IPPA

Deliverable 1.4

Contract Number: 269849

WP1 Final Overview Report

Phil Richardson, Galson Sciences Ltd, United Kingdom
Anne Minhans and Beate Kallenbach-Herbert, Öko-Institute e.V., Germany
Kjell Andersson, Karita Research AB, Sweden

Date of issue of this report: 22nd August 2013
Start date of project: 01/01/2011
Duration: 36 Months

Foreword

The core aim of the IPPA project is the establishment of arenas where stakeholders can join together to increase their understanding of the issues involved in radioactive waste disposal and of their respective views. The project was not limited to national programmes; it also includes the multi-national context, because issues such as Environmental Impact Assessment and the Espoo Convention, the regional repository option and implementation of the Aarhus Convention have been examined. The project also investigated how negotiations on compensation and added value can be implemented at the local level.

The IPPA project is structured in six work packages dedicated to specific areas of research and implementation. Work Package 1 ("*Taking stock of research results - Mapping prerequisites for implementation*") provided participants with information and overview of theoretical achievements and practical experiences from research and national programmes, which should be valuable when organizing activities and arenas for participation and transparency. The work package developed a Knowledge Base of approaches for the involvement of stakeholders in dialogue on contentious issues, based initially on international experience and subsequently on learning from the IPPA project itself. Due to unavoidable delays in progressing participation activities in Work Package 2 of the project, Work Package 1 was extended into Year 3 - it was originally planned to be completed at the end of Year 2 - in order to be able to include feedback on these activities.

This Deliverable presents an overview of the activities undertaken in Work Package 1, and discusses the working methods employed during development of the Knowledge Base and its evolution into a product capable of being incorporated into the draft Participation Toolbox, which at the time of writing is still under development in Work Package 5.3. The report does not discuss in detail the results of the different work streams undertaken within Work Package 1, for which the reader is referred to the earlier Work Package Deliverables, Richardson *et al.* (2011), and Richardson *et al.* (2013).

IPPA is a project under the European Atomic Energy Community's Seventh Framework Programme FP7/2007-2011. Its objectives, work programme and results are presented, and all open deliverables made available for downloading, on the dedicated project website www.ippaproject.eu. The project website and the Participation Toolbox will remain available after the end of the project for at least five years.

CONTENTS

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Work Package

As outlined in the IPPA Description of Work, Work Package 1 was designed to act as a source of information and support to the participants in the IPPA Project. It was to develop a 'Knowledge Base' (hereafter the KB) of approaches for the involvement of stakeholders in decision-making and dialogue on contentious issues, based initially on international experience and subsequently on learning from the IPPA project itself. It was to produce results that would feed into Task 5.3 of Work Package 5 at the end of Year 2, and which would form the basis for development of the 'Participation Toolbox', which would be made available online at the end of the IPPA project.

1.2 Participants

Three organisations were involved in this Work Package. It was led by Galson Sciences Ltd (GSL) from the United Kingdom, represented primarily by Phil Richardson. The Öko-Institut from Germany was represented by Beate Kallenbach-Herbert and Anne Minhans, with Karita Research AB from Sweden represented by Kjell Andersson (IPPA Co-ordinator).

1.3 Working method

The working method adopted in the Work Package sought from the beginning to reduce the need for unnecessary travel and expenditure on the part of the participants whilst encouraging the maximum amount of interaction between them. Draft papers and discussion documents prepared during the different stages of the work were developed through frequent exchange and iteration via email and discussed in regular teleconferences using Skype. In addition, later teleconferences also made use of the 'Netviewer' program, which allows participants to share screens and documents and comment and amend text interactively. There was also interaction with other IPPA participants, especially those involved in Work Package 2, again primarily by email and at the project meetings.

1.4 Planned outputs

As mentioned above, the principal planned output from Work Package 1 was the KB, containing information on various participation tools, methods and processes that have been used to encourage and facilitate public and stakeholder involvement in decision-making associated with a range of contentious issues. The KB is intended to form the basis of the Participation Toolbox to be developed in Work Package 5.

2 Initial Development of the Knowledge Base (Year 1)

This section provides a brief overview of the approach taken during Year 1 to identify suitable case studies and assemble details of the tools, methods and processes used. The reader is referred to other Work Package 1 Deliverables (especially Richardson *et al.*, 2011, D1.1) for more details of the actual case studies etc.

The approach involved development of an interactive spreadsheet in order to present the information in a way that enabled comparisons to be made between the different tools, methods and processes and which also began to indicate ways in which the data could be used to build the Participation Toolbox in Year 3, as part of Work Package 5. This was especially important given that Work Package 5, including the Toolbox development, was to be managed by the Öko-Institut participants in Work Package 1 (assisted by GSL), thereby ensuring consistency of approach as the project progressed.

2.1 Identification of suitable case studies

Development of the initial version of the KB was based on a number of case studies identified by the Work Package participants and which were selected because of their coverage of a number of contentious issues and use of various tools, methods and processes for public participation. These ranged from the expansion of airports and highways in Austria and Germany, through examination of public attitudes to GM foods in the United Kingdom and mobile phone radiation in Sweden, to a number of projects related to radioactive waste management in Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany and the United Kingdom. This breadth of coverage was intended to ensure that a suitable range of participation tools would be identified in this first stage. It was also important that sufficient information of the projects involved was available in the open literature in order to allow the case studies to be described in enough detail.

At this stage a focus was put on such tools, methods and processes for public participation that aim for an interactive involvement of different stakeholders. A modified Participation Ladder was developed which classified the participation levels "*Consult/Exchange*", "*Collaborate*" and "*Joint decision-making*" as interactive, while the "*Inform*" and "*Listen*" levels were categorised as non-interactive. A detailed description of this modified Participation Ladder is provided in Richardson *et al.* (2011).

2.2 Use of the review template

Details of the individual case studies were obtained from examination of reports and overviews from the open literature as well as from the detailed experience of the Work Package participants, and were collated using a specifically-designed template.

The template was designed to provide information that could be used both for comparison between the case studies but also as the basis for potential search criteria in the future Participation Toolbox. This meant that each case study was reviewed and presented using an identical structure, demonstrating the consistency of approach which would be essential for later development of the Participation Toolbox.

2.3 Development of initial tool descriptions

Having identified the initial suite of case studies, and gathered consistent information on them by means of the review template, the tools, methods and processes used were examined, with some case studies illustrating the use of more than one tool, method or process. Identification of a number of underlying principles of good public participation, informed by the relevant literature, allowed identification of a series of properties that would be used to assess and screen the tools for their applicability to other contentious issues. The main resource was the list of criteria used previously in the RISCOM II project, based on Hunt *et al*. (2001), which were adapted further in ARGONA, and used to assess a number of specific participatory processes (Richardson *et al*., 2009).

The properties were divided into 3 main groups which characterised them as:

- *"Instrumental" (those properties concerned with enhancing the quality of decision-making, finding acceptable outcomes and the integration of these into a legitimate process),*
- *"Procedural" (those properties concerned with the conduct of the process, for example whether it provides conditions that assure equal rights for all participants) and*
- *"Constitutive" (those properties that refer to the benefits implied by participation, such as for example the development of understanding and capacity building).*

In order to provide a first overview of the tools collected so far, the information collated in the case study review templates was used to populate an interactive Excel spreadsheet, as described in Deliverable 1.1 (Richardson *et al*., 2011). This allowed each of the identified tools, methods and processes to be mapped directly against the properties outlined above, as well as against their position in the modified Participation Ladder. This method also allowed cross-referencing against the originating case study, thereby presenting additional information in terms of a number of issues and factors as separate database worksheets.

2.4 Preparation of Deliverable D1.1

Deliverable 1.1 (Richardson *et al*., 2011) was the first presentation from Work Package 1 of the results of the work undertaken in the first year of the IPPA project. The aim was to take a step in building the KB of tools for participation and to present it for use by other project participants, especially those in Work Package 2.

The first iteration of the draft Deliverable was prepared by GSL and circulated to the other Work Package participants for review and addition of suitable content. It outlined the work undertaken and described above, namely identification of the case studies, tools and underlying principles. It presented the modified Participation Ladder as well as overviews of the case studies and the review templates. It also included a more detailed presentation of the interactive spreadsheet and a guide to its use.

The Deliverable was submitted to the project coordinator in July 2011 and made available on the IPPA project website.

2.5 Communication at project meetings

In August 2011 Phil Richardson (Work Package leader) was invited to make a presentation of the KB to the stakeholder meeting organised in Bucharest, Romania, by Work Package 2 participants from the Institute for Nuclear Research, Pitesti. Details of the KB development were outlined, together with details of the various participation levels, tools and case studies, in a presentation entitled '*Public involvement in contentious issues, with special relevance to radwaste management*'.

The meeting offered the opportunity to indicate to the meeting participants the importance of future feedback regarding the KB, and of the planned Work Package 2 engagement activities, which would be an important part of the subsequent KB development and transformation into the Participation Toolbox.

The second IPPA project meeting was held in Bratislava, Slovakia, in September 2011. Phil Richardson and the Öko-Institut participants presented details of the KB and introduced the underlying principles behind its development. Stress was again laid on the need for interaction and feedback with all project participants, especially those in Work Package 2, in order to develop and improve the KB using learning and experience from real activities. Examples were shown of the interactive spreadsheet and the ways in which it could be manipulated.

Two 'feedback sessions' were organised at the meeting to allow project participants to comment on the KB and the plans for its further development. Besides stressing the usefulness of the KB, these sessions identified a number of areas for potential improvement. Further input was given by the members of the IPPA Advisory Group at the end of the meeting and in a detailed written summary after the meeting. One important suggestion was to emphasise the role of the case studies as examples of the use of particular tools, methods or processes, rather than making it appear as if the case studies were the important starting point of any search for suitable tools. The tools should therefore be presented in a more generic manner using the case studies as additional examples of their use under specific circumstances and conditions.

It was also suggested that non-iterative tools should also be included, as they may be important contributions in those processes that generally comprise a set of different but complementary tools. In addition, some examples were suggested for other search criteria which could usefully be added.

3 Development of the KB Database (Year 2)

3.1 Development of the database from the spreadsheet

The next phase of developing the KB aimed to:

- Implement the comments provided during the project meeting in Bratislava in September 2011 and from the Advisory Group.
- Add further information.
- Improve the way in which the KB could be manipulated.

The subsequent development of the Participation Toolbox later in the project, for which the KB was intended to act as the main resource, was the guiding principle in performing the necessary activities.

As more information was added to the KB, it became clear that it would be possible to search more easily if the data were presented in the form of an Access database. This could then act as a 'stepping-stone' towards the Participation Toolbox, and enable a smooth transition between this Work Package and Work Package 5. Development of the database began in June 2012, carried out primarily by GSL, in conjunction with Öko-Institut and Karita Research, and involved numerous iterations and review which continued into late 2012. This helped identify data gaps and omissions, and allowed new information to be sought as required. It was also agreed to merge certain data fields to simplify the likely search methodology that would be used later in the Participation Toolbox.

3.2 Improvement and expansion of generic tool descriptions

One of the main challenges in revising the existing KB was to make the transition from a case study-related presentation of tools to one based on generic tool descriptions with case studies providing examples of their use.

In an iterative process the existing specific tools (described in the case studies) were carefully examined with regard to similar approaches which could be summarised under one generic tool name. For example, the specific tools used in the participation processes for the enlargement of the Frankfurt and Vienna airports were summarised under the generic tool "*Mediation Forum*", presenting both case studies as additional information material for a more in-depth understanding of the functioning of the tool under specific circumstances.

Furthermore, work was undertaken to identify a range of other tools that occupied particular locations on the Participation Ladder, but the use of which were not represented in the case studies at that time. By the end of Year 2, some 34 separate tools, methods or processes had been identified and incorporated in the KB (see Richardson *et al.,* 2013 for details). These were referred to as 'generic' tools, linked where possible to one or more specific case studies. Some 33 tools, methods and processes were subsequently incorporated into the Toolbox following discussion and amalgamation.

In the context of developing the KB towards a collection of generic tools, the criteria used to describe them were amended and further developed in an iterative approach. A clear distinction was therefore made between criteria that are mainly relevant to describe the use of the tool in the context of a specific case and those that are necessary for describing the tool itself in a more generic manner. With regard to the future transfer into an interactive toolbox, the criteria that describe the tools were classified into "*criteria for tool selection*" and those that provide further information.

It was found that the "*criteria for tool selection*" were to a large degree already covered by the categories provided in the review template which had been used in Year 1 (see Section 2.2 above).

At the present time, the final set of criteria providing a suitable description of a tool on a generic level and which is therefore foreseen as the starting point for the tool selection in the future Participation Toolbox, comprises the following:

- Level of decision-making (referring to the administrative levels national, regional or local).
- Phase of decision-making (referring to the phases "plans/programmes" or "projects" as defined in the Aarhus Convention).
- Number of stakeholders involved.
- Combination of stakeholders (e.g. public, scientific experts, elected representatives).
- Participation Level (as defined in the modified Participation Ladder).
- Frequency of meetings.
- Implementer of the tool.

For each of these criteria, categories had to be developed that are suitable for representing potential search results. For example, the "number of stakeholders" comprises the following four categories:

- < 10
- $10 - 30$
- $30 - 100$
- > 100

The final set of criteria, as well as the related categories, will be presented in detail in the final report on the development of the Participation Toolbox at the end of Year 3, as part of Work Package 5.

In addition, the feedback with regard to the coverage of non-interactive tools was taken into account. The KB was continually expanded by incorporation of a number of further tools/methods/processes that had either been used in the existing case studies, or based on the literature or personal experience of the Work Package members. They were identified through internal discussions and details obtained from academic and internet research.

3.3 Improvement of case studies

The use of the case studies as additional sources of information has not reduced their value compared to their original use as a primary source of information in the preliminary version of the KB. They provide important insight from "real life" which goes far beyond what can be described on a generic level. The description of the circumstances and conditions under which specific tools have been used is an important part of the case studies. It allows future users to reflect on similarities and differences with regard to their own cases and on potential influences these may have on the strengths and pitfalls associated with the use of the tool.

With regard to these objectives, the template for the case studies was adapted and additional information provided for those based on Work Package 2 activities, as well as those based on the experiences of the Work Package 1 team members.   The presentation of the case studies in the KB now follows the following structure:

- Background Information.
  - Phase of the decision-making process.
  - Formal framework of the decision-making process.
  - Objectives of the process.
- Which tool was used?
- Objectives and outcomes of stakeholder engagement.
- Stakeholders Involved.
- Implementer of the participation process.
- Financing.
- Points to consider.
- Further tools used in the case study.

3.4 Incorporation of Work Package 2 activities

As pointed out above, an important feature of the development of the KB in this Work Package was the intention to incorporate learning and experience from the ongoing engagement activities in the five Work Package 2 countries (Czech Republic, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia).   Unfortunately, this did not prove to be as straightforward as was originally expected. The main reason for this was the reality of the ongoing repository siting processes in the five countries, which were overtaken by political and programmatic issues that delayed or even prevented some of the planned activities from taking place on the expected timescales. Although this was difficult in terms of the proposed work plan, it was also important, in that it demonstrated the "real-life" situations being addressed in the IPPA project. This has served to make the project clearly distinct from other more theoretical projects and has allowed participants to adapt and amend their efforts to carry out meaningful stakeholder engagement in response to real situations. In this way the KB has been able to reflect real situations, and this in turn has helped Work Package 1 participants recognise the way in which the subsequent Participation Toolbox could and should be structured in order to be of most use to future users.

Despite the difficulties due to the slower than anticipated progress in Work Package 2, it was important that the KB continued to be developed so as to include as much information about the national activities as possible. To this end the original review template used for the case studies was adapted and circulated to Work Package 2

participants with a request for them to include as much information as was possible about both their ongoing and, in some cases, their planned engagement activities. A special session was held at the third IPPA project meeting in Warsaw, Poland, in March 2012, involving a presentation of the latest version of the KB and outlining the need for information on the national activities. This was accompanied by a feedback session on the amended review template in order to explain how they should be completed. Completed templates were received over the following months and incorporated into the KB following review by the national participants to ensure accuracy in their interpretation and presentation.

Towards the end of Year 2 additional information on planned and ongoing activities in the five Work Package 2 countries was becoming available, and was translated into case studies as per the revised structure for presenting case studies in the developing database. Due to this revised structure, additional information was requested beyond that originally requested via the review templates.

In a final iteration step in Year 3 this additional information was circulated to the relevant country participants for checking and, where necessary, updating of the case studies to reflect the latest situation. Work Package 2 participants were prompt and generous in their responses.

3.5 Extension of work package timeframe

As described elsewhere in this document, the relatively slow pace of progress in the five Work Package 2 countries had significant impact in turn on the pace of progress in aspects of Work Package 1. The original intention had been to finish work at the end of Year 2 with production of the completed KB and the various deliverables. In the event this was not possible, and it was agreed with the project coordinator during the latter part of the year that it would be sensible to continue the activities into Year 3. This would have no impact on the overall Work Package budget but would allow development of the KB, the tool descriptions and the interactions with Work Package 2 to continue, thereby ensuring that the KB content, which forms the basis of the Participation Toolbox, would be as complete as possible and reflect the latest progress in the five countries through the relevant case studies.

4 Continuation of Work Package 1 Activities in Year 3

4.1 Development of the online Participation Toolbox

Discussions had begun in October 2012 about development of the draft Participation Toolbox. It was agreed that as Öko-Institut would lead this work under Task 3 of Work Package 5, they would begin exploration of how this could be done. A suitable contractor was identified and a specification for the online 'front-end' of the Toolbox agreed. The specification included the capability for Work Package 5 participants to edit online text in real time and for selected information, especially the case studies, to be made available for export as downloadable PDF files by future users. In late 2012 the selected contractor was instructed by Öko-Institut to prepare an initial draft of the Toolbox in early 2013. The draft version was presented at the fourth project meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, in March 2013.

4.2 In-project workshop (March 2013)

As explained in Deliverable 1.2 (Richardson *et al*., 2013), the original IPPA Description of Work proposed that an internal Work Package 1 workshop would be held towards the end of Year 2 in order to obtain feedback from Work Package 2 participants on their use of the KB. It was intended that this would inform the subsequent development of the Participation Toolbox in Work Package 5 in Year 3 of the project.

In the event, due to the unavoidably slower than expected progress in the five Work Package 2 countries already mentioned, it did not prove possible to hold this workshop as planned. It was therefore agreed with the project co-ordinator that the opportunity afforded by the fourth IPPA project meeting in Ljubljana, in March 2013, should be used for this purpose. Consequently, a special session was arranged on the second day of the meeting for small group discussion of the developing draft Participation Toolbox, in terms of content and suitability, and to identify whether additional information might be available that could also be incorporated. Deliverable 1.2 (Richardson *et al*., 2013) presents details of the workshop proceedings and outcome. There was general approval by participants of the content and presentation of the information in the KB through the proposed Toolbox interface, while suggestions for improvement were also made.

4.3 Preparation of Deliverable 1.2

Following the fourth project meeting in Ljubljana, in March 2013, development of Deliverable 1.2 was begun, again primarily undertaken by GSL. The aim of this second Work Package 1 Deliverable was to briefly describe how the original version of the KB had been further developed since the publication of Deliverable 1.1 (described above) and to discuss how it had been informed by activities within Work Package 2. It also discussed how the KB had been used by some IPPA project participants and concluded with a brief report on the outcome of the review workshop.

A draft of the deliverable was circulated for review and comment to the other Work Package participants and the final version (Richardson *et al*., 2013) submitted to the project coordinator on 10th May 2013 for addition to the project website.

4.4 Preparation of this document

As development of the Participation Toolbox has moved forward, responsibility has passed from GSL to Öko-Institut as leaders of Work Package 5. Some work has continued under Work Package 1, such as gathering of additional tool descriptions etc. as required, but the main activity has been the development of this document, in order to complete the work programme and enable 'handing over' of the KB data in as complete a form as possible.

This summary document has been largely prepared by GSL but has benefited from review and input from the other Work Package 1 participants. Its publication completes the Work Package programme of work.

5 Summary

The purpose of this document has been to outline the work that has been carried out in Work Package 1 of the IPPA Project.

Output from Work Package 1 has included three Deliverables in addition to the KB:

- **Deliverable 1.1:**
  P Richardson *et al*., '*The IPPA Knowledge Base Version 1*' (14 July 2011)
  In addition to introducing the case studies and associated descriptions of tools used to develop the first version of the KB, this Deliverable provided some theoretical background and presented details of the identified principles that underlie good public participation processes. It also presented a modified Participation Ladder that has been used as the basis of the classification of approaches used in the KB and the subsequent draft Participation Toolbox.

- **Deliverable 1.2**:
  Phil Richardson *et al*., '*Development of the Knowledge Base and its Review by IPPA Project Partners*' (10 May 2013)
  This Deliverable presented details of the further development of the KB during Year 2 of the project. Due to delays in other project activities in Work Package 2, Work Package 1 was extended into Year 3, and this Deliverable also introduced the consultation process that was followed at the workshop held during the IPPA project meeting in Slovenia in March 2013. Consequently it was agreed with the project coordinator that the planned Deliverable 1.3 was no longer required.

- **Deliverable 1.4** (this document):
  Although not published as such, the main output from the Work Package has been the contents of the Knowledge Base Database (Version 1.6) which became the raw material for development of the draft Participation Toolbox in 2013.

The Knowledge Base has been passed on to Work Package 5 in the form of an Access database, and at the time of writing is being further enhanced and used to develop the Participation Toolbox, which will be an online resource for individuals and organisations planning or considering a stakeholder engagement process, and includes details of tools, processes and methods that can be used to fulfil different goals and outcomes.

The Participation Toolbox is intended to remain available online for 5 years following the end of the IPPA project in December 2013.

6 References

Hunt J, Day J, and Kemp R (2001). '*Stakeholder Dialogue: Experience and Analysis*'. RISCOM II Deliverable 4.1. August 2001.

Richardson PJ, Hicks TW, Galson DA and Greulich-Smith T (2009). '*Assessing Participatory and Dialogue Approaches*'. ARGONA - Arenas for Risk Governance (Contract Number: FP6-036413), Deliverable 15.

Richardson PJ, Michie E, Minhans A, Kallenbach-Herbert B and Andersson K (2011). '*The IPPA Knowledge Base Version 1*'. IPPA Deliverable 1.1, July 2011.

Richardson PJ, Michie E, Minhans A, Kallenbach-Herbert B and Andersson K (2013). '*Development of the Knowledge Base and its Review by IPPA Project Partners*'. IPPA Deliverable 1.2, May 2013.