

Deliverable D5.3

Conclusions and actions points from the first Stakeholder Event

Due date of Deliverable: M12

Submitted to EC: M12

Responsible for Deliverable: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Magnus Ljung and Nadarajah Sriskandarajah

Summary

WP5 has been responsible for drawing conclusions and suggesting action points based on experiences made at the first Stakeholder Event. The action points provide feedback into the design of subsequent Stakeholder Events. The outcomes of the first Stakeholder Event has been discussed with the Project Management Board and already become part of the project development. Deliverable 5.3 focus on procedural issues aiming to improve stakeholder involvement and to clarify what content issues in need for additional clarification.

Objectives

The objective of this deliverable is to draw conclusions and suggest action points based on the experiences made at the first Stakeholder Event.

Introduction and background

Task 5.4 is behind this deliverable and it is about synthesizing and reporting the outcomes and experiences made at the first stakeholder event. This provides feedback into the design of subsequent Stakeholder Events. By documenting all discussions and summarizing the outcomes of each Stakeholder event, especially the feedback sheets and evaluation form (D5.2), we have a good baseline for suggesting potential improvements of both content and procedure.

This deliverable contains both general conclusions from the event and action points. Together, they contribute to the planning activities within the Project Management Board. In this way WP5 report to and support the other WPs in implementing the outcome of the Stakeholder Events and integrating the knowledge in each step of project development.

The action points focus on procedural issues. The main purpose is to help to improve the forthcoming stakeholder involvement, but also to clarify which issues might need additional clarification. The action points highlight potential improvements of the OrAqua-project, as suggested by the stakeholders.

Conclusions

The documentation of the first Stakeholder event was presented in D5.2. The feedback sheets and the evaluation form gave us important information regarding organizational, procedural and participation related issues (annexes 13-15 in D5.2). The outcomes from the round tables and café dialogues became inputs to the scientific review process (annexes 10-12 in D5.2). Thus some aspects have already been integrated in the scientific review (D4.1), and are part of the processing for D4.2 (the MCDA survey) and D4.3 (communication material before the second stakeholder event).

An overall evaluation of the organization, facilitation and participation of the first event shows that the participants in general were satisfied with the design of the event and the general level of stakeholder participation. Improvements are possible in areas such as access to materials beforehand, event logistics, quality of facilities, and the use of a broader variety of facilitation techniques. The diversity of stakeholders (perspectives, pre-understanding, engagement, etc.) made it hard to satisfy all individual needs. Nevertheless, the expressed interest in continuing the dialogue with OrAqua and the willingness to contribute to it shows that the participants valued the OrAqua-initiative highly and that the event enabled a need among stakeholders to have both voice and influence on the future of organic aquaculture.

We conclude that the first Stakeholder Event fulfilled its purposes and also that it has strengthened the stakeholder platform in OrAqua. It is important to keep in mind that the success in meeting the end purpose of the stakeholder events in OrAqua cannot be evaluated until after the third event. It takes time to build strong relations, to explain and create acceptance for the delimitations of our project, and to show how inputs from stakeholders are taken care of and processed. Our view is that this first step has created a good platform for future dialogues. The aspects that need to be changed will be taken into account in the planning process of the coming Stakeholder events.

Action points

The planning process for the second Stakeholder Event the 19-20th of October 2015

- General planning finished in May 2015
- Detailed planning finished two months before the next event (August 2015)
- Adapting checklist, incl. clear allocation of responsibilities and deadlines
- Working group constituted (WP1, WP4, WP5 and WP6) – reporting to PMB

- Testing the MCDA-model in advance (suggested to be done in Brno, CZ, 24-26/3 2015)
- Making sure that the participants at the second stakeholder event represent as many relevant perspectives as possible (connected to the quality of the MCDA-process at the event)

Preparing the participants

- Continuous updates on the OrAqua-homepage
- Invitation sent in May 2015
- Detailed program sent in September 2015
- Relevant background material is sent to registered participants or made accessible on the website one month before the event (i.e. communication material, e.g. review summaries, newsletter, aquaculture statistics, etc)
- Introducing relevant information about the MCDA (purpose, roles, process and content)

Overall process design

- 12 hours workshop is preferred (an example is from 12.00 day 1 until 14.00 day 2)
- The MCDA-process needs at least 4 hours effective time (day 1) and 2 hours follow up/feedback (day 2)
- More time to introduce OrAqua and contextual factors
- More time for dialogue and stakeholder exchange, also in plenary sessions
- Well prepared and focused questions for group discussions – what do we want to have input on?

- Logistics and physical conditions at best level possible (avoiding disturbances, time for transportation)

Facilitation

- Putting more effort in engaging all participants in the dialogue
- Group facilitators well prepared and trained – following a script

European Organic Aquaculture - Science-based recommendations for further development of the EU regulatory framework and to underpin future growth in the sector

- Use a greater variety of facilitation techniques and methods

Content issues

- Spending more time on introducing and explaining OrAqua in relation to ongoing regulatory processes and activities in Europe (as part of an external analysis), and also which delimitations that have been made in the project
- Explaining how the input at the first Stakeholder Event has been managed and which impact it has had on the OrAqua-project/work packages
- Based on the evaluation of the first stakeholder event spend more time on explaining the current regulatory framework and its concrete impact on organic aquaculture practices and development
- Raising critical issues in clearer ways, avoiding misunderstandings such as that OrAqua is not involving systems critique, emphasizing that OrAqua indeed is an opportunity to scientifically criticize the regulatory system for organic aquaculture.
- Letting more stakeholder perspectives being invited for prepared presentations/inputs – such that the event will focus even more on their views rather than on presentations by OrAqua team

Continuous stakeholder participation

- Strengthening the interaction with participants between the stakeholder events, especially through the OrAqua-homepage, leading to a functional Stakeholder Platform (WP1)
- Inviting participants to comment on questions/issues through the homepage (when relevant)

Follow up - activities

- Immediate follow-up activities involving the whole PMB
- Follow up of the outcome of the MCDA-process, so that if additional data gathering is needed it can be done immediately