literature about the tool			
<b>Are you aware of any KEY policy and / or academic literature evaluating your tool?</b> <i>(e.g. reports, journal articles, books)</i>	<p>There is a lot of literature around stakeholder mapping though there is little evidence on how it engages with the EA/ES at present.</p>		
Task 4: Your experience of working on the tool			
<b>Have you done any research/consultancy work on this tool in terms of its development, testing and/or evaluation?</b> <i>If so, please provide an outline.</i>	<p>Stakeholder mapping is widely-practices in South Africa to ensure that all potentially-affected voices are heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark Everard and many others have done stakeholder mapping around various schemes in South Africa (relating to water supply).</li> <li>• Mark has also done stakeholder mapping in relation to PES development in India (around ecotourism).</li> </ul>		
<b>Guidance</b>	<p>For Tasks 5-7, please also try to consider the <b>future</b> development and application of this tool in the TABLES project in your answers.</p>		
Task 5: Incorporating the ecosystem approach (EA) and ecosystem services (ES)			
<p><b>**Please refer to the summary text about ES for concept clarification at the end of this template (appendix)**</b></p>			
<b>Using examples (from practice, research or consultancy), explain how EA and/or ES are currently</b>	<p>At present, stakeholder mapping is too often still based on the ‘usual suspects’ and also done retrospectively. This entails such shortlisting as ‘statutory consultees’ assuming that democratically-elected and publicly-funded officials have the vision and interests of all in society in their mind and at heart. A nice ideal, but one often at odds with practical reality!</p>		

<p><b>incorporated in/by the tool</b></p> <p><i>If neither approach is currently incorporated, please move to the next question</i></p>	<p>It is the intent of the Convention of Biological Diversity’s ‘ecosystem approach’ (1995) as well as the UNECE Aarhus (1998) that public engagement in environmental decision-making, or indeed decisions as they pertain to the environment and how it affects people (i.e. in theory all decisions), that all potentially affected stakeholders should be engaged in decision-making.</p> <p>So the gap between legacy practice and current intent/commitments is stark. It may therefore represent a significant democratic gap, an omission of considering optimal value for money, and a fragmented view of how ecosystems function and measures necessary to secure their integrity and resilience.</p> <p>The best examples would appear to be in the developing world at present.</p>
<p><b>How <u>could</u> the ecosystem approach and/or ecosystem services be (further) incorporated within the existing tool?</b></p>	<p>As articulated previously, the ecosystem services framework could be invaluable for mapping the breadth of potentially-affected stakeholders (i.e. the beneficiaries of all ecosystem services), many of whom have been historically omitted. It is also essential that this is done at the outset of projects so that those mapped may be engaged strategically throughout.</p>

**Task 6: Situating the tool within priority questions/criteria arising from the scoping interviews**

<p><b>Explain how the tool can be situated within the priority questions/criteria that arose in the scoping interviews</b></p> <p><i>Complete as many boxes as required</i></p>	<p><b>Priority question/criteria</b></p>	<p><b>Does your tool address/implement this question/criteria? Or does it have the potential if it was better integrated with an EA/ES approach?</b></p> <p><i>Please explain how.</i></p>
	<p><b>Language and communication</b></p>	
	<p>1. Contribution to aiding the development of shared vocabulary within which principles of EA and ES can be shared with multiple stakeholders across built and/or natural environment</p>	<p>Mapping and engaging stakeholders is an essential first step towards common agreement, with the ecosystem services framework presenting a common language albeit one needing development for common understanding.</p>
	<p>2. Capacity of the tool to develop shared understandings of the many identities and values of places from the perspectives of multiple visitors, residents and businesses</p>	<p>As noted above, mapping and engaging stakeholders is an essential first step towards common agreement, with the ecosystem services framework presenting a potential common understanding (but needing work with language).</p>
<p>3. Capacity of the tool to improve</p>	<p>Again, mapping stakeholders using the ecosystem</p>	

or enable engagement across different publics so avoiding the usual suspect problem	services framework enables identification of all beneficiaries/victims of decisions, not just the habitual 'usual suspects'.
<b>Learning from experience/pedagogy</b>	
4. Capacity of the tool to help reveal and value 'hidden' assets that are not recognised by communities or publics that use them	All stakeholders bring different perspectives and value systems to make decisions more robust and deliver better cumulative value per unit investment.
5. Extent to which tool is building on other tools or EA/ES progress	By bringing the ecosystem services framework into the mapping of stakeholders, this contributes to optimising societal value and greater inclusivity as well as balancing conservation with exploitation incorporating long-term sustainability of the system.
6. Extent to which tool is locally derived or grounded or can be adjusted to closely reflect 'local' context. Is the tool suitable for an open source approach?	Stakeholder mapping can occur across a range of scales from different nations (for global protocols) to local commons (such as catchments).
7. Extent to which the tool is open to interpretation and application in a variety of forms (that reflect 'cultural' differences)	The whole point of the breadth of services reflected by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment's diverse provisioning, regulatory, cultural and supporting services is to integrate a wide range of culturally-relative value systems.
<b>Developing and selecting tools</b>	
8. Is the tool dependent on a specific funding source? How onerous is the application procedure? What are the chances of success?	Stakeholder mapping using ecosystem services as a screening mechanism need not be onerous. Commitment to engaging identified stakeholders throughout the development of policies or decisions is more onerous.
9. Does skills development (essential or optional?) and support exist for the tool or is there a body to ensure the optimal and correct use of it?	No specific skills development is necessary, but a corporate commitment to undertake stakeholder mapping and ensuing engagement has to be evident.
10. Extent to which current statutory hooks can be exploited by the tool or will benefit the quality or application of the tool (e.g. NNPF's duty to cooperate, SUDS, ecol. networks)	We are already committed to stakeholder engagement, and therefore mapping, under the CBD 1995, Aarhus Convention 1998, Water Framework Directive 2000, etc., and of course 'cross-Government direction of travel' such as the HM Government Natural Environment White Paper, Welsh Government Green Paper, etc. We really just have to do what we said, including inclusive stakeholder mapping!
<b>Informing resultant policies effectively</b>	
11. Extent to which the tool informs or improves policies/decisions. What does the tool cover? (full range of	Stakeholder mapping should inform who to engage in decision-making, contributing to the resilience, cumulative value and equity of decision-making

positive and negative economic, social and environment impacts / tradeoffs?)	
12. How does the tool link into the planning system (applications and processes). At what cost / extra burden?	Stakeholder mapping is in theory something we should be doing already in the planning process.
<b>Delivering management objectives</b>	
13. Suitability or capacity of the tool to assist with managing visitor needs and pressures within protected areas / the considered area? How?	Not directly relevant other than sounding out local people as to protection of biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape and tranquillity and natural character
<b>Local ownership/new governance</b>	
14. To what extent can the tool assist in developing statutory plans (local and management plans) and improve ownership and use by publics?	Stakeholder mapping should be used for these purposes.
15. To what extent does/could the tool contribute to a new form of community governance in management of the environment?	Stakeholder mapping can help identify the broader community with common interests in a landscape unit, and who should be engaged, or may be interested in engagement, in its governance. Not all stakeholders are tweed-wearing retirees!
<b>Improved tools: understanding flows, interconnections and spatial issues</b>	
16. Capacity to improve spatial understandings of the flows and interactions of various ecosystem services between sectors and at different scales	By taking better account of wider stakeholder constituencies, better account can be taken of spatial and temporal understanding of ecosystem service flows.
17. Capacity of the tool to reconcile assessments of options and benefits across different scales (and sectors)	Stakeholder mapping is a first step towards engaging different constituencies to deliberate about options and benefits across different scales.
18. Extent to which the tools is capable or can be manipulated to work across sectoral and administrative boundaries	Stakeholder mapping is a first step towards engaging different constituencies to better work across sectoral and administrative boundaries.
19. Extent to which the tool can handle data shortages and gaps (or is effectiveness considerably compromised?)	Not all decisions are data-driven, particularly where they integrate different, often data-sparse value systems. So stakeholder mapping is a first step towards creating a dialogic space to span data gaps.
20. To what extent has/could the tool put landscape/nature conservation and designated species/sites on the radar (positively or resulting in resentment?)	Some stakeholders will emphasise these designations, whilst others will question their societal value in relation to competing interests.

*Please add any further comments here:*

**Task 7: A SWOT analysis of the tool**

**Referring back to the relevant policy and academic literature (listed in Task 3), plus your own expertise (listed in Task 4) and the way in which the tool is situated within the priority questions/criteria (listed in Task 6), please complete a summary SWOT analysis ensuring that each point is well justified**

*Where possible, this analysis should reflect the tool's past and current application, as well as its effectiveness in policy and decision making processes*

**Strengths** *(of the tool in delivering intended outcomes)*

- Delivers on what we're meant to be doing anyhow
- Creates greater equity
- Potentially greater public value per unit of investment
- Leads to more resilient and acceptable outcomes

**Weaknesses** *(factors that detract from the tool's ability to deliver intended outcomes)*

- Stakeholder engagement triggers greater expectation of engagement though the process (which we're meant to be doing anyhow)

**Opportunities** *(consider opportunities for application of the ecosystem approach and services)*

- There are already enough hooks, and indeed commitments, to undertake stakeholder mapping as a means to increase engagement

**Threats** *(factors which negatively affect the tool and its outcomes)*

- Potential capture by strong vested interests, for which management measures will need to be put in place

*Classify these by their "seriousness" and "probability of occurrence" in the table below, and pay particular attention to the threats associated with potential use of ecosystem approach/ecosystem services.*

Threat	Seriousness (high, medium, low)	Probability of occurrence (high, medium, low)
Capture by vested interests	High	Medium

Please add further comments here:

**Guidance** *Please now use the remainder of the document (box below) to make any general comments, observations or analyses of the tool*

**Further comments**