What do we know about participation by stakeholders and the public in forest planning and nature conservation?
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1. **What** is participation?
2. **Why** is it demanded/done (in this context)
3. **Who** is included?
4. **How** is it done?
5. **So what?** ➔ **Examples**
6. **Conclusions/wrap-up**
1 What is participation?

- Engaging ‘others’ (outside the ‘normal’ decision making and planning cycle)
- Main rationale: improve planning/decision making beyond hierarchy and markets (“bottom-up”)
# What: Types of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of participation</th>
<th>Experts ...</th>
<th>Local people/stakeholders ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Ask for information; make the decisions</td>
<td>Contribute information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Make decisions, then involve local people to help implement them</td>
<td>Contribute information and action based on decisions already made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Work with local people to decide what is needed, and contribute expert knowledge where needed</td>
<td>Work with experts to decide what is needed, and contribute knowledge where needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active / bottom-up</td>
<td>Support local people with information</td>
<td>Make decisions; seek experts where needed; implement decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What: depends on level and stage

- Different types of participation, and different methods, at each **stage of the planning/policy cycle**

  Also different **levels:**
  - Policy development (*e.g.* National Forest Programme)
  - Strategic plan (*e.g.* a regional forest strategy)
  - Operational plan (*e.g.* a forest management plan)
2 Why participation?

Main rationale: improve planning/decision making → pluralize & democratize process, improve policies/planning content-wise, increases legitimacy & effectiveness (Bulkeley & Mol 2003; Dietz & Stern, 2008)

Reasons for participation include:
1. Mandated by law or policy
2. Local/‘others’ knowledge is useful (pragmatic approach)
3. Polarisation or opposition of societal groups needs an inclusive approach
4. More covert motives: distraction, delaying tactics, appeasement
3 Who participates?

Stakeholders/citizen include those who:

- are affected by decisions and actions taken
- and / or have the power to influence the outcome

→ The choice of “participation partners” is a critical step in the whole process!
Who participates: an approach to select potential participants (from UK public forest management)

1 Public: the community or people in general

2 Stakeholders: those who have an interest in a particular decision, either as individuals or representatives of a group. This includes people who influence a decision, or can influence it, as well as those affected by it.

3 Community: ‘all the people living in one district’; ‘a group of people with shared origins or interests’

From the Forestry Commission (United Kingdom):
https://www.forestry.gov.uk/forestry/infd-5xkjm7
Who participates: methods for selecting stakeholders

- Top down – planners decide
- Bottom up – ask stakeholders to identify themselves
- Ad hoc or snowballing – start with a short list, ask those stakeholders to identify others...
- Pro-active identification of ‘hard to reach’ groups
## 4 How is participation done?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of participation</th>
<th>Example of approach ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td><em>Make decisions, then involve local people to help implement them</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>round tables or forest visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td><em>Work with local people to decide what is needed, and contribute expert knowledge where needed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>round tables with some decision making mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active / bottom-up</td>
<td><em>Support local people to do their own forest planning</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory planning tools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Lawrence A. "No Personal Motive?" Volunteers, Biodiversity and the False Dichotomies of Participation. Ethics, Place and Environment. 2006;9:279-98
5 Examples: 1 New Scotland’s Forestry Strategy, 2019

- **What:** stakeholder consultation
- **Why:** required by law when new policy is developed
- **Who:**
  - stakeholders (e.g. forest industry representatives and conservation NGOs) employ policy officers who draft and circulate responses
  - any member of the public can also respond
- **Where / when / how:** draft strategy published; electronic and paper submissions by deadline
- **So what:**
  - Final strategy better in the opinion of many stakeholders
  - Polarisation not resolved (irreconcilable responses)
  - Much unpaid time and expertise used
Example 2: Local collaboration (US Pacific Northwest, since 2000ths)

- **What:** Participation of local stakeholders in forest planning for national forests
- **Why:** established by (second) Bush administration, attempt to give voice to (rural) communities, also to “re-start” forest management after it was largely stopped as outcome of the “Spotted Owl Crisis”
- **Who:** local stakeholder and (regional) interest groups, also citizens
- **Where / when / how:** distinct designs and outcomes
- **So what:** way to enable cross-interest collaboration at local level after a severe forest policy crisis, differently evaluated by stakeholders (see next slide)
Example 2: Local collaboration (US Pacific Northwest, since 2000ths)

“Collaboration creates trust and then also when the extremist would be at the table, the average person would realize that they were extremists, ok?” (Forest Service)

“Collaboration is a way to reject robust science, multi-faceted robust science, to basically establish public license.” (Environmentalist)

“It's like eating an elephant, one bite at a time.” (Timber Industry)

Source: Original Interview data, G. Winkel, 2011
Example 2: Local collaboration (US Pacific Northwest, since 2000ths)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude towards local stakeholder participation</th>
<th>Wood industry: Industrial forestry</th>
<th>Forest service: multiple use</th>
<th>Environmental groups: Ecosystem management</th>
<th>Community activists: Social forestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Conclusions/wrap-up

Participation...

• can serve various motivations and expectations – from democratic legitimacy to conflict resolution and better information/knowledge
• can target different groups (society – professional stakeholders)
• can be applied in different stages and levels of forest policy and management planning
• is subject to strategic considerations of stakeholders
• can have different outcomes – and sometimes not the intended ones