**An evaluation of approaches for
promoting relevant authority
and stakeholder participation in
European Marine Sites in the UK**

**Peter JS Jones[1], Jacquie Burgess[2], and Darren
Bhattachary[2]**
August 2001

[1] Environment and Society Research Unit
Department of Geography
University College London
Remax House, 31-32 Alfred Place
London WC1E 7DP
Tel 020 7679 5284, P.J.Jones@ucl.ac.uk

[2] Environment and Society Research Unit
Department of Geography
University College London
26 Bedford Way
London WC1H 0AP

An evaluation of approaches for promoting relevant authority and stakeholder participation in European Marine Sites in the UK

Gwerthusiad o'r dulliau o hybu cyfranogiad awdurdodau perthnasol a rhai â diddordeb mewn Safleoedd Morol Ewropeaidd yn y DU

September 2001

Prepared by   Peter JS Jones[1], Jacquie Burgess[2], and Darren Bhattachary[2]

[1] Environment and Society Research Unit
Department of Geography
University College London
Remax House, 31-32 Alfred Place
London WC1E 7DP

Tel. 020 7679 5284,
Email P.J.Jones@ucl.ac.uk

[2] Environment and Society Research Unit
Department of Geography
University College London
26 Bedford Way
London WC1H 0AP
Prepared for: The UK Marine SACs Project, Project Manager, John Torlesse, English Nature.

An evaluation of approaches for promoting relevant authority and stakeholder participation in European Marine Sites in the UK

Report Overview

Introduction

This document reports the findings of a project, commissioned as part of the *UK Marine SACs Project*, to evaluate different approaches employed to provide for Relevant Authority (RA) and stakeholder participation in European Marine Sites (EMSs). These findings are based on 15 case studies which were informed primarily by interviews conducted with EMS project officers over June-July 1999. Telephone interviews with a small sample of RAs and stakeholders were also carried out for four case studies in order to gain wider views on the participation approaches employed.

The aims and objectives of this project are:

- to evaluate the effectiveness of approaches and techniques which have been employed to promote RA and stakeholder participation in EMS management scheme processes;
- to analyse the contexts within which these techniques have been employed;
- to make recommendations concerning good practice in different contexts.

In the UK the EC's Habitats and Birds Directives have been implemented through the Habitats Regulations which place a duty on RAs to produce and implement management schemes for EMSs. RAs are required to work in partnership with each other and with stakeholders in order to maintain the favourable conservation status of features within EMSs.

In developing and employing approaches and techniques for promoting RA and stakeholder participation in the management of EMSs, the following challenges need to be addressed.

- Individual combination of characteristics of each EMS.
- Statutory imperative to comply with legislation, which may alienate some stakeholders.
- Low level of awareness of the importance and value of marine conservation features
- Limited experience of RAs, particularly the NCAs, in fulfilling statutory conservation obligations in the marine environment.
- Relatively limited marine scientific knowledge base, which increases the degree of uncertainty under which decisions must be taken.
- The multiple-use and sectoral management policy framework.
- Resistance to outside interference amongst some stakeholder communities.
- Lack of experience of some project officers in developing partnerships for marine conservation.

This evaluation of the different approaches which have been developed to meet these challenges for the 15 case studies is largely based on the perspective this sample of EMS project officers. Given resource limitations and the relatively early stage in the process, when management schemes for the EMS case studies were still being developed, it was not possible to employ criteria or indicators of success based on the *outputs* from the EMS management schemes. Instead, criteria or indicators based on the emerging success or otherwise of the EMS management scheme *processes* were employed in order to provide a basis for more comprehensive evaluations in the future.

The literature on different approaches to managing marine nature reserves in the UK and around the world indicates that approaches which provide for the participation of RAs and stakeholders can promote cooperation, and that these relatively 'soft' bottom-up approaches need to be coupled with relatively 'hard' top-down approaches.

Social process concepts

Participation can be defined as a social process through which people are able to influence and share control over the decisions which affect them. Four stages of participation are identified:

1. information sharing activities
2. consultative activities
3. collaborative activities
4. empowerment activities

These four stages of participation are distinguished by an increasing intensity of communication, and by a shift in power relations from asymmetrical (top-down) to symmetrical (equal partners). Building partnerships with RAs, enabling a range of stakeholders to participate actively in decision-making, and informing/consulting with wider stakeholders are all social processes. Social scientists use the metaphor of **social capital** to describe the ways in which social processes in an area contribute to productive outcomes. Social capital is an expression of:

- *Trust* in the honesty, integrity and sincerity of the individuals and organisations who are engaged in a joint project.

- *Confidence* in the knowledge, capabilities and authority of the individuals and organisations engaged in the process.

Social capital is produced through the interactions of people in their professional and personal **networks.** The productivity of these networks will depend on two key factors:

- *Extensiveness* - a network may be diverse in its membership or tightly constrained to a particular interest group.

- *Density of relations* - a network contributing high social capital in a locality would be one where its members meet one another in many different contexts; and where there is widespread knowledge of what is happening elsewhere in the network.

Under the terms of the Habitats Regulations, RAs are to be brought together in partnership to take joint responsibility for the management of a site, which means that RAs will need to be engaged in all four stages of the participatory process. It is argued that it is important that EMS processes also engage stakeholders up to and including stage 3, *ie* bringing stakeholders into collaborative arrangements with the management partnership. Whether it is possible to empower stakeholders and so extend participation to stage 4 will depend largely on the political culture of the partnership.

It is proposed that **face-to-face communications** and allowing **sufficient time** for processes are key factors in the development of social capital and networks. In the specific context of EMSs, it is proposed that the following factors are particularly important in recognising and then building social capital for the EMS process.

1.   Involving RAs and stakeholders in the initial management scheme design process demonstrates confidence in the expertise and knowledge of stakeholders, and builds trust in the commitment that exists to share power and responsibility.

2.   Bringing RAs/stakeholders into partnership throughout the life of the project means that continuity can be achieved and allows time to build social relations and strengthen networks.

3.   An ongoing open process of innovation, negotiation, modification and change will help to build consensus based on a better understanding of divergent positions, and help secure legitimacy for decisions.

4.   By building social capital to support the EMS, there will be greater mutual accountability among RAs and stakeholders. This will increase commitment to resolving issues within the scheme and making it a success.

The effectiveness of EMS processes in building social capital is strongly related to the specific contexts in which they are carried out: **participatory processes are context-dependent processes.** The local characteristics of sites are therefore important, including:

- physical features and landscape
- social and economic activities, both past and present
- political culture and, in particular, existing policy networks.

Case study methodology

The weakest element in participatory theory and practice is evaluation: robust indicators and mechanisms to track the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of participatory processes are still under development. It was therefore necessary to focus on the extent to which site-specific processes seem to be contributing to:

- the development of enduring and robust social capacity which promotes cooperation and which can be drawn upon to address site management conflicts and sustain commitment;
- the potential to eventually achieve conservation objectives on a site and fulfil legal obligations.

Contextual evaluation

The concept of social capital is used to provide a means of categorising the 15 case studies, and to draw out the different approaches and techniques which have been employed to develop social capital. It is possible to broadly classify the 15 sites into two groups:

Sites with stronger social capital at the start of the EMS process. In all but one case, it was found that the development of an estuary or firth management partnership prior to the EMS has generated substantial social capital, even where there were considerable conflicts between development and conservation interests prior to the EMP. In other cases, the lessons learned and approaches employed in previous nature conservation designations or similar initiatives helped develop relations between RAs, stakeholders and local NCA officers.

Sites with weaker social capital at the start of the EMS process . It is important to bear in mind that this classification is not pejorative in any sense. The social capital 'state' is considered solely in terms of the local history of partnerships and initiatives which have been developed to achieve objectives similar to those for EMSs, *ie* focused on marine conservation and integrated marine resource management. Localities classified here as having weaker social capital to support the development of the EMS will often have high social capital in other respects. In most sites in this category there had been no previous overarching management initiative. Such areas are clearly not necessarily lacking in social cohesiveness, but it is argued that only partial social networks existed to support the development of the EMS.

Building on these baseline assessments of social capital states, it is possible to identify four categories of case studies in terms of their social capital 'directions', as is summarised in the table at the end of this summary.

Stronger social capital, successfully capitalised upon. In all these cases, the former social networks have been successfully utilised to develop the EMS. What is common to all these cases is that the previous management structures have been successfully adopted and/or adapted to provide for the development of the EMS.

Weaker social capital strengthened through the EMS. Approaches such as having many proactive meetings, workshops and discussions, and establishing relatively flat, inclusive management structures to provide for the active participation of stakeholders in partnership with RAs, appear to have been successful in strengthening social capital for the EMS in contexts where there was relatively little support beforehand.

Stronger social capital, but experienced some difficulties with the development of the EMS. In one case a previous voluntary conservation initiative had developed high social capital for a part of the EMS, but the initial decision to shelve this initiative whilst the EMS was being developed alienated some stakeholders and RAs. In another case the previous EMP had been successful in developing social capital, but the complicated and extensive nature of this site, the high number of RAs and stakeholders, and the potential for conflicts between development and conservation interests posed major challenges for the development of the EMS.

Weaker social capital, and experienced some difficulties in developing the EMS. In two cases the large, geographically fragmented character of the EMS has made it difficult for RAs and stakeholders to relate to the EMS as a single unit for management. Also, initial emphasis was given to establishing a management group for the RAs, which led to delays in recruiting support among stakeholders.

Key lessons from the 15 EMS case studies

Geographical contexts

- Where EMSs are large and consist of a number of geographically disconnected units, efforts need to be focused on identifying ways of developing RA/stakeholder awareness of the importance of managing the site as a whole, and/or of exploring the potential for 'federated' management structures.

- In rural sites where there are fewer potential stakeholders, there is a much higher expectation and need for participation by a greater proportion of stakeholders. In urban sites where there are more potential stakeholders, there is a lower expectation and need for participation of a smaller proportion of stakeholders. This needs to be taken into account when considering the appropriateness of participation techniques.

Pre-EMS management history

- Where social capital has been generated through a previous management initiative, this is more likely to be maintained and enhanced if the EMS is integrated with the previous initiative through adoption/adaptation of the management structure and approach.

- Where a previous management initiative has been unsuccessful in generating cross-sectoral social capital, it seems advantageous to assess the underlying causes of this previous lack of success and focus efforts on addressing these, and/or, in extreme cases, to pursue the EMS separately.

EMS Management structures

- It is beneficial if the management structure that should be adopted is openly discussed at the outset with the participation of stakeholders.

- Two-tier management structures, in which RAs and stakeholders are represented through separate groups, would appear to be particularly appropriate to sites with a large number of potential stakeholders where social capital developed through previous initiatives is high.

- Two-tier management structures which are relatively bottom-up, in which many responsibilities are devolved to the stakeholder group, appear to be particularly appropriate where stakeholder numbers are high but social capital was initially low.

- Flat management structures, involving both RAs and stakeholders in the same group, would appear to be particularly appropriate for coastal areas where stakeholder numbers are relatively low and their stakes are relatively high, though this structure

was also successfully applied to a site with many stakeholders, so should not be ruled out for such sites.

- A variety of RAs have adopted a lead role and this is very much a case-by-case decision depending upon the local political context.

Initial Consultation

- It is advantageous to have as many face-to-face meetings with RAs and stakeholders as early in the process as is feasible in order to personally engage/recruit people and build trust and confidence in the process .

- Consultation packs on proposals to designate an EMS should include as much information as is feasible concerning potential management implications.

- Confining the consultation to owners/occupiers alienated some stakeholders, particularly fishermen: all direct stakeholders should be consulted.

RA partnership-building approaches

- Early workshops addressing and explaining the new responsibilities upon RAs appeared to have over-emphasised the legal duties and the potential consequences of non-compliance, which was less than optimal in developing a sense of partnership and shared responsibility amongst the RAs. Liaison between the EMS project officer and the national nature conservation agency (NCA) can avoid many potential problems by ensuring that workshops are presented in a manner which is sensitive to the local RA context.

- Participatory workshops can be problematic where RAs are used to a very formal approach and may not be familiar with more participatory, creative approaches. However, where RAs are more open to such workshops, or where specialist facilitation skills are employed, they can be very successful in 'breaking the ice' and developing relations amongst the RAs.

- Assigning RAs specific, tangible responsibilities related to the development of the management scheme as early as possible in the process helps generate partnership.

- Where a particular RA has taken a strong lead role in the initial development of the management scheme, it is important that they step back and encourage and provide for other RAs to take collective action in order to promote inter-RA cooperation and reduce the risk of loss of institutional momentum.

Stakeholder participation-building approaches

- When recruiting stakeholders, reliance should not be placed on statutory consultation lists, or on reaching wider stakeholders through groups such as Parish Councils, as both these approaches will 'miss' many stakeholders.

- Asking the stakeholders identified through initial efforts to identify other stakeholders who should be involved appears to be a successful approach to increasing representation.

- Stakeholders are more likely to feel that they are partners in the EMS if they are, as far as is feasible, able to work in collaboration with the RAs through devolved two-tier management structures or are empowered through flat management structures.

- Where the input of stakeholders is restricted to discussion, advice, consultation and information provision, this can lead to apathy, a lack of willingness to cooperate with the management scheme, or even protests/defiance, particularly in rural sites.

- Where there have been problems developing stakeholder participation in the management scheme, the use of more participative consultation approaches on the draft management scheme can be used as an opportunity to engage stakeholders, as can a high profile launch of the final management scheme.

- Assigning stakeholders specific, tangible responsibilities related to the development of the management scheme can develop social capital and provide for constructive stakeholder participation.

- Integrating the identification of opportunities for compatible development and regeneration opportunities in the EMS promotes stakeholder (and some RA) participation.

- Project officers need to be aware of existing, perhaps latent, conflicts amongst stakeholders/RAs which the EMS may be drawn into.

- If consulting on a draft document, do not make it look too glossy and finalised as this can give stakeholders the impression that it is a *fait accompli*.

General approaches

- There is a need to achieve a balance between meeting deadlines and keeping the EMS moving forward, and not pushing the process too fast in a manner that may alienate some stakeholders/RAs.

- EMS structures and processes need to be designed from the outset as self-supporting in the longer-term absence of a dedicated project officer.

- It is important that a culture of honesty and trust is developed amongst RAs/stakeholders to provide for a generally positive and constructive political environment.

- It is important to emphasise nature conservation as a partnership process rather than reducing it to matters of science and legal responsibilities.

- In the longer term it is critical that initiatives arising from the EMS are seen to be happening on the ground in order to maintain the participation and commitment of RAs and stakeholders.

Role/value of specific participatory techniques

Participatory Appraisal: good means of gathering preliminary information on the site and the views of the participants on management issues, but not a means of facilitating deliberations concerning the resolution of conflicts and the development of a management scheme**.**

Future Search: good as a means of gathering preliminary information on the views of the participants concerning the site, but not as a means of facilitating deliberations concerning the

fulfilment of objectives, the resolution of conflicts, and the development of management measures.

Consensus Building through stakeholder dialogue: this approach would appear to be effective in gathering initial information concerning the site, discussing conflicts, identifying opportunities and developing a management scheme which has the support of stakeholders and RAs

Role of Central NCA

Tensions arose in several instances over the input of the central NCA to the local process of developing a management scheme. These tensions could, to a degree, be overcome by:

- ensuring that central NCA presentations and documents are sensitive to the local RA/stakeholder culture;
- avoiding scientific terms and acknowledging and respecting the knowledge and aspirations of stakeholders;
- ensuring that central NCA interventions are fully explained and preferably made in person, so that the local project officer is able to maintain some independence;
- ensuring that a positive, constructive approach is taken in order to support local initiatives and engender a sense of local ownership.

The delays in the delivery of the conservation objectives and operations advice was a significant issue in many case studies. The following approaches were generally successful in dealing with the delays.

- Provide for the input of stakeholders/RAs to the advice through informal and formal consultations, paying particular attention to demonstrating that stakeholder/RA input is being incorporated, and providing sufficient time for deliberation and response.
- Ensure that stakeholders/RAs have other tasks related to the development of the management scheme/wider EMS issues while objectives and operations advice is being further developed.
- Ensure that the RAs/stakeholders know what to expect in terms of the level of detail of the objectives and operations advice and its role in the management scheme preparation process.

Role of project officers

- The skills and competencies of project officers need to match the social and political culture of sites, *eg* on a rural site with close-knit communities, people skills and local knowledge may be particularly important, whilst on a complex urban site, political and scientific expertise may be particularly important.
- Project officers with appropriate experience of the local political culture should be employed where possible, particularly for sites which are likely to be politically sensitive or contentious.

- Where practicable and appropriate, EMS tasks should be undertaken by project officers rather than consultants as this develops their knowledge, experience and standing.
- Required project officer skills and training should be balanced between developing social/political capacity and in developing a scientific base for the management scheme.

The role of champions/opponents

- It is important to identify those individuals who have the trust and respect of certain factions of the stakeholder/RA community and to build there support for and understanding of the EMS.

Role of Science

- Scientific information concerning the site, including the details of why it was selected, should be made available as early in the EMS process as is possible, in order to maximise its impact.
- The potency of good, and often existing, scientific information in resolving conflicts should not be under-estimated.
- It should be made clear where there are gaps in the scientific knowledge in order to identify research/monitoring priorities, and where decisions need to be made under a degree of uncertainty.
- RA and stakeholder involvement in scientific assessments and monitoring exercises, including the recognition and utilisation of their ecological and other local knowledge, should be maximised.

Role of interpretation and publicity

- Information sharing activities are a pre-requisite for higher levels of participation and not a substitute.
- Glossy and expensive information sharing initiatives may alienate some RAs/stakeholders.
- Support can be promoted through the *process* of developing interpretive and publicity material by using local people in such initiatives and employing other local resources.
- It is important to achieve a balance between presenting the need for conservation with the need for compatible traditional activities and development opportunities.

Overview of European Marine Site case studies

Social Capital State	EMS	No. RAs	No. SHs	Management history	Management Structure	Participation/ partnership-building	Other features
Higher: successfully capitalised upon	Plymouth Sound and Estuaries	14	400K	EMP: rebuilt previously strained relations	3 EMP structures: *two- tier*	AG has consultation/discussion function; SH/RA knowledge employed through workshops, q'aires, etc; emphasis on many meetings and honesty	Queen's Harbour Master important champion; liaison to ensure that NCA presentations sensitive to local context
	Strangford Lough	4	60K	ASSI, MNR: many conflicts aired and resolved	RA/SH Management Comm. With RA implementation Group: *flat*	SHs have decision-making powers in partnership with RAs on Management Comm., to which many tasks devolved; many conflicts previously negotiated through marine nature reserve (MNR)	Many relevant statutory functions within DoE(NI): aids integration; proceeding cautiously to ensure that management structure remains 'flat'
	Morecambe Bay	13	200K	EMP: rebuilt previously strained relations	MG - RAs; AG - EMP AG: *two-tier*	Meetings, including informal local meetings; surveys in partnership with RAs/SHs	Interpretation initiatives include prints produced by local artist and video/photos of marine life, as well as aerial photos of EMS
	Essex Estuaries	16	500K	EMP for part; relations built through SSSI/SPA liaison	2 EMP structures: *two-tier* + Harbour Authority AG - SHs and RAs.	Future Search workshop employed for one of EMPs: established visions for estuary, beyond EMS; emphasis on identifying compatible development opportunities	NCA PO focused on science and SH liaison, + LA PO focused on development opportunities and other strategic issues
	Solway Firth	16	100K	EMP which employed PRA workshops and consulted widely	EMP MG adopted EMS role; no AG - role fulfilled by previous EMP: *two-tier*	SH input previously provided through EMP ; informal scientific AG formed; otherwise EMP strategy and structure essentially fulfilling these roles	All SHs on EMP list sent leaflet introducing the EMS; Post-LIFE concerns, particularly as PO facilitates scientific AG
	Chesil and the Fleet	10	1K	Private estate led management structure since 1990; SPA 1985	Former structure employed: MG - RAs; AG – SHs: *two-tier*	Farmers not represented in former management structure so workshop planned to include them; long-standing scientific AG; statutory obligations played-down	EMS unique in that mostly owned by private estate; NCA/DETR workshop antagonised Ras
Lower: successfully developed	Papa Stour	6	0.15K	Pursuing local shellfisheries management	Advisory Panel consisting of RAs/SHs - TGs; *flat*	Great emphasis on meetings and local workshops	LA has had a key role in developing the flat Advisory Panel
	Sound of Arisaig	7	1K	None; some previous negative experiences with SSSIs	Management Forum consisting of RAs/SHs; most tasks devolved to TGs: *flat*	Emphasis on meetings and networking: PO knows and is a member of the local community; many SHs appreciated tourism development potential	LA has had a key role in developing and formalising the role of the flat Management Forum and TGs
	Loch Maddy	8	0.2K	None; some previous negative experiences with SSSIs	Open MG – RAs and SHs meet on an open to all basis: *flat*	Emphasis on meetings, networking and local workshops involving form of PRA; many SHs appreciated tourism development potential	Glass-bottomed boat chartered to promote awareness of EMS features; EMS interpretation centre being discussed
	Wash and N. Norfolk Coast	15	110K	EMP – *three-tier*; wildfowlers alienated	MG – RAs & commoners; AG split into 3 geographical areas; *two-tier*	EMS management structure separated from EMP in order to provide for wildfowlers participation; wildfowlers also involved in surveys, etc; emphasis on meetings	Listening and admitting mistakes important; RSPB warden was invaluable in developing participation of wildfowlers

Social Capital State	EMS	No. RAs	No. SHs	Management history	Management Structure	Participation/ partnership-building	Other features
	NE Kent	10	120K	None; some previous conflicts between LA & NCA	SH & RA Group have developed MS, with MG of RAs for implementation: *flat*	Consensus Building workshops used to provide for SH & RA participation; plan for coastal regeneration plan developed alongside EMS MS	LA, with whom there had previously been conflicts, had key role in development of and participation in CB workshops
Higher: experiencing some difficulties with development	Cardigan Bay	9	10K	Voluntary CMHC (for dolphins) largely established by SHs	MG, AG, & TG + annual conference: *three-tier*	Unclear/intangible role of AG &TGs has been an obstacle to participation; public meetings planned to discuss draft MS and develop SH interest	Initial shelving of Marine Heritage Coast alienated many RAs & SHs, some of whom became outspoken opponents of EMS
	Solent/S. Wight Maritime	40	1,140 K	EMP: important for developing EMS: forum for discussions/objections	EMS MG – RAs; AG – EMP TGs: based on issues or geographical areas: *two tier*	EMS management structure agreed by RAs/SHs through EMP; too many RAs/SHs for meetings; reliance on letters, newsletters and public meetings	Complex site with many SHs/conflicts; disconnected: many estuaries, island/ mainland; EMS now divided into two
Lower: experiencing some difficulties with development	Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau	10	60K	None	MG but insufficient interest amongst SHs in TG so SH Liaison Group established to discuss MS: *two-tier*	Two extensive mailings inviting expressions of interest in TGs yielded very few responses; public meetings stimulated interest in EMS as a result of which SH Liaison Group established	Difficulties in securing RA commitment, but this was overcome, partly by assigning MG task of establishing SH Liaison Group; discontinuous shape of site an issue?
	Berwick. & N. N'land Coast	27	35K	Partnerships established for parts: voluntary MNR, Heritage Coast & NNRs	MG – RAs; AG/TGs – SHs: *two tier*	Meetings important in re-engaging RAs and recruiting SHs + newspaper articles for SHs; RA participatory workshop 'fell flat': used to formal meetings;	AG delayed in face of MG apathy: long cross-border site, Reg. 33 delays and lack of issues; AG/TGs produced issues paper

Gwerthusiad o'r dulliau o hybu cyfranogiad awdurdodau perthnasol a rhai â diddordeb mewn Safleoedd Morol Ewropeaidd yn y DU

Arolwg o'r Adroddiad

Rhagarweiniad

Mae'r ddogfen hon yn adrodd ar ganfyddiadau prosiect a gomisiynwyd fel rhan o *Prosiect ACA Morol y DU* i werthuso'r gwahanol ddulliau a gymerwyd fel bod Awdurdod Perthnasol (AP) a'r rhai â diddordeb yn cymryd rhan yn Safleoedd Morol Ewropeaidd (SME). Mae'r canfyddiadau hyn wedi'u seilio ar 15 astudiaeth achos a gasglodd eu gwybodaeth yn y lle cyntaf trwy gyfrwng cyfweliadau a gafodd eu cynnal gan swyddogion prosiect SME yn ystod Mehefin-Gorffennaf 1999. Cafodd cyfweliadau ffôn hefyd eu cynnal gyda sampl bychan o AP a chyda rhai â diddordeb yn achos pedwar astudiaeth achos a hynny er mwyn cael golwg ehangach ar y dulliau cyfranogiad a gymerwyd.

Nodau ac amcanion y prosiect yma yw:

- gwerthuso effeithiolrwydd y dulliau a'r technegau sydd wedi'u cymryd i hyrwyddo AP a rhai eraill â diddordeb i gymryd rhan ym mhrosesau cynllun rheoli SME
- dadansoddi y cyd-destunau y cafodd y technegau yma eu gweithredu o'u mewn
- gwneud argymhellion ynglyn ag ymarfer da mewn gwahanol gyd-destunau

Yn y DU mae Gorchmynion Cynefinoedd ac Adar y GE wedi cael eu gweithredu trwy Reoliadau'r Cynefinoedd sy'n ei gwneud hi'n ddyletswydd ar AP i wneud a gweithredu cynlluniau rheoli ar gyfer SME. Mae'n ofynnol i AP weithio mewn partneriaeth gyda'i gilydd a chyda rhai eraill â diddordeb er mwyn cynnal statws cadwraethol ffafriol y nodweddion o fewn SME.

Wrth ddatblygu a gweithredu dulliau a thechnegau ar gyfer hyrwyddo cyfranogiad AP a rhai eraill â diddordeb yn rheolaeth SME, mae gofyn ystyried y sialensiau canlynol.

- Cyfuniad unigol o nodweddion pob SME.
- Gorchymyn statudol i gydymffurfio â deddfwriaeth, allai elyniaethu rhai â diddordeb.
- Lefel isel o ymwybyddiaeth ynglyn â phwysigrwydd a gwerth nodweddion cadwraeth forol.
- Prinder profiad AP, yr AGN yn enwedig, wrth gyflawni ymrwymiadau statudol cadwraeth yn yr amgylchedd morol.
- Cymharol ychydig o sylfaen gwybodaeth wyddonol forol sydd yn achosi mwy o ansicrwydd a phenderfyniadau angen eu gwneud.
- Y fframwaith polisi amryfal ddefnydd a rheolaeth adrannol.
- Gwrthwynebiad i ymyrraeth o'r tu allan ymhlith rhai cymunedau sydd â diddordeb.
- Diffyg profiad rhai swyddogion prosiect mewn datblygu partneriaethau ar gyfer cadwraeth forol.

Mae'r gwerthusiad yma o'r gwahanol ddulliau sydd wedi cael eu datblygu i gyfarfod y sialensau yma ar gyfer y 15 astudiaeth achos wedi'i sylfaenu yn bennaf ar bersbectif y sampl yma o swyddogion prosiect SME. O ystyried cyfyngiadau'r adnoddau a'i bod yn ddyddiau cymharol gynnar ar y broses, pan oedd cynlluniau rheoli ar gyfer y SME yn dal i gael eu datblygu, nid oedd yn bosibl defnyddio criteria neu ddangoswyr o lwyddiant wedi'i sylfaenu ar *allgynhyrchion* o gynlluniau rheoli SME. Yn lle hynny, defnyddiwyd criteria neu ddangoswyr yn seiliedig ar y llwyddiant neu'r aflwyddiant oedd yn amlygu'i hun ynglyn â *phrosesau* cynllun rheoli'r SME er mwyn cael sail ar gyfer gwerthusiadau mwy cynhwysfawr yn y dyfodol.

Mae'r llenyddiaeth ar wahanol ddulliau o reoli gwarchodfeydd natur morol yn y DU a ledled y byd yn arwyddo fod dulliau sy'n darparu ar gyfer cyfranogiad AP a rhai eraill â diddordeb yn gallu hyrwyddo cydweithio a bod y dulliau cymharol 'feddal' gwaelod-i fyny yma angen cael eu cysylltu â dulliau cymharol 'galed' o'r brig i lawr.   .

Cysyniadau proses gymdeithasol

Gellir diffinio cyfranogiad fel ***proses gymdeithasol trwy'r hon y gall pobl ddylanwadu a rhannu rheolaeth dros y penderfyniadau sy'n eu heffeithio hwy.*** Mae pedwar cam cyfranogiad wedi'i nodi:

1.   gweithgareddau rhannu gwybodaeth
2.   gweithgareddau ymgynghorol
3.   gweithgareddau cydweithredu
4.   gweithgareddau awdurdodi

Mae'r pedwar cam yma o gymryd rhan wedi'u hynodi gan fwy a mwy o gyfathrebu a chan symudiad mewn cysylltiadau pwer o anghymesur (o'r brig i lawr) i gymesur (partneriaid cydradd). Prosesau cymdeithasol yw adeiladu partneriaethau gydag AP, gan alluogi ystod o rai â diddordeb i gymryd rhan weithredol mewn gwneud penderfyniadau a rhoi gwybod/ymgynghori â chylch ehangach o rai â diddordeb. Mae gwyddonwyr cymdeithas yn defnyddio'r mataffor **cyfalaf cymdeithasol** i ddisgrifio'r ffyrdd y mae prosesau cymdeithasol mewn ardal yn cyfrannu tuag at ganlyniadau cynhyrchiol. Mae cyfalaf cymdeithasol yn fynegiant o:

- **Ymddiriedaeth** yng ngonestrwydd, unplygrwydd a didwylledd yr unigolion a'r mudiadau sy'n ymwneud â phrosiect ar y cyd.

- **Hyder** yng ngwybodaeth, gallu ac awdurdod yr unigolion a'r mudiadau sy'n rhan o'r broses.

- Caiff cyfalaf cymdeithasol ei greu trwy gydweithiadau pobl yn eu **rhwydweithiau** proffesiynol a phersonol. Bydd canlyniad y rhwydweithiau yma yn dibynnu ar ddau brif ffactor:

- **Ehangder** – gall rhwydwaith fod yn amrywiol o ran ei aelodaeth neu wedi'i gyfyngu'n llwyr i un grwp diddordeb arbennig.

- **Dyfnder y berthynas** – byddai rhwydwaith s'yn cyfrannu cyfalaf cymdeithasol uchel mewn ardal yn un ble byddai ei aelodau yn cyfarfod â'i gilydd mewn nifer o gyd-

destunau gwahanol; a ble y ceir gwybodaeth eang o'r hyn sy'n digwydd mewn mannau eraill yn y rhwydwaith.

Yn ôl amodau Rheoliadau Cynefinoedd, mae angen dod ag AP at ei gilydd mewn partneriaeth i gymryd cyfrifoldeb ar y cyd o reolaeth y safle. Golyga hyn fod gofyn i AP fod ynghlwm â phedair cam y broses gyfranogaeth. Ceir dadlau ei bod yn bwyig fod prosesau SME hefyd yn ymrwymo'r rhai â diddordeb hyd at a chan gynnwys cam 3, *hy* dod â'r rhai â diddordeb i drefniadau cydweithrediadol gyda'r bartneriaeth reoli. Mae pru'n a yw hi'n bosibl rhoi pwer i rai â diddordeb a thrwy hynny ymestyn eu cyfranogiad hyd at gam 4 yn dibynnu i raddau helaeth ar ddiwylliant politicaidd y bartneriaeth.

Caiff ei argymell fod **cyfathrebu wyneb yn wyneb** a chaniatau **amser digonol** ar gyfer prosesau yn ffactorau pwysig yn natblygiad cyfalaf cymdeithasol a rhwydweithiau. Yng nghyd-destun penodol SME, caiff ei argymell fod y ffactorau canlynol yn hynod bwysig mewn adnabod ac yna adeiladu cyfalaf cymdeithasol ar gyfer y broses SME.

1. Mae ymrwymo AP a rhai â diddordeb yn y broses ddechreuol o gynllunio'r cynllun rheoli yn dangos hyder yn arbenigedd a gwybodaeth y rhai â diddordeb ac mae'n adeiladu ymddiriedaeth yn yr ymrwymiad i rannu pwer a chyfrifoldeb.
2. Trwy i'r AP/rhai â diddordeb fod yn rhan o'r bartneriaeth o ddechrau'r prosiect ceir parhad ac amser i adeiladu perthynas gymdeithasol a chryfhau rwydweithiau.
3. Bydd proses barhaus agored o dorri tir newydd, trafod, addasu a newid yn gymorth i adeiladu consensws yn sieliedig ar well dealltwriaeth o safbwyntiau gwahanol ac o gymorth i sicrhau cyfreithlondeb i benderfyniadau.
4. Trwy adeiladu cyfalaf cymdeithasol i gefnogi'r SME, bydd mwy o gydatebolrwydd ymhlith AP a rhai â diddordeb. Bydd hyn yn cryfhau eu hymrwymiad i ddatrys problemau o fewn y cynllun a sicrhau ei lwyddiant.

Mae effeithiolrwydd prosesau SME mewn adeiladu cyfalaf cymdeithasol yn perthyn yn agos i'r cyd-destunau penodol lle y'i gweithredir: **mae prosesau cyfranogiad yn brosesau sy'n dibynnu ar gyd-destun.** Mae nodweddion lleol safleoedd felly'n bwysig, gan gynnwys:

- nodweddion ffisegol a thirwedd
- gweithgareddau economaidd a chymdeithasol, presennol ac yn y gorffennol
- diwylliant politicaidd ac, yn arbennig, rhwydweithiau polisi presennol

Methodoleg astudiaeth achos

Gwerthusiad yw'r elfen wannaf mewn theori cyfranogiad ac ymarfer: mae dangosyddion a mecanweithiau cryf i fesur ansawdd, effaith ac effeithiolrwydd prosesau cyfranogiad yn dal i gael eu datblygu. Roedd angen canolbwyntio felly ar faint yr oedd prosesau safle- benodol i'w gweld yn cyfrannu at:

- ddatblygiad o gynhwysedd cymdeithasol cryf a pharhaol sy'n hyrwyddo cydweithrediad ac y gellir galw arno i gynnal ymrwymiad ac ymdrin ag anghydweld ynglyn â rheolaeth safle.

- Y potensial i gyflawni mewn amser amcanion cadwraethol ar safle a chyflawni'r gofynion cyfreithiol.

Gwerthusiad cyd-destunol

Mae'r cysyniad o gyfalaf cymdeithasol yn cael ei ddefnyddio i fod yn gyfrwng categoreiddio'r 15 astdiaeth achos ac i amlinellu'r gwahanol ddulliau a thechnegau a ddefnyddiwyd i ddatblygu cyfalaf cymdeithasol. Mae'n bosibl yn fras dosbarthu'r 15 safle i ddau grwp:

Safleoedd gyda chyfalaf cymdeithasol cryfach ar ddechrau'r broses SME. Ym mhob achos ond un, canfyddwyd fod datblygu partneriaeth rheoli moryd neu aber cyn y SME wedi cynhyrchu cyfalaf cymdeithasol sylweddol, hyd yn oed lle cafwyd cryn wrthdaro rhwng diddordebau datblygiad a chadwraeth cyn y CME. Mewn achosion eraill, roedd y gwersi a ddysgwyd a'r dulliau a gafodd eu gweithredu gyda dynodiadau cadwraeth natur blaenorol neu fentrau tebyg wedi helpu i feithrin perthynas rhwng AP, rhai â diddordeb a'r swyddogion NCA lleol.

Safleoedd gyda chyfalaf cymdeithasol gwannach ar ddechrau'r broses SME. Mae'n bwysig cofio nad yw'r dosbarthiad yma'n ddifrïol mewn unrhyw ffordd. Mae'r 'cyflwr' cyfalaf cymdeithsol yn cael ei ystyried yn unig yn nhermau hanes lleol y partneriaethau a'r mentrau sydd wedi cael eu datblygu i gyflawni amcanion tebyg i rai'r SME, *hy* yn canolbwyntio ar gadwraeth forol a rheolaeth adnoddau morol integredig. Yn aml bydd gan yr ardaloedd sydd wedi'u dosbarthu yma fel rhai â chyfalaf cymdeithasol gwannach i gefnogi datblygiad y SME gyfalaf cymdeithasol uchel mewn ffyrdd eraill. Yn y rhan fwyaf o safleoedd yn y categori yma doedd dim menter reolaethol flaenorol drosfwaol. Nid yw ardaloedd o'r fath yn amlwg o anghenraid yn brin o gydlynoldeb cymdeithasol, ond dadleuir mai dim ond rhwydweithiau cymdeithasol rhannol oedd yn bodoli i gynnal datblygiad SME.

Gan adeiladu ar yr asesiadau sylfaenol yma o gyflyrau cyfalaf cymdeithasol, mae'n bosibl diffinio pedwar dosbarth o astudiaethau achos yn nhermau eu 'cyfeiriadau' cyfalaf cymdeithasol fel y crynhoir yn y tabl ar ddiwedd y crynodeb yma.

Cyfalaf cymdeithasol cryfach, wedi elwa'n llwyddiannus arno. Ym mhob un o'r achosion yma mae'r rhwydweithiau cymdeithasol blaenorol wedi cael eu defnyddio'n llwyddiannus i ddatblygu'r SME. Yr hyn sy'n gyffredin i'r holl achosion hyn yw fod y strwythurau rheolaeth blaenorol wedi cael eu mabwysiadu a/neu eu haddasu'n llwyddiannus i ddarparu ar gyfer datblygu'r SME.

Cyfalaf cymdeithasol gwannach wedi'i gryfhau trwy'r SME. Mae'n ymddangos fod dulliau megis cynnal nifer o gyfarfodydd rhagweithiol, gweithdai a thrafodaethau a sefydlu strwythurau rheolaeth fflat, cymharol gynhwysol wedi bod yn llwyddiannus mewn cryfhau cyfalaf cymdeithasol i'r SME mewn cyd-destunau lle'r oedd cymharol ychydig o gefnogaeth cynt.

Cyfalaf cymdeithasol cryfach ond wedi cael peth anawsterau wrth ddatblygu'r SME. Mewn un achos roedd cyn fenter gadwraethol wirfoddol wedi datblygu cyfalaf cymdeithasol uchel ar gyfer rhan o'r SME ond bu i'r penderfyniad dechreuol i roi'r fenter yma o'r neilltu tra oedd y SME yn cael ei datblygu elyniaethu rhai â diddordeb ac AP. Mewn achos arall

roedd y PME blaenorol wedi bod yn llwyddiannus wrth ddatblygu cyfalaf cymdeithasol ond roedd natur cymhleth a helaeth y safle yma, y nifer uchel o SP a rhai â diddordeb a'r posibilrwydd o gael gwrthdaro rhwng diddordebau datblygu a chadwraeth wedi gosod sialensau mawr i ddatblygiad y SME.

Cyfalaf cymdeithasol gwannach ac wedi profi peth anawsterau wrth ddatblygu'r SME. Mewn dau achos roedd natur helaeth, wasgaredig yn ddaearyddol yr AME wedi'i gwneud hi'n anodd i'r AP a rhai â diddordeb berthnasu i'r AME fel un uned i'w rheoli. Hefyd roedd y pwyslais yn y dechrau ar sefydlu grwp rheoli ar gyfer yr AP a bu oedi cyn ennyn cefnogaeth ymhlith rhai â diddordeb.

Gwersi pwysig i'w dysgu oddi wrth y 15 astudiaeth achos SME

Cyd-destunau daearyddol

- Pan fo SME yn fawr ac yn cynnwys nifer o unedau daearyddol digyswllt, mae angen canolbwyntio ymdrechion ar bennu ffyrdd o ddatblygu ymwybyddiaeth AP/rhai â diddordeb o bwysigrwydd rheoli'r safle fel un uned a/neu archwilio'r posibilrwydd o strwythurau 'ffederal' o reoli.
- Mewn safleoedd gwledig lle y mae llai o botensial am rai â diddordeb ceir llawer mwy o ddisgwyliadau ac angen am gyfranogiad gan gyfran fwy o rai â diddordeb. Mewn safleoedd trefol lle y mae mwy o botensial am rai â diddordeb ceir llai o ddisgwyliadau ac angen am gyfranogiad gan gyfran lai o rai â diddordeb. Mae angen cadw hyn mewn cof wrth ystyried pa mor berthnasol yw technegau cyfranogi.

Hanes rheolaeth cyn-SME

- Ble y mae cyfalaf cymdeithasol wedi cael ei greu trwy fentrau rheolaeth blaenorol, mae hyn yn fwy tebygol o gael ei gynnal a'i wella os yw'r SME yn rhan o'r fenter flaenorol trwy fabwysiadu/addasu'r strwythur a'r dull rheoli.
- Pan fo menter reolaeth flaenorol wedi bod yn aflwyddiannus mewn creu trawsdoriad o cyfalaf cymdeithasol, mae'n ymddangos yn fanteisiol asesu achosion sylfaenol y diffyg llwyddiant blaenorol a chanolbwyntio ymdrechion ar ddelio â'r rhain a/neu, mewn achosion eithafol, sefydlu'r SME ar wahân.

Strwythurau Rheolaeth SME

- Mae'n fanteisiol os yw'r strwythur rheolaeth ddylid ei fabwysiadu yn cael ei drafod yn agored o'r dechrau gyda'r rhai â diddordeb yn cymryd rhan.
- Ymddengys y byddai strwythurau rheolaeth deuris, ble y mae AP a rhai â diddordeb yn cael eu cynrychioli trwy grwpiau ar wahân, yn arbennig o addas ar gyfer safleoedd gyda nifer uchel o rai sydd yn debygol o fod â diddordeb a ble y mae cyfalaf cymdeithasol wedi'i ddatblygu trwy fentrau blaenorol yn uchel.
- Mae strwythurau rheolaeth deuris, sydd yn gymharol o'r gwaelod i fyny a lle y mae llawer o gyfrifoldebau wedi'u trosglwyddo i'r grwp o rai â diddordeb, yn ymddangos

yn arbennig o addas ble y mae yna nifer uchel o rai â diddordeb ond y cyfalaf cymdeithasol wedi bod yn isel ar y dechrau.

- Byddai strwythurau rheolaeth fflat yn cynnwys AP a rhai â diddordeb yn yr un grwp yn ymddangos yn arbennig o addas ar gyfer ardaloedd arfordirol ble y mae'r nifer â diddordeb yn gymharol isel a llawer yn y fantol iddynt, er cafodd y strwythur yma ei ddefnyddio'n llwyddiannus hefyd ar gyfer safle gyda nifer o rai â diddordeb. Ni ddylid felly ei ddiystyrru ar gyfer safleoedd o'r fath.

- Mae amrywiaeth o AP wedi mabwysiadu rôl flaenllaw ac mae hi'n fater o benderfynu ar bob achos unigol yn dibynnu ar y cyd-destun politicaidd lleol.

Ymgynghori dechreuol

- Mae o fantais cael cymaint â phosibl o gyfarfodydd wyneb yn wyneb gyda'r AP a rhai âdiddordeb mor fuan â phosibl yn y broses er mwyn ymrwymo/recriwtio pobl yn bersonol ac adeiladu ymddiriedaeth a hyder yn y broses.

- Dylai pecynnau ymgynghorol ar argymhellion i ddynodi SME gynnwys cymaint o wybodaeth ag sy'n bosibl ynghylch oblygiadau rheolaeth posibl.

- Bu i rai â diddordeb gael eu gelyniaethu, yn enwedig pysgotwyr, oherwydd fod yr ymgynghori wedi'i gyfyngu i berchenogion/deiliaid: dylid ymgynghori â phawb sydd â diddordeb uniongyrchol.

Dulliau o adeiladu partneriaethau AP

- Ymddengys fod gweithdai cynnar yn ymdrin a thrafod y cyfrifoldebau newydd ar AP wedi gorbwysleisio'r dyletswyddau cyfreithiol a chanlyniadau posibl peidio â chydymffurfio. Nid oedd hyn y ffordd orau posibl o ddatblygu ymdeimlad o bartneriaeth a chyd gyfrifoldeb ymhlith AP. Gall cyswllt rhwng swyddog prosiect y SME a'r asiantaeth genedlaethol gwarchod natur (AGGN) rwystro nifer o broblemau tebygol trwy sicrhau fod gweithdai yn cael eu cyflwyno mewn dull sensitif i'r cyd-destun AP lleol.

- Gall gweithdai cyfranogol fod yn broblemus pan fo AP wedi arfer â ddulliau ffurfiol iawn ac efallai heb fod yn gyfarwydd â dulliau mwy cyfranogol a chreadigol. Pan fo AP yn fwy parod i dderbyn gweithdai o'r fath neu ble y ceir sgiliau hyrwyddiad arbenigol ar waith, gallant fod yn fforrdd lwyddiannus iawn o 'dorri'r garw' a datblygu perthynas ymhlith AP.

- Mae pennu cyfrifoldebau penodol, gwirioneddol ar AP yn ymwneud â datblygiad y cynllun rheoli a hynny mor fuan â phosibl yn y broses yn gymorth i greu partneriaeth.

- Ble y mae AP arbennig wedi cymryd rôl arweinyddol gref yn natblygiad dechreuol y cynllun rheoli, mae'n bwysig eu bod yn camu'n ôl ac yn annog ac yn rhoi lle i AP eraill gymryd camau gyda'i gilydd i hyrwyddo cydweithrediad rhwng AP a thrwy hynny leihau'r perygl o golli'r momentwm sefydliadol.

Dulliau o adeiladu cyfranogiad rhai â diddordeb

- Wrth recriwtio rhai â diddordeb, ni ddylid dibynnu ar restrau ymgynghori statudol nac ar gyrraedd rhai â diddordeb ehangach trwy grwpiau megis Cynghorau Bro gan y bydd y ddwy ffordd yma yn 'colli' nifer o rai â diddordeb.

- Dull sydd i'w gweld yn llwyddo i gynyddu'r gynrychiolaeth yw'r un lle y gofynnir i'r rhai â diddordeb gafodd eu denu yn ystod yr ymdrechion cynnar enwi rhai eraill â diddordeb ddylai fod yn cymryd rhan.

- Mae rhai â diddordeb yn fwy tebygol o deimlo eu bod yn bartneriaid yn y SME os ydynt, cyn belled ag y bo hynny'n bosibl, yn gallu cydweithredu gyda'r AP trwy gyfrwng strwythurau rheolaeth deuris neu yn cael yr hawl i weithredu trwy gyfrwng strwythurau rheoli fflat.

- Ble y mae cyfraniad y rhai â diddordeb wedi'i gyfyngu i drafod, cynghori, ymgynghori a chyflwyno gwybodaeth, gall hyn arwain at ddifaterwch, amharodrwydd i gydweithredu gyda'r cynllun rheoli neu hyd yn oed at brotestiadau/herio, yn enwedig mewn safleoedd gwledig.

- Lle y cafwyd problemau wrth ddatblygu cyfranogiad rhai â diddordeb yn y cynllun rheoli, gellir defnyddio dulliau mwy cyfranogol ymgynghorol gyda'r cynllun rheoli drafft fel cyfle i ymrwymo rhai â diddordeb. Byddai lansiad fyddai'n tynnu sylw yn ateb yr un angen yn achos y cynllun rheoli terfynol.

- Trwy roi cyfrifoldebau penodol, gwirioneddol a pherthnasol i ddatblygiad y cynllun rheoli i rai â diddordeb gellir datblygu cyfalaf cymdeithasol a darparu ar gyfer cyfranogiad adeiladol rhai â diddordeb.

- Mae integreiddio manylion cyfleoedd ar gyfer datblygiad cydnaws a chyfleoedd adfywio yn y SME yn sbarduno rhai â diddordeb (a rhai AP) i gymryd rhan.

- Mae gofyn i syddogion y prosiect fod yn ymwybodol o wrthdaro, dan yr wyneb efallai, sy'n bodoli ymhlith rhai â diddordeb/AP y gallai'r SME gael ei dynnu i mewn iddo.

- Os yn ymgynghori ar ffurf dogfen ddrafft, peidiwch â gwneud iddi edrych yn rhy sgleiniog a therfynol gan y gallai hyn roi'r argraff i'r rhai â diddordeb ei fod yn *fait accompli*.

Dulliau cyffredinol

- Mae angen cael cydbwysedd rhwng cwblhau mewn pryd a chadw'r SME i symud rhagddi a pheidio gwthio'r broses yn rhy gyflym mewn ffordd fyddai'n bosibl o elyniaethu rhai o'r AP/rhai â diddordeb.

- Mae angen cynllunio'r strwythurau a'r prosesau SME fel eu bod yn cynnal eu hunain o'r dechrau er mwyn paratoi at absenoldeb tymor hirach swyddog prosiect ymroddgar.

- Mae'n bwysig fod diwylliant o onestrwydd ac ymddiriedaeth yn cael ei ddatblygu ymhlith AP/rhai â diddordeb er mwyn cael amgylchedd politicaidd positif ac adeiladol yn gyffredinol.

- Mae'n bwysig pwysleisio mai proses o bartneriaeth yw gwarchod natur yn hytrach na'i gyfyngu i faterion gwyddonol a chyfrifoldebau cyfreithiol.

- Yn y tymor hir, mae'n hollbwysig fod mentrau sy'n codi o'r SME i'w gweld yn digwydd ar lawr gwlad er mwyn cynnal cyfranogiad ac ymrwymiad AP a rhai â diddordeb.

Rôl/ gwerth technegau cyfranogol penodol

Gwerthusiad cyfranogol: yn ffordd dda o gasglu gwybodaeth ddechreuol ynglyn â'r safle a barn y cyfranogwyr ar faterion rheolaethol ond nid yn ffordd o hwyluso penderfyniadau ynglyn â datrys anghydfod a datblygiad cynllun rheoli.

Ymchwil i'r Dyfodol: yn dda fel modd o gasglu gwybodaeth ddechreuol ar farn cyfranogwyr ynglyn â'r safle, ond nid fel modd o hwyluso penderfyniadau ynglyn â chyflawni amcanion, datrys anghydfod a datblygu mesurau rheolaeth.

Adeiladu consensws trwy i rai â diddordeb drafod: byddai'r dull yma'n ymddangos yn fodd effeithiol o gasglu gwybodaeth ddechreuol ynglyn â'r safle, trafod anghydfod, diffinio cyfleoedd a datblgu cynllun rheolaeth sydd â chefnogaeth y rhai â diddordeb ac AP.

Rôl AGN Ganolog

- Bu tensiynau mewn sawl achos dros gyfraniad AGN yn ganolog i'r broses leol o ddatblygu cynllun datblygu. Gallai'r tensiynau yma gael eu datrys i raddau trwy:-
- sicrhau fod cyflwyniadau a dogfennau AGN ganolog yn sensitif i ddiwylliant yr AP/rhai â diddordeb yn lleol;
- peidio defnyddio termau gwyddonol a chydnabod a pharchu gwybodaeth a dyheadau rhai â diddordeb;
- sicrhau fod ymyrraeth AGN ganolog yn cael ei egluro'n llawn a gorau oll wedi'i gyflwyno'n bersonol fel bod y swyddog prosiect lleol yn gallu cadw rhywfaint o annibyniaeth;
- sicrhau fod dull positif, adeiladol yn cael ei gymryd er mwyn cefnogi mentrau lleol a magu ymdeimlad o berchenogaeth leol.

Roedd yr oedi cyn cyflwyno'r amcanion cadwraeth a'r cynghorion gweithredu yn fater arwyddocaol mewn nifer o astudiaethau achos. Roedd y dulliau canlynol yn llwyddiannus yn gyffredinol wrth ddelio gyda'r oedi.

- Darparu trwy ymgynghori ffurfiol ac anffurfiol ar gyfer cyfraniad y rhai â diddordeb/AP i'r broses o gynghori gan dalu sylw'n arbennig i ddangos fod cyfraniad y rhai â diddordeb/AP yn cael ei ymgorffori a chan ddarparu digon o amser ar gyfer ymgynghori ac ymateb.
- Sicrhau fod gan y rhai â diddordeb/AP dasgau eraill perthnasol i ddatblygu'r cynllun rheoli/materion SME ehangach tra bo cyngor ynglyn ag amcanion a gweithredu yn cael ei ddatblygu ymhellach.
- Sicrhau fod yr AP/rhai â diddordeb yn gwybod beth i'w ddisgwyl yn nhermau lefel manylion y cyngor ynghylch amcanion a gweithredu a'i rôl yn y broses o baratoi cynllun rheoli.

Rôl swyddogion prosiect

- Mae angen i sgiliau a chymwysterau'r swyddogion prosiect weddu i ddiwylliant cymdeithasol a pholiticaidd y safle, *ee* ar safle wledig gyda chymunedau clos, gallai adnabod pobl a gwybodaeth leol fod yn hynod bwysig tra ar safle drefol fwy cymhleth gallai arbenigedd politicaidd a gwyddonol fod yn arbennig o bwysig.

- Pan fo hynny'n bosibl, dylid cyflogi swyddogion prosiect gyda phrofiad perthnasol o'r diwylliant politicaidd lleol, yn enwedig ar gyfer safleoedd sydd yn debygol o fod yn sensitif yn boliticaidd neu'n gecrus.

- Ble bo hynny'n ymarferol a pherthnasol, dylai tasgau SME gael eu gwneud gan swyddogion prosiect yn hytrach na chan ymgynghorwyr gan fod hyn yn datblygu eu gwybodaeth , eu profiad a'u statws.

- Dylai'r sgiliau a'r hyfforddiant y mae'n ofynnol i swyddogion prosiect eu cael fod yn gydbwysedd rhwng datblygu sgiliau cymdeithasol/politicaidd a datblygu sylfaen wyddonol ar gyfer y cynllun rheoli.

Rôl cefnogwyr/gwrthwynebwyr

- Mae'n bwysig adnabod yr unigolion rheini sydd ag ymddiriedaeth a pharch rhai carfanau o gymuned y rhai â diddordeb/AP ac adeiladu ar eu cefnogaeth a'u dealltwriaeth o'r SME.

- Rôl Gwyddoniaeth

- Dylai gwybodaeth wyddonol am y safle, gan gynnwys yr holl fanylion ynglyn â pham y'i dewiswyd, fod ar gael mor fuan â phosibl yn y broses SME er mwyn gwneud yn fawr ohono.

- Ar gyfer datrys anghydfod, ni ddylid bychanu gwerth gwybodaeth wyddonol dda sydd yn aml ar gael.

- Dylid ei gwneud yn berffaith glir ble y ceir bylchau yn y wybodaeth wyddonol er mwyn diffinio blaenoriaethau ymchwil/monitro a ble y mae angen gwneud penderfyniadau tan rywfaint o ansicrwydd.

- Dylai AP a rhai â diddordeb gymryd cymaint o ran â phosibl mewn ymarferion asesu a monitro gwyddonol ac mae hyn yn cynnwys cydnabod a defnyddio'u gwybodaeth ecolegol leol ac unrhyw wybodaeth leol arall.

Rôl dehongliad a chyhoeddusrwydd

- Mae gweithgareddau rhannu gwybodaeth yn angenrheidiol ar gyfer lefelau uwch o gyfranogiad ac nid yn rhywbeth wrth gefn.

- Gallai mentrau rhannu gwybodaeth sgleiniog a chostus elyniaethu rhai AP/rhai â diddordeb.

- Gellir hybu cefnogaeth trwy'r *broses* o ddatblygu deunydd deongliadol a chyhoeddusrwydd a hynny drwy ddefnyddio pobl leol mewn mentrau o'r fath a thrwy gyflogi adnoddau lleol eraill.

- Mae'n bwysig cael cydbwysedd rhwng cyflwyno'r angen am gadwraeth gyda'r angen am weithgareddau traddodiadol cydnaws a chyfleoedd datblygu.

Arolwg o astudiaethau achos Safleoedd Morol Ewropeaidd

Cyflwr Cyfalaf Cymdeithasol	SME	Nifer AP	Nifer Rhai â Didd.	Hanes y Rheolaeth	Strwythur Rheolaeth	Cyfranogiad/ adeiladu partneriaeth	Nodweddion eraill
Uwch: wedi elwa'n llwyddiannus arno	Aberoedd a Chulfor Plymouth	14	400K	PRhA: wedi adfer perthynas oedd yn flaenorol dan bwysau	3 strwythur PRhA: *duris*	GY â swyddogaeth ymgynghorol/trafod; gwybodaeth RhâD/AP yn cael ei ddefnyddio trwy weithdai, holiaduron ac yn y blaen; pwyslais ar nifer o gyfarfodydd a gonestrwydd	Harbwr Feistr y Frenhines yn gefnogwr pwysig; cysylltu i wneud yn siwr fod cyflwyniadau ACN yn sensitif i'r cyd-destun lleol
	Strangford Lough	4	60K	AoDdGA, GNF: nifer o groestyniadau wedi'u lleisio a'u datrys	Pwyll. Rheolaeth AP/RhâD Gyda gweithrediad AP Grwp: *fflat*	Mae gan Rai â Didd hawl i wneud penderfyniadau mewn partneriaeth ag AP ar y Pwyllgor Rheoli, sy'n cael delio â nifer o dasgau; cyn hyn roedd nifer o groestyniadau yn cael eu trafod drwy'r warchodfa natur forol (GNF)	Nifer o swyddogaethau statudol o fewn AyrA(GI) : integreiddiad cymorth; yn symud ymlaen yn ofalus i sicrhau fod strwythur rheolaeth yn parhau'n fflat
	Bae Morcambe	13	200K	PRhA: wedi adfer perthynas oedd yn flaenorol dan bwysau	GRh - AP; GY – GY PRhA: *deuris*	Cyfarfodydd, gan gynnwys cyfarfodydd lleol anffurfiol; arolygon mewn partneriaeth gyda AP/Rh â D.	Mentrau dehongliad yn cynnwys printiau o waith arlunydd lleol a fideo/lluniau o fywyd norol, yn ogystal â lluniau o'r awyr o SME
	Aberoedd Essex	16	500K	PRhA; ar gyfer rhan; perthynas wedi'i adeiladu trwy gyswllt â SoDdGA/AGA	2 strwythur PRhA: *deuris* + GY Awdurdod Harbwr - RhâD ac AP.	Gweithdy ymchwil yn y dyfodol yn cael ei ddefnyddio ar gyfer un o'r PRhA: gweledigaeth wedi'i sicrhau ar gyfer aber, y tu draw i SM; pwyslais ar adnabod cyfleoedd datblygu cydnaws	SP GNG wedi canolbwyntio ar wyddoniaeth a chyswllt RhâD,+ SP ALL wedi canolbwyntio ar ddatblygu cyfleodd a materion statudol eraill
	Aber Solway	16	100K	PRhA ddefnyddiodd weithdai GoGG ac a ymgynghorodd yn helaeth	GY wedi mabwysiadu rôl SME; dim GY- rôl wedi cael ei llenwi gan y PRhA blaenorol: *deuris*	Cyfraniad RhâD cyn hyn drwy PRhA; GYgwyddonol anffurfiol wedi'i ffurfio; fel arall strategaeth a strwythur SME i bob pwrpas yn cyflawni'r rôl yma	Yr holl RâD ar restr PRhA wedi derbyn taflen yn cyflwyno'r SME; ystyriaethau ôl LIFE yn enwedig a'r SP yn hyrwyddo GY gwyddonol
	Chesil a'r Fleet	10	1K	Stad breifat wedi arwain y strwythur rheolaeth er 1990; AGA 1985	Defnyddio'r strwythur blaenorol: GRh - AP; GY– RhâD: *deuris*	Ffermwyr ddim yn cael eu cynrychioli yn y strwythur reolaeth flaenorol felly gweithdai wedi'u cynllunio i'w cynnwys nhw; GY gwyddonol ers peth amser; rhwymedigaethau statudol yn cael eu chwarae i lawr	SME yn unigryw am eu bod gan fwyaf ym meddiant stad breifat; gweithdy GNF/AACRh wedi gelyniaethu AP
IS:wedi'i ddatblygu'n Llwyddiannus	Papa Stour	6	0.15K	Yn dilyn rheolaeth gregynbysgodfeydd leol	Panel Ymgynghorol yn cynnwys AP/Rh â D -GT: *fflat*	Pwyslais mawr ar gyfarfodydd a gweithdai lleol	ALL wedi chwarae rhan allweddol mewn datblygu'r Panel Ymgynghorol fflat
	Culfor Arisaig	7	1K	Dim; rhywfaint o brofiad negyddol gyda SoDdA	Fforwm Rheoli yn cynnwys AP/Rh â D; y rhan fwyaf o dasgau wedi'u trpsg;wuddp i GT: *fflat*	Pwyslais ar gyfarfodydd ac ar rwydweithio: SP yn gwybod hyn ac mae'n aelod o'r gymuned leol; nier o Rh â D	Mae'r ALL wedi chwarae rhan allweddol mewn datblygu a ffurfioli rôl y Fforwm Rheolaeth Fflat a GT
	Loch Maddy	8	0.2K	Dim; rhywfaint o brofiad negyddol gyda SoDdA	GRh agored – AP a Rh â D. yn cyfarfod ar y telerau agored i bawb : *fflat*	Pwyslais ar gyfarfodydd, rhwydweithio a gweithdai lleol yn ymrwymo rhyw ffurf ar GoGG; nifer o RhâD yn gwerthfawrogi'r potensial am ddatblygiad twristaidd	Cwch gyda llawr gwydr wedi'i llogi i hyrwyddo ymwybyddiaeth o nodweddion SME; canolfan ddehongli SME yn cael ei thrafod
	Wash ac Arfordir G. Norfolk	15	110K	PRhA – tair gris; adarwyr wedi'u gelyniaethu	GRh – AP & phobl gyffredin; GY wedi'i rannu i 3 ardal ddaearyddol; *deuris*	Strwythur rheolaeth SME ar wahan i SME er mwyn rhoi lle i gyfranogiad adarwyr; adarwyr yn ymwneud hefyd ag arolygon,ac yn y blaen; pwyslais ar gyfarfodydd	Gwrando a chyfaddef camgymeriadau yn bwysig; warden RSPB yn werthfawr tu hwnt wrth ddatblygu cyfranogiad adarwyr
	GDd Caint	10	120K	Dim; rhywfaint o wrthdaro rhwng ALL & AGN	GrwpRhâD acAP wedi datblygu CRh, gyda GRh o AP yn ei weithredu RAs: *fflat*	Gweithdai adeiladu consensws yn cael eu defnyddio i ddarparu ar gyfer cyfranogiad RhâD & AP; cynllun adfywio arfordir ar y gweill ac yn cael ei ddatblygu ochr yn ochr â CRh SME	ALL, gyda'r rhai y bu cecru ynghynt, â rôl allweddol mewn datblygu a chyfranogi mewn gweithdai CB

Cyflwr Cyfalaf Cymdeithasol	SME	Nifer AP	Nifer Rhai â Didd.	Hanes y Rheolaeth	Strwythur Rheolaeth	Cyfranogiad/ adeiladu partneriaeth	Nodweddion eraill
Uwch : yn cael peth anawsterau gyda datblygiad:	Bae Ceredigion	9	10K	PATMC gwirfoddol (ar gyfer dolffiniaid) wedi'i sefydlu'n bennaf gan RhâD	GRh, GY, & GT + cynhadledd flynyddol: *tair gris*	Rôl GY&GT heb fod yn glir/yn ddisylwedd a hyn wedi bod yn rhwystr i gyfranogiad; cyfarfodydd cyhoeddus wedi'u trefnu i drafod CRh drafft ac i ennyn ymroddiad RhâD	Fe wnaeth y ffaith fod yr Arfordir Treftadaeth Forol wedi'i rhoi o'r neilltu ar y dechrau elyniaethu nifer o AP a RhâD, rhai ohonynt yn siarad wedyn yn agored yn erbyn SME
	Y Solent/D. Wight Arfor	40	1,140K	PRhA: Yn bwysig ar gyfer datblygu SME: fforwm ar gyfer trafod/gwrthwynebu	SME –AP; GY–PrhA-GT: wedi'i sylfaenu ar bynciau dadleuol neu ar ardaloedd daearyddol: *deuris*	Strwythur rheolaeth SME wedi'i bennu gan AP/RhâD trwy PRhA; gormod o AP/RhâD i gyfarfodydd; dibynnu ar lythyrau, cylchlythyrau a chyfarfodydd cyhoeddus	Safle gymhleth gyda nifer o Rai â Didd/anghydweld; digyswllt: nifer o aberoedd, ynys/tir mawr; SME bellach wedi'i rhannu'n ddwy
Is: yn cael peth anawsteaur gyda datblygiad	Penrhyn Llyn a'r Sarnau	10	60K	Dim	GY ond dim digon o ddiddordeb ymhlith RhâD yn Ygt felly Grwp Cyswllt RhâD yn cael ei sefydlu i drafod CRh: deuris	Bu llythyru ar raddfa fawr ddwywaith ond ychydig o ymateb a gafwyd i'r cais i ddangos diddordeb mewn GT; bu i gyfarfodydd cyhoeddus ennyn diddordeb mewn SME ac o ganlyniad sefydlwyd Grwpiau Cyswllt RhâD	Anawsterau i sicrhau ymrwymiad AP, ond cafodd hyn ei ddatrys, yn rhannol trwy roi tasg i'r GRh i sefydlu Grwp Cyswllt RhâD; siâp bylchog y safle yn broblem?
	Berwick & Arfordir G. N'land	27	35K	Partneriaethau wedi'u sefydlu ar gyfer rhannau: AWF gwirfoddol, Treftadaeth Arfordir & GNG	GRh –AP; GY/GT –RhâD: *deuris*	Cyfarfodydd yn bwysig er mwyn ail ymrwymo AP a recriwtio Rh â D. + erthyglau papur newydd ar gyfer Rh â D; gweithdai cyfranogol yr AP wedi bod yn 'fflat': wedi arfer â chyfarfodydd ffurfiol;	GY wedi'i ohirio yn wyneb difaterwch GRh: safle traws ffin faith, 33 o achosion o oedi a diffyg materion i'w trafod wedi'u cofrestru; GY/GT wedi cynhyrchu papur sy'n faes trafod

Mae'n rhaid darllen y tabl yng nghyd-destun yr adroddiad llawn. Mae eglurhad o'r tabl i'w gael yn Adran 3.

List of abbreviations and acronyms

AG   Advisory Group
ASSI   Area of Special Scientific Interest: terrestrial/intertidal nature conservation
            designation in Northern Ireland, equivalent to SSSI.
CCW   Countryside Council for Wales
CMHCP   Ceredigion Marine Heritage Coast project
DETR   Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions
DoE(NI)   Department of Environment (Northern Ireland)
EA   Environment Agency
EMP   Estuary (or Firth) Management Partnership
EMS   European Marine Site comprising UK SACs and SPAs (or part of) below the
            Highest Astronomical Tide level
EN   English Nature
LA   Local Authority
MAFF   Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
MG   Management Group
MNR   Marine Nature Reserve
MPA   Marine Protected Area
MS   Management Scheme
NCA   Nature Conservation Agency: see EN, SNH, CCW
NNR   National Nature Reserve
OLCDD   Operation Likely to Cause Disturbance or Deterioration
PDO   Potentially Damaging Operation (applies to SSSIs)
PO   Project Officer
PRA   Participatory Rural Appraisal
RA   Relevant Authority
SAC   Special Area of Conservation under the Habitats Directive
SEPA   Scottish Environment Protection Agency
SH   Stakeholder
SNH   Scottish Natural Heritage
SPA   Special Protection Area under the Birds Directive (79/409/EEC)
SSSI   Site of Special Scientific Interest: terrestrial/intertidal nature conservation
            designation in England, Scotland and Wales
TG   Topic Group

Rhestr o fyrfoddau ac acronymau

GY	Grwp Ymgynghorol
AoDdGA	Ardal o Ddiddordeb Gwyddonol Arbennig: dynodiad gwarchodaeth natur tirol/rhynglanwol yng Ngogledd Iwerddon, cydradd i SoDdA
CCGC	Cyngor Cefn Gwlad Cymru
PMTAC	Prosiect Morol Treftadaeth Arfordir Ceredigion
AACRh	Adran yr Amgylchedd, Cludiant a'r Rhanbarthau
AyrA(GI)	Adran yr Amgylchedd (Gogledd Iwerddon)
AA	Asiantaeth yr Amgylchedd
PRA	Partneriaeth Rheolaeth Aberoedd (neu Firth)
SME	Safle Morol Ewropeaidd gan gynnwys ACA y DU ac AGA (neu ran ohonynt) islaw lefel y Llanw Artronomaidd Uchaf
EN	English Nature
ALL	Awdurdod Lleol
GAPB	Gweinyddiaeth Amaeth, Pysgodfeydd a Bwyd
GRh	Grwp Rheoli
GNF	Gwarchodfa Natur Forol
AWF	Ardal Warchodedig Forol
CRh	Cynllun Rheoli
AGN	Asiantaeth Gwarchodaeth Natur: gweler EN, SNH, CCGC
GNG	Gwarchodfa Natur Genedlaethol
GynDoAAneuDd	Gweithred yn Debygol o Achosi Afolnyddiad neu Ddirywiad
GAGD	Gweithred a Allai Greu Difrod (yn achos SoDdGA)
SP	Swyddog Prosiect
GoGG	Gwerthusiad o Gyfranogiad Gwledig
AP	Awdurdod Perthnasol
AGA	Ardal Gwarchodaeth Arbennig dan y Gorchymyn Cynefinoedd
SEPA	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
RhâD	Rhai â Diddordeb
SNH	Scottish Natural Heritage
AGA	Ardal Gwarchodaeth Arbennig dan y Gorchymyn Adar (79/409/EC)
SoDdGA	Safle o Ddiddordeb Gwyddonol Arbennig: dynodiad gwarchodaeth natur tirol/rhynglanwol yn Lloegr, Yr Alban a Chymru
GT	Grwp Testun

Lluniwyd rhai ohonynt i ddibenion yr adroddiad hwn ac nid ydynt i gyd yn rhai swyddogol

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This document reports the findings of a project, commissioned as part of the *UK Marine SACs Project*, to evaluate different approaches employed to provide for Relevant Authority (RA) and stakeholder participation in European marine sites (EMSs). These findings are based on 15 case studies which were informed primarily by interviews conducted with EMS project officers over June-July 1999. Telephone interviews with a small sample of RAs and stakeholders were also carried out for four case studies in order to gain wider views on the participative approaches employed.

The aims and objectives of this project are:

- to evaluate the effectiveness of approaches and techniques which have been employed to promote RA and stakeholder participation in EMS management scheme processes;
- to analyse the contexts within which these techniques have been employed;
- to make recommendations concerning good practice in different contexts.

This project is part of the LIFE funded *UK Marine SACs Project* which is focused on the development of management schemes for 12 representative 'demonstration' sites to improve understanding where knowledge is limited and develop good practice guidance. Other aspects of the LIFE project involve research on:

- the ecological requirements of the features for which the sites have been selected;
- their sensitivity to natural and human modified change;
- measures for minimising particularly damaging impacts;
- the development of practical techniques for monitoring the status of conservation features.

This project complements these more scientific studies and focuses on the socio-political management issues encountered in establishing management schemes on sites.

1.2 Audience

The audience for this report is envisaged to be those practitioners and policy makers in the UK and the EU with interests in the management of EMSs or stakeholder participation in conservation policy.

1.3 Birds and Habitats Directives

The Birds Directive (Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds) complements the Habitats Directive by requiring member states to protect rare or vulnerable bird species through designating Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Together, the terrestrial

and marine SPAs and SACs are intended to form a coherent ecological network of sites of European importance, referred to as Natura 2000.

In May 1992, the member states of the European Union adopted the 'Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora'. This is more commonly referred to as the Habitats Directive. The main aim of the Directive is to promote the maintenance of biodiversity; in particular, it requires member states to work together to maintain or restore to favourable conservation status certain rare, threatened, or typical natural habitats and species. These are listed in Annex I and II of the Directive respectively.

One of the ways in which member states are expected to achieve this aim is through the designation and protection of a series of sites, known as Special Areas of Conservation (SACs).

1.4   UK approach to European marine sites

1.4.1   Habitats Regulations

The requirements of the Habitats Directive have been transposed into UK legislation through the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 and the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) (Northern Ireland) Regulations 1995, hereafter referred to collectively as the Regulations.

On land above the low water mark, SACs and SPAs are underpinned by Sites of Special Scientific Interest. However, there is no existing legislative framework for implementing the Habitats Directive in marine areas. Therefore, the Regulations include a number of provisions specifically for new responsibilities and measures in relation to marine areas.

The Regulations place a general duty on any Competent Authority exercising legislative powers to perform these in accordance with the Habitats Directive. The term 'European marine site' (EMS) is defined to mean any SPA and SAC or part of a site that consists of a marine area, and "marine" includes intertidal areas up to the highest astronomical tide level. EMS shall be the term used throughout the report unless the issue being discussed relates specifically to marine SACs or SPAs. The new duties in connection with the management of marine sites are summarised below.

1.4.2   Management schemes

In the UK, management schemes may be established on European marine sites as a key measure in meeting the requirements of the Habitats Directive. Each scheme will be prepared by a group of authorities having statutory powers over the marine area. The Regulations set out which authorities have responsibilities for managing these sites and how they are to be managed, as described below:

Relevant authorities (RAs) are those who are already involved in some form of relevant marine regulatory function and are therefore required to be directly involved in the management of a marine site. RAs include the following:

Nature Conservation Agency (NCA)
Local Authorities
Environment Agencies
Sea Fishery Committees
Port and Harbour Authorities
Navigation Authorities
Lighthouse Authority

A scheme may be established by one or more of the relevant authorities. It is expected that one will normally take the lead. Once established, all the relevant authorities have an equal responsibility to exercise their functions in accordance with the scheme.

The Regulations place a special duty on the statutory nature conservation agencies to advise the other relevant authorities as to the conservation objectives for a site and the operations that may cause deterioration or disturbance to the habitats or species for which it has been designated. This advice is referred to as Regulation 33 advice (Regulation 28 in Northern Ireland) and it forms the basis for developing the management scheme.

Other than this duty, the Regulations do not provide any one authority with an overriding power or coordinating function over other authorities in the development and implementation of a scheme. The process, therefore, relies upon the cooperation across all authorities in a site. However, certain powers are reserved to Ministers to direct the relevant authorities to take specific action in the event that the scheme is failing to deliver the requirements of the Directive.

Further Government guidance (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions 1998) on European marine sites indicates that the voluntary approach is the preferred form of establishing further regulatory measures. Statutory approaches should only be applied in the event that voluntary means are not proving effective. It also states that the relevant authorities should form themselves into a management group to oversee the process of establishing a management scheme for a site. The guidance strongly recommends that other groups - including owner and occupiers, users, industry and interest groups - be involved in developing the scheme. To achieve this, Government guidelines suggest the formation of advisory groups and a process for regular consultation during the development and operation of the scheme.

1.4.3   UK Marine SACs

In the UK, candidate SACs have been selected for the ten marine features listed in Annex I and II of the Directive which are found in UK waters. These are shown in tables 1.1 and 1.2. As at October 1999, 39 marine SACs had been forwarded to the European Commission as candidate SACs. This is an evolving series of sites and new sites have since been proposed for designation.

Table 1-1 Marine features for which UK marine SACs have been selected

Annex I habitat	Annex II species
Estuaries	Bottlenose dolphin
Large shallow inlets and bays	Common seal
Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater at all times	Grey seal
Mud and sandflats not covered by sea water at low tide	
Reefs	
Lagoons	
Submerged or partially submerged sea caves	

1.5   EMSs selected as case studies for the project

The 15 EMS case studies include all 12 demonstration sites under the *UK Marine SACs Project* and 3 additional sites: NE Kent, Essex Estuaries, and the Solent (Solent Maritime and South Wight Maritime). The 12 LIFE demonstration sites are due to have completed management schemes before October 2001, when the LIFE project ends.. The additional 3 sites are subject to national NCA deadlines which should in turn comply with the deadlines set out in the Habitats Directive:

June 2000:   first 6 yearly report on conservation measures taken for SACs, evaluation of their impact on conservation status and results of surveillance to be submitted (Article 17(1))

June 2004:   adopted sites must be designated (Article 4(4)).

The 15 EMS case studies (Solent and South Wight Maritime being regarded as one for the purposes of this project) have been selected on the basis of a variety of marine SAC conservation features (Table 1.2). The SPA component of some case study EMSs have been selected on the basis of listed species of birds under the Birds Directive, but these are not detailed in this section.

Table 1-2 Habitats/species for which case study Marine SACs selected

	S - sandbanks	E - estuaries	M – mud and sandflats	L - lagoons	I – inlets and bays	R - reefs	C – sea caves	GS – Grey seal	CS – Common seal	BD – Bottlenose	Total
Berwickshire and N North'd Coast			▓				▓	▓			3
The Wash and N Norfolk Coast	▓		▓						▓		3
Essex Estuaries		▓	▓								2
NE Kent (Thanet Coast)						▓	▓				2
Solent Maritime		▓									1
South Wight Maritime						▓					1
Chesil and the Fleet				▓							1
Plymouth Sound and Estuaries	▓	▓			▓						3
Cardigan Bay		▓								▓	2
Llyn Peninsula and the Sarnau						▓					1
Morecambe Bay			▓		▓						2
Strangford Lough					▓						1
Solway Firth	▓	▓	▓								3
Sound of Arisaig	▓										1
Loch Maddy				▓	▓						2
Papa Stour						▓	▓				2
Total	4	5	5	2	4	4	3	1	1	1	

S - Sandbanks which are slightly covered by seawater at all times; E - Estuaries; M - Mud and sand flats not covered by sea water at low tide; L - Lagoons; I - Large shallow inlets and bays; R - Reefs; C - Submerged or partly submerged sea caves; GS - Grey seal; CS - Common seal; BD - Bottlenose dolphin.

1.6   Challenges

In developing and employing approaches and techniques for promoting RA and stakeholder participation in the management of EMSs, the following challenges need to be addressed.

1.6.1   The unique characteristics of each site

Each EMS will have its own unique combination of physical, socio-cultural, ecological and economic characteristics which need to be taken into account when deciding which participatory techniques might be appropriate for the site.

1.6.2   The statutory imperative to comply with legislation

The Regulations place a legal commitment on RAs to ensure the maintenance of the favourable conservation status of the EMS. These commitments, to a degree, require certain objectives to be achieved within certain deadlines which can restrict the time available to develop participation. This will obviously affect the socio-political dynamics for each EMS and should be taken into account when designing and applying techniques. Such a statutory imperative can promote participation and compliance, particularly amongst RAs. However, it must also be recognised that RAs and stakeholders are often indifferent, if not hostile, to such imperatives, and that the manner in which the statutory imperative is presented and managed

can affect how such initiatives are received. Essentially, a balance needs to be achieved between making RAs and stakeholders aware of these statutory commitments and enabling their cooperation with management scheme processes.

1.6.3 Low level of awareness

The conservation of biodiversity in terrestrial sites is a familiar concept to the majority of people. Land is an apparently 'fixed' resource - clearly demarcated in terms of rights of ownership, where spaces can be set-aside for landscape and nature conservation (Cole-King 1995). Marine conservation is much more problematic. Many RAs and stakeholders have a low level of awareness of the conservation value of the marine features of EMSs and are unfamiliar with statutory, marine biodiversity conservation-focused management initiatives. Most of the adverse effects of disturbance to marine ecosystems are not apparent to the majority of people. Even if people are aware of the adverse effects of certain uses, their lack of familiarity with and empathy for most marine life means that their reaction is likely to be one of indifference.

It could also be argued that society's relation to the sea is largely defined in terms of the resources it provides, particularly as a place to harvest fish, dilute and disperse liquid wastes, and undertake marine navigation. Furthermore, the resilience of marine ecosystems is often overestimated, in that it is widely assumed that they can withstand the impacts of a wide range of uses. This lack of awareness and unfamiliarity needs to be addressed from the outset when designing techniques for promoting cooperation with management scheme processes. However, it is important to remember that lack of familiarity with the sea may also have a positive affect, many people arguably having a particular interest in marine life because it is unusual, mysterious and unpredictable (Kenchington 1990).

1.6.4 Limited experience of RAs, particularly NCAs

Compared to terrestrial nature conservation management, RAs and other organisations have less experience and fewer methodologies and concepts relevant for marine conservation. Implementing statutory conservation designations in the subtidal marine environment is novel. There is relatively little institutional experience in managing conflicts between RAs and stakeholders that are likely to arise.

1.6.5 Relatively limited scientific knowledge base

It must also be recognised that due to the logistical problems of studying and monitoring subtidal habitats, the scientific knowledge base to inform EMS selection, vulnerability assessments and monitoring is relatively limited. This can be problematic when it comes to justifying and supporting management issues with RAs and stakeholders. Furthermore, the scale, connectivity, complexity, variability, stochasticity and dynamism of marine ecosystems restricts the scientific confidence that can be attached to related predictions. This has a number of fundamental implications for the design, management and evaluation of EMSs. In particular, these implications include lack of long-term baseline monitoring studies, lack of knowledge about trophic relationships over different spatial and temporal scales, and difficulties in gaining scientific evidence to support claims concerning sustainable exploitation levels and cause-effect relationships. This lack of scientific knowledge and confidence may exacerbate and protract certain debates and conflicts in EMS management scheme processes.

1.6.6 The multiple-use and sectoral management policy framework

Multiple uses and activities tend to occur in a given marine area, each activity being managed by sectoral policies by a given RA. One of the aims of EMS management scheme is to promote integration to achieve conservation objectives, but it must be recognised that both stakeholders and RAs are relatively unfamiliar with such integrated approaches below the Low Water Mark. A lack of experience with cross-sectoral approaches to marine management may also mean that partnerships between RAs may not be well developed, and that RAs may not be accustomed to justifying their actions to each other, particularly with regard to marine conservation objectives. In many places, there will be historical customs and permissive rights over coastal seas which may affect the willingness stakeholders to cooperate.

1.6.7 Resistance to outside interference

There is potential for resistance, particularly amongst stakeholders, but also amongst some RAs, to what may be seen as "outside interference" from both national and European governments. This is particularly likely in rural communities distant from centres of power, and where there may have been previous conflicts over terrestrial nature conservation initiatives, fishery policies or wider development proposals. Refusals to co-operate may also arise because the users of marine resources, unlike landowners and farmers, are less accustomed to regulation and controls driven by external factors such as nature conservation.

1.6.8 Lack of project officer experience

Some EMS project officers may lack the experience, expertise and confidence in designing and implementing techniques to promote RA and stakeholder participation specifically for marine conservation.

All or some of these challenges will have been faced by project officers in designing and implementing 'good practice' techniques for providing for RA and stakeholder participation in the development of management plans for the European marine sites.

1.7 Evaluation at an early stage of the EMS policy process

Critical issues when evaluating environmental policy initiatives include:

- Who should undertake the evaluation?
- At what stage(s) in the process evaluation should take place?
- What criteria should be used to determine the relative success of different approaches and techniques?

In this project, site visits and interviews with the project officers on the 15 EMS sites were carried out during the period June-July 1999. In all cases, two members of the research team visited the EMS and conducted the interviews. The interviews were informal, lasting between 2-5 hours. In some cases, more than one person took part in the discussions, as for example, in Morecambe Bay, where a senior NCA officer was able to reconstruct the history of the site before the EMS officer joined the team; or in Cardigan Bay, where the Local Authority

officer in charge of the Heritage Coast project participated in a joint interview with the CCW officer; or in Shetland, where the project officer had only been in post for a few months, and so the lead officer from the Island Council responsible for marine issues joined the discussions. Telephone interviews with a small sample of RAs and stakeholders were also carried out for four case studies in order to gain wider views on the participation approaches employed.

The principal aim of the research was to collate the experiences of the officers in the 15 sites, and to provide a conceptual foundation for a more formal evaluation after the end of the LIFE project. Often, the vital work of the early stages of building partnerships are 'lost' or forgotten as the institutions and relations become routinised. At the time of the research in summer 1999, the conservation objectives and operations advice were being consulted upon. The management scheme formulation process was either at a very early stage or about to begin. The timing of the site visits at this stage of the management scheme preparation process will undoubtedly raise some issues that are peculiar to those events, or that are dealt with in later stages. It is thus not possible to employ criteria or indicators of success based on the *outputs* from the EMS management schemes. Instead, criteria or indicators based on the emerging success or otherwise of the EMS management scheme *processes* to be employed. These will be relatively subjective as one is essentially attempting to predict what techniques and approaches are more likely to maximise the *potential* for cooperation on the basis of *emerging* responses, issues and the evolving dynamics among RAs/stakeholders.

To re-iterate: it is important to recognise that this report captures experiences over the first 1-4 years of the EMS process. It is an interim evaluation based almost entirely on interviews and discussions with the EMS project officers. It therefore provides partial accounts which will provide the foundations for a much fuller review at the end of the process.

1.8   Experience from elsewhere

There has been relatively little literature on participation-building approaches related to marine protected areas (MPAs), though attention to these matters is increasing. Milton (1991) argues that MPA conflicts are based on fundamental differences between the ways in which marine resource users and marine conservationists perceive the issues. In particular, she argues that conservationists often fail to recognise that their initiatives to conserve marine habitats and species will have fundamental impacts on the culture and economy of coastal communities: in effect, nature conservation equates to social change in quite fundamental ways. For these reasons, Milton recommends that the diversity of perspective and the complex interactions between RAs, users and NGOs should be recognised from the outset in MPA designation processes. In this way, conflicts may be avoided or addressed early in the process before positions have hardened.

Fiske (1992) also emphasises that establishing MPAs involves the negotiation of bio-ecological and socio-cultural processes. This is illustrated through two examples under the US National Marine Sanctuaries program. One marine sanctuary in Puerto Rico was selected and designated through a 'top-down' process which provoked fierce opposition from stakeholders, particularly fishermen. Feelings ran so high that armed guards had to be provided to protect officials at public hearings on the MPA proposal. The situation was exacerbated by the federal approach to the Marine Sanctuary that had been adopted by the

US. Eventually, the Puerto Rican Governor announced that he would not support the Marine Sanctuary and the proposal was abandoned.

By way of contrast, another Marine Sanctuary proposal in American Samoa was more sensitive to national and local concerns. Meetings at both levels were held to discuss the possible designation. At a local level, particular attention was paid to discussing how the Marine Sanctuary and related conservation measures might be integrated with traditional marine property rights and the concerns of local subsistence cultures. Local stakeholders began to support the Marine Sanctuary, as they wanted younger and subsequent generations to be able to appreciate the reef and its resources. Following a compromise whereby the commercial fishing ban was lifted in one zone, the Marine Sanctuary was successfully designated. Though the two case studies are in different contexts, they do illustrate the importance of taking account of political sensitivities, particularly in a federal context, and of taking account of the traditional practices, concerns and priorities of local stakeholders.

The introduction of marine sanctuary designations should be seen as a type of planned social change involving national and sub-national organisations to restructure peoples' behaviour towards resources they customarily use. The process of bottom-up or participatory planning is thus recommended; local peoples' perspectives are understood, their concerns valued, and their knowledge employed so that the proposed designation may be adapted and integrated with prior customary use patterns (Fiske, 1992). Beyond this general principle, when reviewing the literature on MPAs around the world, it is not possible to produce a definitive and universally applicable typology of approaches to providing for participation in MPA management. The management regime for each MPA is influenced by the ecological, cultural, political, socio-economic and institutional contexts in question. However, from the wide range of MPA cases that have been published, it is possible to identify two different management approaches (Figure 1.1).

Top-down: based primarily on strategic scientific priorities

Emphasis on enforcement	Executive cross-sectoral authority	Education to justify restrictions and promote compliance	Reliance on comprehensive scientific information	Little scope for compromise
↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
↑	↑	↑	↑	↑
Emphasis on stakeholder participation and cooperation	Community-based partnership	Education to promote support and participation	Science used for guidance where appropriate and available	Greater scope for compromise

Bottom-up: based primarily on socio-economic priorities guided by science

Figure 1-1 Different stances concerning approaches to the selection, design and management of MPAs

In order to combine strategic scientific and resource management objectives such as those under the Habitats Directive with the need to promote stakeholder cooperation, recognition is growing of the need to combine 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approaches (Kelleher and Recchia 1998). This process is not easy, given the different rules, norms and practices associated with different styles of decision-making (Bryson and Crosby, 1993; Burgess *et al*.

1999). 'Top-down' approaches tend to be driven by statutory regulations, international agreements, bureaucratic styles of decision-making and enforced by the legal apparatus of the courts. These 'hard' processes of environmental decision-making contrast strongly with the ways in which 'bottom-up' processes work. At the local level, customary rights and responsibilities hold sway, and these informal rules are (re)negotiated informally between local people within a range of social, cultural and political institutions. A duty of compliance is recognised through collective commitment and standing in the community rather than threat of external enforcement.

Failure to recognise these different styles of environmental decision-making or take account of them in the selection, design and management of MPAs is likely to exacerbate conflicts and thus undermine the potential of a MPA to achieve its objectives (Jones, under review). In the UK context, experiences with voluntary and statutory MPAs indicate that cautious approaches which provide for the meaningful participation of stakeholders can be successful in both achieving nature conservation objectives and promoting cooperation, whereas reliance on statutory powers can exacerbate conflicts and undermine the potential for cooperation (Jones 1999).

1.9   Outline of the report structure

Section 2 of this report will consider some of the *general issues concerning participatory processes*, setting out a four stage classification of participation and introducing the concept of social capital which will be used as the basis for comparison between the 15 case studies. Section 2 will also *introduce the case studies* by considering the challenges that EMS contexts present for participation. **Section 3** introduces a typology based on social capital 'states' at the start of the EMS process, and the subsequent 'direction' in which social capital appears to be developing. This typology is used to group the 15 case study sites and provide contexts in which to explore the effectiveness of different participation processes in building support for the EMS. **Section 4** reports the findings of telephone interviews with a small sample of RAs and stakeholders for four case studies concerning wider views on the participation approaches employed. **Section 5** of the report draws out the *key lessons* from the case studies. A glossary of participation techniques is provided in Appendix 1.

2. Principles underpinning the selection of participatory processes

One of the remarkable features of the last decade has been renewed interest in encouraging public participation in local environmental planning (Healey, 1997). There are several reasons to account for this development, not least the desire to establish greater legitimacy for decisions where there is marked social and political conflict between different interests. In the specific context of nature conservation, two kinds of concerns have been expressed about enhancing public participation in policy processes. The first is the danger of capture by special interest groups - be they fishermen or middle class residents' associations; the second, an increasing bureaucratisation as stakeholders find themselves entangled in ever more arcane systems of rules and regulations whilst little is achieved on the ground (see Goodwin, 1998).

This section of the report is divided into three subsections. In the first, a range of participatory processes is identified which allows for greater specificity in terms of first defining which groups ('publics') are to be engaged in a participatory process; and the extent to which groups are to be drawn into power-sharing relations. This is followed in section 2.2 by discussion of an important concept which strengthens understanding of the social processes underpinning participation. The concept is that of 'social capital' (Coleman 1988, p.98). There is growing consensus that building social capital is an important mechanism for resolving difficult natural resource problems where there is little incentive for collective action (Ostrom, 1990; Pennington and Rydin, 2000). In section 2.3 the fifteen case studies are introduced through a brief discussion of site-specific factors which are shaping the outcomes of the EMS process. Finally, in section 2.4 the case study methodology is outlined.

2.1 Determining who should be engaged in participation, and how they should be engaged

A widely accepted definition of 'participation' is that of *a social process through which people are able to influence and share control over the decisions which affect them.* Different kinds of participatory techniques engage different stakeholders to a greater or lesser degree in decision-making, and the objectives of the lead organisation promoting participation are fundamental to the kinds of processes deployed (Table 2.1). Each stage identified in the table encompasses those that precede it. In other words, it is not possible to achieve greater empowerment of stakeholders without effective information, consultation and collaboration activities also being undertaken.

Under the terms of the Habitat Regulations, RAs are to be brought together in partnership to take joint responsibility for the management of a site. With reference to Table 2.1, **the RAs will need to be engaged in all four stages of the participatory process**. The progress that EMS project officers have been able to make, thus far, in developing partnerships with their RAs is a good measure of the effectiveness of the participatory techniques they have applied.

Reviewing participatory experiences around the world, Aycrigg (1998) concludes that there is a general failure to evolve sustainable institutional mechanisms. Too often the emphasis is on discrete bits of process rather than on developing arrangements for the 'afterlife' of the

project. So, the extent to which the institutional arrangements put in place to manage the EMS will meet their obligations 'after-LIFE' will be an excellent, longer term indicator of the effectiveness of the partnership-building process.

Table 2-1 A four stage classification of participation

Level of participatory activity	Examples of techniques	Objective
1. Information sharing activities	Newsletters; web sites; leaflets; videos, public displays; slide presentation; media briefings	To place information in the public domain
2. Consultative activities	Management group consisting of RAs consults stakeholders through questionnaire surveys; focus groups; public meetings; face-to-face briefings with key individuals/organisations, etc	To encourage a two -way exchange of information
3. Collaborative activities:	Creating hierarchical management groups whereby RAs collaborate with stakeholders through topic groups to scope a problem and discuss solutions, mounting ecological surveys; running site-based events, etc	To engage the knowledge's and resources of stakeholders
4. Empowerment activities	Creating 'flat' management groups combining RAs and stakeholders; co-opting individuals from RAs (and stakeholder groups); devolving budgets and resources, etc	To share power and responsibility for the decisions being made, and their outcomes.

There will be a range of *Stakeholders* who live and work in the area, and who have a legitimate interest the EMS. Stakeholders may be defined as anyone with a stake in the outcome of a decision and may, thereby encompass the entire population of the area (and beyond if there are significant leisure activities at the site, for example). Normally, the term 'stakeholder' is limited to those individuals and organisations who have an active role or interest in the area. Their stake may be based on economic, social, aesthetic and /or environmental concerns. For example, typical stakeholders to be found in the LIFE demonstration sites include fishermen; the operators of commercial port facilities; boat-building and marine industries; marine recreational interests such as sailing and diving; and environmental/nature conservation groups.

In terms of Table 2.1, it is important that EMS processes engage stakeholders up to and including stage 3 *ie* **bringing stakeholders into collaborative arrangements with the management partnership.** Whether it is possible to empower stakeholders and so extend participation to stage 4 will depend largely on the political culture of the partnership. The culture of the RAs within the area may or may not be supportive of power sharing and it is unlikely that the project officer will be able significantly to influence that culture, at least in the short to medium term.

Given the fundamental economic, social and technological changes which are occurring in UK society, the concept of a 'community' where people living in the same place share a

common set of values, interests and practices is less relevant than it once was. Contemporary society is characterised by multiple values and multiple interests: divergence rather than convergence is the norm. In addition, huge numbers of people are becoming more disconnected from public life. This disengagement, often described as a '**democratic deficit'** because the numbers of people voting in local and national elections is steadily declining, finds expression in the falling number of people willing to volunteer their time and energy for local activities.

The reasons underpinning these social changes are complex and should not detain us here. But an important consequence for the EMS process will be difficulties in engaging wider stakeholders in participatory processes. Referring back to Table 2.1, **stage 1 processes of information sharing are important to provide opportunities for people to gain awareness of what is happening** but it is likely that even stage 2 consultations will engage very few people. There are strong arguments in terms of the efficiency of policy initiatives to support the view that it may not be appropriate to provide for the higher levels of participation for wider stakeholders in particular contexts (see Bryson and Crosby, 1993).

2.2 Understanding participation as a process of building 'social capital'

The stages of participation identified in Table 2.1 are distinguished by increasing intensity of communication, and by a shift in power relations from asymmetrical ('top-down') to symmetrical ('equal partners'). Building partnerships with RAs, enabling a range of stakeholders to participate actively in decision-making, and informing/consulting with wider stakeholders are all **social processes.** That is, individuals with multiple professional and personal concerns come together to discuss their different perspectives, knowledge, values, requirements and concerns. Through these activities, personal relationships may be strengthened; areas of consensus identified; real or potential conflicts exposed; and mutual commitment to a course of action negotiated.

Conservation professionals will be familiar with the metaphor of 'natural capital' which is used both to describe the contributions that nature makes to the well being of society; and as a way of determining the status of habitats and species. Social scientists use the metaphor of **social capital** to describe the ways in which social processes in an area contribute to productive outcomes (see Ostrom 1990, 1993; Pennington and Rydin, 2000). Social capital is an expression of trust and confidence between people and organisations:-

- *Trust* in the honesty, integrity and sincerity of the individuals and organisations who are engaged in a joint project. Trust relationships are strengthened, for example, when there are shared norms about how the work should be done; when there are no 'hidden agendas'; or when individuals are able to admit that they have made a mistake. A vital element in building trust is the notion of *reciprocity* - that is, individuals and organisations recognise they have mutual obligations and meet them. If there is little or no trust between people, it is impossible to build partnerships and provide for meaningful participation.

- *Confidence* in the knowledge, capabilities and authority of the individuals and organisations engaged in the process. Of central importance to the EMS process is the confidence that stakeholders place on the scientific case for the designation. It is equally important that scientific experts demonstrate that they also recognise and

value - demonstrate that they have confidence in - the depth and variety of local knowledge about the habitats and their species.

Social capital is produced through the interactions of people in their professional and personal **networks.** The productivity of these networks will depend on two key factors:

- *Extensiveness* - a network may be diverse in its membership or tightly constrained to a particular interest group. An example of the former would be a voluntary organisation supporting local conservation initiatives; an example of the latter often used in the social capital literature is the Mafia. In terms of achieving policy goals, the tight-knit network may be more effective in the short-term but may not be so in the long-term when policies come to be implemented. Also, a tight network will not perform well if one of the objectives is to enhance democratic rights to participate in policy making.

- *Density of relationships* - a network contributing high social capital in a locality would be one where its members meet one another in many different contexts; and where there is widespread knowledge of what is happening elsewhere in the network.

Networks indicate the structure of social capital in a locality, and there are simple processes through which policy networks can be mapped out (Rhodes 1990). To build networks and thereby, to build social capital in terms of the EMS process means that effort must be devoted to:

- *Face-to-face communication* - that is, opportunities for discussion and debate between people. Being able to talk together, explore the viewpoints of others, and gain understanding of 'where they are coming from' is a vital element of building partnerships, providing for participation and moving towards consensus about what should be done.

- *Time -* all social processes require time in order for individuals to build trusting relationships, gain confidence in each other's expertise, and understand each other's perspectives. Having the time to do this vital social 'work' is often compromised: (i) by shortage of resources (money, people), and (ii) by pressures to deliver schemes within tight deadlines which are most often imposed from above rather than negotiated between individuals at the local level. At the same time, if individuals or organisations are 'not playing fair', delay can be used as a means of undermining the process. Points of closure, *ie* deadlines beyond which decisions must be taken, are essential.

In summary, the following factors are proposed as being particularly important in recognising and then building social capital for the EMS process. First, involving RAs and stakeholders in the initial design process demonstrates confidence in the expertise and knowledge of stakeholders, and builds trust in commitment to share power and responsibility. Second, by bringing them into partnership throughout the life of the project, continuity can be achieved which allows time to build social relations and strengthen networks between stakeholders/RAs. It also introduces the project officer into existing networks. Third, if there is an ongoing open process of innovation, negotiation, modification and change, it will help

to build consensus based on a better understanding of divergent positions, and help secure legitimacy for decisions. Finally, by building social capital to support the EMS, there will be greater mutual accountability among RAs and stakeholders. This will increase the legitimacy of the scheme and develop/demonstrate genuine commitment to making it a success.

2.3 Site-specific factors influencing participation in the EMS

The effectiveness of EMS processes in building social capital is strongly related to the **specific contexts** in which they are carried out: **participatory processes are context-dependent processes**. The old adage of 'horses for courses' is nowhere more appropriate than in the selection and application of particular participatory processes. There are no techniques/approaches which have universal applicability. The impacts of processes and their effectiveness in achieving their objectives are always the consequence of context-specific interactions. Particular people engaged in particular activities in particular places will determine the success of the EMS process.

In deciding which partnership-building and participation processes to use in an EMS, it is important to understand the characteristics and qualities of the site and its people, and to **identify some of its defining elements**. These help to define the context within which EMS project officers have to work. Over the last decade, there has been recognition of the significance of **local distinctiveness** in both nature conservation and landscape management through the development of EN's 'natural areas' classification, and the Countryside Commission's 'landscape character' maps. Local distinctiveness includes:

- physical features and landscape
- social and economic activities, both past and present
- political culture and, in particular, existing policy networks

Table 2.2 provides details of the 15 EMS sites included in the project, and summarises some of the elements which contribute to their local distinctiveness. The case studies in the table are ranked in order of the approximate number of local stakeholders around the site. As will be discussed below, population size is a particularly important attribute when considering which stakeholder participation approaches might be appropriate in a given context. The main contextual attributes can be outlined as follows:-

2.3.1 Physical characteristics

The area of candidate marine SACs studied in this project ranges from 694 ha (*Chesil and the Fleet*) to 96,980 ha (*Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau, North Wales*). As Kenchington (1990) makes clear, most people do find it difficult to relate to marine conservation features, as they are largely 'out of sight and out of mind'. However, it would seem reasonable to assume that some aspects of the physical features of the site could potentially encourage a sense of local attachment. The great majority of sites in the project, including 10 of the 12 LIFE sites, are either estuaries or bays which have visible land boundaries enclosing or partially enclosing the body of water. Examples in the project range in size from *Loch Maddy* in North Uist, through the *Essex Estuaries* and *Plymouth Sound and Estuaries* to *Morecambe Bay* and the *Solway Firth*. It would seem reasonable to assume that these relatively spatially discrete

EMSs would be easier to identify as specific sites which may already be 'owned' or belong to the locality.

Where the site is a linear stretch of coastline or a peninsular, it may well be more difficult to experience any sense of mutuality or shared responsibility for the site. The *Berwickshire and Northumberland Coast EMS* is essentially a linear site. There are also two sites in the project which are located on peninsular's- the NE Kent EMS which runs from Ramsgate in the north to Broadstairs in the south; and *the Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau* EMS in North Wales. The problem of generating a sense of shared responsibility is exacerbated in the latter case as the site is relatively fragmented in that the northern Llyn Peninsula section is quite cut-off from the southern estuary and Sarnau section by the exclusion of Tremadoc Bay. In such cases, there is an initial hurdle to overcome of enabling stakeholders to identify with or support a new geographical entity

2.3.2   Social and economic activities

The sites are widely distributed around the UK: the cultural, social and economic characteristics of the regions within which they are located vary widely. The numbers of local stakeholders for each site in table 2.2 have been estimated by project officers, primarily through census data for coastal areas, and it is recognised that there will be variability in the way these figures have been estimated. However, they do broadly indicate the variation among the case studies in the number of stakeholders, ranging from 150 (*Papa Stour*) to 1,140,000 *(Solent)*. This will obviously have a major effect when considering which participation approaches might be appropriate and effective.

Some case studies, such as the *Sound of Arisaig* and *Loch Maddy* in Scotland, have rural hinterlands with small, scattered crofts and villages. Others, such as *Llyn Peninsula and the Sarnau* and *Cardigan Bay* in Wales, or *Morecambe Bay* and *the Wash* in England have landward regions where rural agricultural settlements are interspersed with small ports, seaside and free-standing towns. Finally, some of the sites are bounded by large urban areas with relatively small patches of accessible sea-shore. *Plymouth Sound and Estuaries* would be the best example. In the smaller rural sites, the local population consists of a relatively small number of stakeholders who may nearly all be active in the EMS process. Their close dependence on small-scale marine activities makes them potentially vulnerable to restrictions on their livelihoods from management measures to achieve conservation objectives. In the larger more urban sites, there will be a substantial population with no significant stake in marine activities or no active interest or engagement in marine conservation issues. The participation of the relatively small number of rural stakeholders is thus more critical and more likely to occur than the participation of the relatively large number of urban stakeholders (Edwards *et al* 1997)

Table 2-2 Attributes of EMS case studies

	Area (ha)	Main economic activities	LIFE site	Previous integrated management initiative	No. of RAs	Approx. No. of local stakeholders *
Papa Stour, Shetland	2,900	tourism, fishing, small-scale agriculture, crafts	yes	None	6	150
Loch Maddy, Outer Hebrides	1,850	mariculture, fishing, tourism, small- scale agriculture,	yes	None	8	200
Sound of Arisaig, West Highlands	5,300	tourism, mariculture, fishing, small-scale agriculture	yes	None	7	1,000
Chesil and the Fleet, Southern England	694	agriculture, commercial port at its eastern end, tourism, recreation	yes	Fleet management group - established 1990	10	10,000
Cardigan Bay, West Wales	96,871	tourism, agriculture, fishing	yes	Ceredigion Marine Heritage Coast - established 1995	9	10,000
Berwickshire & N. North'd Coast, NE England/SE Scotland	64,760	fishing, agriculture, tourism, recreation	yes	None	27	35,000
Llyn Peninsular & Sarnau, North Wales	96,980	tourism, agriculture, fishing	yes	None	10	60,000
Strangford Lough, Northern Ireland	15,399	tourism, recreation, agriculture, fishing	yes	Strangford Lough Management Committee - established 1992	4	60,000
Solway Firth, NW England/SW Scotland	12,978	industry, agriculture, forestry, ports, tourism, fishing, recreation	yes	Solway Firth Partnership- 1994	16	100,000
The Wash and N Norfolk Coast, East Anglia	41,620	Tourism, agriculture, ports fishing, recreation	yes	Wash Estuary management group – 1994	15	110,000
NE Kent, SE England	2,269	port, tourism, fishing, recreation	no	None	10	120,000
Morecambe Bay, NW England	17,766	industry, commercial ports, fishing, agriculture, tourism, recreation	yes	Morecambe Bay Partnership - established 1992	13	200,000
Plymouth Sound and Estuaries, SW England	3,752	commercial port, MOD, fishing, recreation, tourism	yes	Tamar Estuaries Consultative Forum - established 1995	14	400,000
Essex Estuaries, East Anglia	26,526	agriculture, tourism, fishing, recreation	no	Part: Blackwater EMP - 1992	16	500,000
Solent/South Wight Maritime, Hampshire	22,615	commercial port, industry, MOD, recreation, tourism, fishing	no	Solent Forum- 1992	40	1,140,000

(*The population figures in the final column are very approximate estimates provided by the EMS project officers to give some idea of the number of potential stakeholders in the EMS).

As shown in Table 2.2, the three Scottish sites may be particularly sensitive on the grounds of economic dependence on marine activities. In other areas where there is a mixture of marine, rural and urban-based economic activities, conflicts may arise between different stakeholders, especially in terms of recreation and tourism, and agriculture and marine interests. In the most urban sites, there are large, powerful economic and industrial players with vested interests in maintaining development pressures on the marine environment. Conservation is most likely to be a minority interest amongst the local population but also, paradoxically, is also most likely to be powerfully fought by NGOs and interest groups.

2.3.3   Political culture and policy networks

In localities with small numbers of residents, each person will be able to speak for themselves in public forums, and will play a number of roles in local networks. At the other end of the scale, in large urbanised areas the great majority of people will not have any desire to become involved in the EMS process. Their 'best interests' will be represented by a small number of people such as local authority officers and elected members, who will be active in a variety of policy networks.

The nature and range of political processes that operate within small, rural places will differ from those of very large urban areas. In small communities, there is an intensity of social relations (which can be both advantageous and a drawback); communications move rapidly through the community; and it is genuinely possible to speak personally to all the stakeholders. As the site becomes larger, more populous and more urbanised such relations are impossible. Increasingly, representatives must speak on behalf of others and bureaucratic procedures become more important in consequence. The greater the number of potential RAs and stakeholders, the more challenging will be the process of building partnerships and increasing social capital. In the early stages at least, different actors will have different agendas that may, only marginally, be concerned with coastal and marine issues. The partnership may also be seen as a means to achieve other economic and/or political ends.

Questions of local political culture will be particularly acute in the EMS process. In every site, the statutory requirements of the Habitats Directive are playing into a highly dynamic and individual political environment. In one site, there may be a long history of voluntary agreements for marine conservation while in another, this history may be marked by dispute. In one site, there may be a long tradition of one political party dominating local or regional government, resistant to any new conservation initiative that might be thought to harm existing economic interests. In another, there may be activist groups who have already won significant concessions and are reluctant to concede gains made; or there may already be some consensus won through earlier conflicts. In all cases, the specific politics of previous nature conservation activities (both terrestrial and marine) will play a material role on the EMS process.

2.4   Case study methodology

The weakest element in participatory theory and practice is evaluation: robust indicators and mechanisms to track the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of participatory processes are under development (Rowe and Frewer, 2000). Evaluative criteria are only just being developed for participatory approaches in environmental decision-making (Clark *et al*. 2000).

For this reason, developing robust evaluative criteria for the EMS process will be an iterative process, involving academics, practitioners and stakeholders. This report represents a stage in the process. It is important to bear in mind that these case studies were conducted at an early stage of the EMS process, and represent primarily the experiences and judgements of the EMS project officers. For these reasons, the **outcomes** of different participatory processes in specific sites cannot yet be evaluated. But it is possible to provide an interim and partial assessment of the extent to which site-specific **processes**, from the project officers' perspectives, seem to be contributing to the:

- development of enduring social capacity which promotes cooperation;
- development of robust social capacity which can be drawn upon to address site management conflicts;
- achievement of conservation objectives and fulfilment of legal obligations.

The issues which emerge from the case studies will be assessed through the concept of 'social capital' and the discussion will draw on themes set out in this section, including those concerning the effect of the different case study contexts. As such, the methodology employed might be described as a comparative contextual evaluation which is focused principally on emerging issues. It draws on theoretical perspectives, though these are not empirically applied as evaluative criteria.

3. Contextual evaluation of the 15 case studies

3.1 Introduction

This section will use the concept of social capital to provide a means of categorising the 15 case studies, and draw out the different approaches and techniques which have been employed to develop a network of RAs and stakeholders to support the development of the EMS. Each site has a unique history of marine and terrestrial conservation activities prior to the introduction of the EMS proposal. This history will be used as a baseline for assessing the extent to which social capital has been generated since the announcement of the EMS proposal.

It must be stressed that, in this discussion, social capital is considered purely in terms of the partnerships and/or networks which have been developed to achieve objectives for or similar to those for EMSs, ie focused on marine conservation and integrated marine resource management. Clearly, social capital is generated and is important in a much wider sense. High degrees of such capital will exist in other contexts for all the coastal communities in question.

In keeping with the tight focus on social relations and policy networks, it is possible to classify the case study sites on the following basis:

Social capital state at the time of the EMS proposed designation, reflecting the history of the site:

- stronger social capital has been developed amongst RAs/stakeholders through successful partnerships related to previous management initiatives;
- weaker social capital exists amongst RAs/stakeholders who may have a history of conflicts, non-cooperation, or apathy

Social capital development in the period since proposed designation of the EMS:

- stronger social capital, successfully capitalised upon: *ie* stakeholder/RA cooperation maintained and developed in EMS
- weaker social capital strengthened: *ie* stakeholder/RA cooperation promoted in EMS
- stronger social capital, but experiencing some difficulties with development: *ie* difficulties taking stakeholder/RA cooperation forward into EMS
- weaker social capital, and experiencing some difficulties with development: *ie* stakeholder/RA cooperation only slowly being secured in EMS.

This structure will provide for the key aspects of the EMS process under each of the four social capital categories to be discussed in Section 3. The key lessons about which participatory processes work well in which contexts will be presented in Section 5.

3.2 Discussion of case studies

The 15 case studies are summarised in table 3.1(overleaf) which should be referred to throughout this section.

3.2.1 Social capital 'states'

The key objective of this report is to consider the main characteristics that influence stakeholder and RA participation in EMS processes, and to provide guidance on appropriate and effective participation approaches. In the interviews with the project officers, they were asked to consider, retrospectively, what kinds of professional and social relations existed in their site; the extent to which there had been any experience of marine and terrestrial conservation activities; and the extent to which they had found support within the RA/stakeholder networks. Drawing on this evidence, it is possible to broadly classify the 15 sites into two groups: those sites where there was stronger social capital to support the EMS process; and those sites where there was weaker social capital to support the EMS process.

Sites with stronger social capital at the start of the EMS process. In all but one case (*Wash and North Norfolk Coast*), it was found that the development of an estuary or firth management partnership[1] prior to the EMS has generated substantial social capital. Partnerships between RAs were working well, and there were many different kinds of opportunities for stakeholder participation (*Plymouth Sound and Estuaries, Morecambe Bay, Solway Firth, Solent*).

On other sites, past experiences with different types of nature conservation initiatives have proved valuable:

- terrestrial and marine conservation designations: Strangford Lough - ASSI, MNR; Cardigan Bay- Ceredigion Marine Heritage Coast;
- a combination of previous initiatives: Essex Estuaries - SSSIs, SPAs, EMP;
- or a private estate-led nature conservation initiative in partnership with English Nature and other stakeholders: Chesil and the Fleet.

In all these sites, the officers described sets of political and professional relations marked by expressions of trust and confidence between RAs, stakeholders and the area officers of the NCA. In these cases, the networks were productive and supportive of partnership initiatives.

These sites suggest that social capital has developed through various previous approaches, such as the establishment of inclusive management structures, and the development of social and professional relations and trust amongst RAs and stakeholders through topic group meetings. The work of a project officer seems to have been a key factor in these sites. In some cases, the project officer has been supported by central NCA funds under the Firths/Estuaries Initiative. In other cases, a local NCA officer has been given responsibility to liase with owners/occupiers over a nature conservation designation. In all cases, the project officer has often had a key role in developing social capital through face-to-face meetings, awareness raising, facilitating the development of a management structure, etc.

---

[1] Firth is the Scottish term for an estuary and its coastal reaches. Subsequently, estuary or firth management partnerships will collectively be referred to as estuary management partnerships (EMPs)

Table 3-1 Overview of EMS case studies

Social Capital State	EMS	No. RAs	No. SHs	Management history	Management Structure	Participation/ partnership-building	Other features
Higher: successfully capitalised upon	Plymouth Sound and Estuaries	14	400K	EMP: rebuilt previously strained relations	3 EMP structures: *two- tier*	AG has consultation/discussion function; SH/RA knowledge employed through workshops, q'aires, etc; emphasis on many meetings and honesty	Queen's Harbour Master important champion; liaison to ensure that NCA presentations sensitive to local context
	Strangford Lough	4	60K	ASSI, MNR: many conflicts aired and resolved	RA/SH Management Comm. With RA implementation Group: *flat*	SHs have decision-making powers in partnership with RAs on Management Comm., to which many tasks devolved; many conflicts previously negotiated through marine nature reserve (MNR)	Many relevant statutory functions within DoE(NI): aids integration; proceeding cautiously to ensure that management structure remains 'flat'
	Morecambe Bay	13	200K	EMP: rebuilt previously strained relations	MG - RAs; AG - EMP AG: *two-tier*	Meetings, including informal local meetings; surveys in partnership with RAs/SHs	Interpretation initiatives include prints produced by local artist and video/photos of marine life, as well as aerial photos of EMS
	Essex Estuaries	16	500K	EMP for part; relations built through SSSI/SPA liaison	2 EMP structures: *two-tier* + Harbour Authority AG - SHs and RAs.	Future Search workshop employed for one of EMPs: established visions for estuary, beyond EMS; emphasis on identifying compatible development opportunities	NCA PO focused on science and SH liaison, + LA PO focused on development opportunities and other strategic issues
	Solway Firth	16	100K	EMP which employed PRA workshops and consulted widely	EMP MG adopted EMS role; no AG - role fulfilled by previous EMP: *two-tier*	SH input previously provided through EMP ; informal scientific AG formed; otherwise EMP strategy and structure essentially fulfilling these roles	All SHs on EMP list sent leaflet introducing the EMS; Post-LIFE concerns, particularly as PO facilitates scientific AG
	Chesil and the Fleet	10	1K	Private estate led management structure since 1990; SPA 1985	Former structure employed: MG - RAs; AG – SHs: *two-tier*	Farmers not represented in former management structure so workshop planned to include them; long-standing scientific AG; statutory obligations played-down	EMS unique in that mostly owned by private estate; NCA/DETR workshop antagonised RAs
Lower: successfully developed	Papa Stour	6	0.15K	Pursuing local shellfisheries management	Advisory Panel consisting of RAs/SHs - TGs; *flat*	Great emphasis on meetings and local workshops	LA has had a key role in developing the flat Advisory Panel
	Sound of Arisaig	7	1K	None; some previous negative experiences with SSSIs	Management Forum consisting of RAs/SHs; most tasks devolved to TGs: *flat*	Emphasis on meetings and networking: PO knows and is a member of the local community; mainly SHs appreciated tourism development potential	LA has had a key role in developing and formalising the role of the flat Management Forum and TGs

Social Capital State	EMS	No. RAs	No. SHs	Management history	Management Structure	Participation/ partnership-building	Other features
	Loch Maddy	8	0.2K	None; some previous negative experiences with SSSIs	Open MG – RAs and SHs meet on an open to all basis: *flat*	Emphasis on meetings, networking and local workshops involving form of PRA; many SHs appreciated tourism development potential	Glass-bottomed boat chartered to promote awareness of EMS features; EMS interpretation centre being discussed
	Wash and N. Norfolk Coast	15	110K	EMP – *three-tier*; wildfowlers alienated	MG – RAs & commoners; AG split into 3 geographical areas; *two-tier*	EMS management structure separated from EMP in order to provide for wildfowlers participation; wildfowlers also involved in surveys, etc; emphasis on meetings	Listening and admitting mistakes important; RSPB warden was invaluable in developing participation of wildfowlers
	NE Kent	10	120K	None; some previous conflicts between LA & NCA	SH & RA Group have developed MS, with MG of RAs for implementation: *flat*	Consensus Building workshops used to provide for SH & RA participation; plan for coastal regeneration plan developed alongside EMS MS	LA, with whom there had previously been conflicts, had key role in development of and participation in CB workshops
Higher: experiencing some difficulties with development	Cardigan Bay	9	10K	Voluntary CMHC (for dolphins) largely established by SHs	MG, AG, & TG + annual conference: *three-tier*	Unclear/intangible role of AG &TGs has been an obstacle to participation; public meetings planned to discuss draft MS and develop SH interest	Initial shelving of Marine Heritage Coast alienated many RAs & SHs, some of whom became outspoken opponents of EMS
	Solent/S. Wight Maritime	40	1,140K	EMP: important for developing EMS: forum for discussions/objections	EMS MG – RAs; AG – EMP TGs: based on issues or geographical areas: *two tier*	EMS management structure agreed by RAs/SHs through EMP; too many RAs/SHs for meetings; reliance on letters, newsletters and public meetings	Complex site with many SHs/conflicts; disconnected: many estuaries, island/ mainland; EMS now divided into two
Lower: experiencing some difficulties with development	Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau	10	60K	None	MG but insufficient interest amongst SHs in TG so SH Liaison Group established to discuss MS: *two-tier*	Two extensive mailings inviting expressions of interest in TGs yielded very few responses; public meetings stimulated interest in EMS as a result of which SH Liaison Group established	Difficulties in securing RA commitment, but this was overcome, partly by assigning MG task of establishing SH Liaison Group; discontinuous shape of site an issue?
	Berwick. & N. N'land Coast	27	35K	Partnerships established for parts: voluntary MNR, Heritage Coast & NNRs	MG – RAs; AG/TGs – SHs: *two tier*	Meetings important in re-engaging RAs and recruiting SHs + newspaper articles for SHs; RA participatory workshop 'fell flat': used to formal meetings;	AG delayed in face of MG apathy: long cross-border site, Reg. 33 delays and lack of issues; AG/TGs produced issues paper

In some cases the EMP was initiated in a political context where there were tensions between economic development interests and conservation concerns (*Plymouth Sound and Estuaries; Morecambe Bay)*. In such cases, a key role played by the project officer was that of 'shuttlecock diplomacy' amongst RAs and stakeholders in order to bridge gaps, resolve conflicts and develop a basis for more positive relations. In one case (*Strangford Lough*), many local conflicts were revealed by the MNR proposal. These were dealt with through negotiations and compromises, which also led to the establishment of an inclusive management structure and more positive relations amongst stakeholders and RAs.

The management structure of these previous initiatives, with the exception of Strangford Lough with a one-tier structure, has been two-tier, in keeping with the Estuaries/Firths Initiative model, and with the EMS management structure model recommended by the DETR (1998). The two-tier structure would appear to have been successful in developing social capital. It might be argued that stakeholders were willing to participate in advisory/topic groups in EMPs because this represented a voluntary process with non-statutory management outcomes. The groups constituted a forum where concerns and issues could be debated. There was no legal requirement underpinning the negotiations, and so stakeholders were not engaged in a statutory decision-making process. By contrast, EMSs have a strong legal framework. Stakeholders are therefore more likely to have reservations about their participation being restricted to an advisory/consultation role through two-tier structures, given that the management outcomes which might affect stakeholders are likely to be more firmly implemented in order to meet statutory commitments.

Our conclusion, however, based on the officers' interviews, is that feelings of trust and confidence generated through two-tier EMPs were generally carried forward to the stakeholder advisory and topic groups supporting the EMS. Clearly, a history of integrated estuarine management or inclusive nature conservation designations can therefore be very beneficial in developing social capital among the RAs and stakeholders. In the majority of cases, they have provided a firm basis for new initiatives such as an EMS, even though they have a different statutory basis.

Sites with weaker social capital at the start of the EMS process. It is important to bear in mind that this classification is not pejorative in any sense. The social capital 'state' is considered solely in terms of the local history of partnerships and initiatives which have been developed to achieve objectives similar to those for EMSs, *ie* focused on marine conservation and integrated marine resource management. Localities classified here as having weaker social capital to support the development of the EMS will often have high social capital in other respects.

In most sites falling into this category, there had been no previous overarching management initiative. Essentially, this was because levels of conflict between users of the coastal and marine resources in these areas were not considered by the UK government and its NCAs as high enough to require the development of a management strategy. Most sites are open, rural coastal areas with relatively low population densities (*Papa Stour*, *Sound of Arisaig*, *Loch Maddy*, *Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau, Berwickshire and N. Northumberland Coast*). These did not include major estuaries or firths in which an EMP might be developed. Such areas are clearly not lacking in social cohesiveness. However, it is argued that only partial social networks could be said to exist to support the integrated management of marine resources which could be built upon to develop the EMS.

Two of the case study sites in the group differ from those listed above. *NE Kent* is a relatively urban coastal area with a high population, and a history of conflicts over coastal and marine conservation. However, the fact that it is not an estuary/firth means that government initiatives to promote integrated management have not been applied to this area. The second is the *Wash and North Norfolk Coast*, where an EMP had been initiated for the estuary. However, the EMP had not developed a high level of social capital because a critical stakeholder group (wildfowlers) had not been adequately included in deliberations, despite the fact that some key EMP strategy proposals directly affected them. This case illustrates that EMPs have not been universally successful in developing high social capital across all sectors.

3.2.2   Social capital development

A key objective of this report is to assess what factors influence the current status and dynamics of RA and stakeholder participation, and thus influence the development of stronger trust and confidence within social and policy networks to support the EMS. In this section, a substantial body of evidence is pulled together from interviews with the project officers in the 15 sites. The specific details are summarised in Table 3.1 and the EMSs are grouped into four categories.

Stronger social capital, successfully capitalised upon. In all these cases, the former social networks have been successfully utilised to develop the EMS. Where EMPs had been developed (*Plymouth Sound and Estuaries, Morecambe Bay, Solway Firth*), these management structures were adopted and/or adapted for the EMS, as well as being employed as a platform to debate the EMS proposal and consult upon related issues. A degree of continuity was thus provided. This enabled the EMS to build upon the social capital generated through the EMP, supporting the development of EMS-related partnerships amongst stakeholders and RAs. Where nature conservation initiatives had led to the development of management structures *(Strangford Lough, Chesil and the Fleet)*, these were similarly employed to support the development of partnerships related to the EMS. Furthermore, previous nature conservation initiatives meant that many of the issues likely to arise in the EMSs had already been negotiated, as was particularly the case with *Strangford Lough.*

The *Essex Estuaries* is something of a hybrid in this respect as it adopted a previous EMP for one of its constituent estuaries, and developed an EMP structure for another, partly in order to establish a management structure for the EMS. A Harbour Authority advisory group is also being adapted for another of its constituent estuaries. Furthermore, relations with many owners/occupiers and other stakeholders had been developed by the NCA project officer through careful liaison concerning SSSI re-notifications and SPA designations. The officer initiated many one-to-one meetings prior to official consultation, in order to build support for the proposals and develop their trust in the NCA. These approaches, combined with an EMS-wide emphasis on compatible development and regeneration proposals, have enabled the Essex Estuaries EMS to proceed with very few objections, and the support of RAs and stakeholders. In one case (*the Solent*), there has been some resistance to such a 'federated' structure, and the structure for the integrated management of the wider site was only just being resolved at the time of the interviews.

What is common to all these cases is that the previous management structures have been adopted and/or adapted to provide for the development of the EMS, *ie* the effectiveness of the existing social and policy networks has been effectively deployed. In one case (*the Solent*), with a highly complex political and administrative environment, major opposition to the EMS from private sector interests, has been effectively reduced through the mobilisation of social and professional networks engaged in the Solent partnership.

Weaker social capital strengthened through the EMS. In three sites (*Papa Stour, Sound of Arisaig, Loch Maddy*), the number of RAs and stakeholders was low enough to enable flat and open management structures to be developed. The local authority, in each case, played a key role in this respect. Such an approach is particularly important in rural areas: whilst the number of stakeholders may be fairly low, they tend to be much 'closer' to the marine environment, valuing it as a means of making a living and/or for cultural reasons. Stakeholders are, therefore, much more directly interested in EMS management initiatives and have a higher expectation of participating in decision-making. The devolution of tasks, responsibilities and decisions to stakeholders operating in a single-tier management structure through workshops and topic groups has therefore been very appropriate in providing for participation in these cases. From interviews with the officers in these three Scottish sites, it is clear that inclusive approaches have thus been successful in developing social capital on which the EMS can draw. There are potential issues about the extent to which stakeholder engagement will be sustained when the LIFE project officer post is withdrawn.

NE Kent has also adopted a single-tier, inclusive management structure, even though it has a much greater number of stakeholders and the site has had a history of conflicts. On this site, a participatory process led by the Environment Council working in partnership with the project officer was effective. A series of consensus-building workshops were held in which all the major stakeholder groups and RAs were represented. The outcome has been a management scheme for which there is a wide sense of ownership amongst the stakeholders. Additionally, the scope of the workshop was widened to include the development of a coastal action plan consisting of proposals for compatible development and regeneration initiatives. This will be taken forward in parallel with the management scheme. Another significant benefit of the NE Kent process was the re-building of relations between English Nature and the local authority (LA). The LA is now likely to become a key partner in taking forward the management scheme and the coastal action plan. The professionally-facilitated, consensus-building approach would thus seem to be appropriate for cases where conflicts and stakeholder numbers are high. However, the responsibility for developing and supporting the process did place a strain on the NE Kent project officer. Having committed the project to this innovative approach, it was sometimes difficult to handle raised expectations of success.

The *Wash and North Norfolk Coast* case is unusual in that the previous EMP had not developed a strong cross-sectoral, social and policy network. A key stakeholder group (wildfowlers) had not been adequately included in the process. The local team decided to proceed with the EMS separately from the existing EMP - to establish a new management structure, partly in order to rebuild relations with the wildfowlers. Trust and confidence in the new process was developed through a cautious, participative approach by the project officer. This involved many face-to-face meetings with stakeholders and RAs. Appropriate tasks and responsibilities were devolved to stakeholders, particularly wildfowlers. The bridge-building role of the RSPB warden was also particularly important in developing the trust and involvement of the wildfowlers in the EMS.

Another key feature of this case is that even though the EMS management structure is two-tier, many tasks and responsibilities are devolved to the stakeholder advisory groups which are relatively autonomous. This devolved two-tier structure has been another means of providing for a more inclusive approach in order to develop stronger social capital. One measure of success is that the wildfowlers have engaged in proposals including the identification of wildfowling refuges - the conservation measure they had objected to so strongly when similar proposals were developed without their participation under the EMP. However, in similar way to the *NE Kent* case, it must be noted that attempting to keep all the parties engaged and committed through a new EMS management structure placed a considerable strain on the project officer.

What is common to all these cases is that major emphasis has been placed on having many proactive meetings, workshops and discussions in order to develop support for the EMS proposal. The establishment of relatively flat, inclusive management structures to provide for active participation of stakeholders in partnership with RAs has also been positive. Such approaches appear to have been successful in strengthening social capital for the EMS, in contexts where there was relatively little support beforehand.

Stronger social capital, but experienced some difficulties with the development of the EMS.
In the case of *Cardigan Bay*, the previous Ceredigion Marine Heritage Coast project (CMHCP) had developed high social capital for a part of the EMS. The CMHCP was a voluntary conservation initiative which involved a partnership between stakeholders, the NCA, NGOs and the LA focused on the 'flagship' conservation of the resident bottlenose dolphin population. The initial decision to shelve the voluntary project whilst the EMS was being developed alienated some stakeholders who became outspoken critics of the EMS. Some of the RAs were also angered by the decision and less supportive of the EMS. Social capital to support EMSs can be undermined if management initiatives are not integrated from the outset with previous management initiatives - particularly where such initiatives have very similar aims to the EMS and have been taken forward with the wide support of stakeholders. In other words, this case suggests that EMS development benefits from integration with previous initiatives, in order to capitalise on existing networks and benefit from the trust and confidence that already exists among the partners.

The more recent decision to re-activate the CMHCP and develop it in parallel with the EMS is likely to facilitate the rebuilding of stakeholder support for the EMS. However, those stakeholders and RAs alienated by the initial decision may bear a residual grudge which will need to be overcome in order to develop their participation. An important caveat with regards to this case is that the CMHCP and the EMS, arguably, were driven by different philosophies. The former represents more strongly preservationist values, whilst the latter is driven by scientific conservation values and practices. This tension was revealed by the split in the EMS research group, for example, over appropriate ways to study the dolphin population. Given this philosophical difference, conflict may well have emerged even if the EMS had been integrated with the CMHCP from the outset.

In the case of *the Solent,* the previous EMP had been successful in developing social capital. However, the complicated nature of this site, including the wide geographic scale of the original designation which included many estuaries as well as maritime features encompassing the mainland and the Isle of Wight, has posed major challenges for the

development of the EMS. In particular, the potential for conflicts between commercial/recreational navigation and developments, and nature conservation has been a major issue. Harbour and port authorities who are used to relative autonomy in decision-making, strongly objected to the proposal. They were supported by many recreational navigation interests. The strength of local social networks was such that the NCA was often excluded from discussions, and forced to react to formal objections to the EMS.

In the Solent case, it is possible to see an example of erosion of trust and confidence in the NCA and its scientific rationale, articulated in many different forums by powerful private sector interests. The decision was taken to divide the site and exclude certain features, in response to stakeholder and RA objections, and successful scientific challenges concerning the selection and design of the EMS. However, this led to further objections from conservation NGOs that the site was being fragmented and the wider ecosystem approach being lost.

Another issue in this case was the relatively high number of stakeholders and RAs. The project officer was unable to meet all of them proactively, on a one-to-one basis. Furthermore, given the size of the population and scale of the consultation, it was impossible to respond quickly to the many written objections that were received during the consultations. These problems were exacerbated by the amount of time the project officer had to spend addressing the scientific challenges. Taken together, they are likely to have further eroded social capital at a critical stage in the development of the EMS.

However, it is also the case that key players in the existing EMP were invaluable in minimising the impact of these problems: the network was used to debate issues, voice objections, and discuss management structure options for the EMS. Considerable efforts were being made by the RAs and major stakeholders in late 1999 to rebuild social capital to support the EMS management scheme.

Weaker social capital, and experienced some difficulties in developing the EMS. In the *Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau* case, apparent lack of interest amongst local stakeholders appears to be hindering the development of the EMS. Two letters of invitation to join advisory groups were sent to local people. The second was sent to approximately 9,500 people. A total of 51 people responded, and just half of these said they would be willing to attend a meeting to take the advisory groups forward. In the light of this experience the management group organised a number of public meetings which generated a much greater degree of interest amongst stakeholders. This has resulted in the establishment of a stakeholder Liaison Group with whom EMS issues and the draft management scheme will be discussed. Progress is thus being made to provide for stakeholder involvement but, due to the earlier advisory group recruitment problems, this is fairly late in the EMS process.

There have also been difficulties in establishing the management group, which became very focused on bureaucratic issues. The lead Local Authority was afraid that the EMS might restrict marina developments and were reluctant, initially, to co-operate in a partnership process. However, the management group became more focused on practical EMS issues through the organisation of the public meetings and the ensuing development of the stakeholder Liaison Group. Both these initiatives have contributed positively to the development of a network for stakeholder participation, and have given a practical and tangible focus to the management group's activities.

The *Berwickshire and North Northumberland* EMS experienced some initial delays in establishing a management structure. This is a very large cross-border site with substantial numbers of RAs and stakeholders who have not, traditionally, been engaged in working together; nor has there been a history of contentious management issues in the area that might have brought RAs and stakeholders into discussion. At the start of the EMS process, letters were sent to invite RA participation rather than face-to-face meetings to promote the idea of the partnership to support conservation of the marine site. Cross-border NCA deliberations and delays concerning the form of the conservation objectives and operations advice also seem to have hindered RA involvement. The establishment of a stakeholder advisory group was delayed due to the management group delays. However, there was a good response by stakeholders to newspaper articles inviting expressions of interest in the advisory group. A series of face-to-face meetings with targeted stakeholder groups introduced the EMS and invited their participation. The outcome was the formation of an advisory group and 5 topic groups with a total membership of 50 stakeholders. These groups have provided forums where RAs and stakeholders have begun to build a relations to support the EMS. An issues paper produced from the groups' deliberations has contributed significantly to the development of the management scheme.

In both these cases the large, geographically fragmented character of the EMS has also arguably been a hindrance to the development of RA/stakeholder partnerships. It does seem to have been difficult for RAs and stakeholders to relate to the EMS as a single unit for management. It is also noteworthy that initial emphasis was given to establishing a management group among the RAs. This led to delays in recruiting support among stakeholders. Information was disseminated by letter, and it may have seemed to stakeholders that they were only to have a consultative role. Without opportunities for the kind of informal discussions that took place in other EMSs through existing social networks and partnerships, it seems that in these two sites, it was much harder to initially engage individuals' interest and enthusiasm for the EMS in the critical early stages of development. However, having done so, it is clear that the EMSs in both localities are now progressing satisfactorily.

3.3   Summary

The analysis in this chapter has been based on interviews with the 15 project officers working on EMSs around the UK. In every case, the officer was invited to 'tell the story' of how their site was developing; in some cases, colleagues participated to reconstruct parts of the account that may have happened before the officer came into post. The research team reflected on each of these histories by writing through a short report to draw out what appeared to be the key moments and key processes in the development of partnership to support the management of each site. The reports were returned to each officer for comments and further clarification, if required.

As argued in Section 2, the concept of social capital provides a critical purchase on what are complex, locally-specific economic, social and political relations. In section 3, a number of aspects of social capital have been used to classify the 15 sites and draw out comparisons between them. Examples have been provided of effective social and policy networks such as those to progress EMPs. Examples have also been used to show where trust and confidence amongst RAs, stakeholders and project officers have been supportive of the process; and to show where interventions by the officer and local office have enabled the building of

relations to support the EMS which were not there before. This analysis is the basis upon which the key lessons are drawn out from the UK EMSs which are presented in the final section of this report.

4. Findings of the RA and stakeholder telephone interviews

4.1 Introduction

The findings discussed so far have essentially been based on face-to-face interviews with the project officers employed to pursue the EMS in question. In some cases a representative of the RA most immediately associated with the EMS *eg* NCA, LA, has also been involved in these interviews, but they were speaking as people who had been working closely with the project officer and had been closely involved in the EMS. In order to gain the views of the wider constituency concerning participation in the EMS in question, and to increase the legitimacy of the findings, a programme of telephone interviews with RAs and stakeholders who had participated in the EMS was undertaken over February and March 2001.

A total of eleven telephone interviews were undertaken involving nine RA representatives and two stakeholders. They were involved in the following sites:

- Plymouth Sound and Estuaries
- NE Kent
- Strangford Lough
- Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau

4.2 Methodology

The following methodology was employed:

1. The EMS project officer in question nominated 2-3 RA and stakeholder representatives, and contacted them to lay the ground and ascertain that they were willing to participate in the telephone interview.

2. The RA and stakeholder representatives were sent an executive summary of the draft final report for this project and an outline of the issues/questions to be addressed in the telephone interviews:

    Strengths of the RA/stakeholder participation approach employed;
    Weaknesses of the RA/stakeholder participation approach employed;
    Was the stakeholder level of input appropriate?
    Was the RA level of input appropriate?
    Was the management structure adequate and how might it be improved?
    Are there issues related to participation which are likely to influence the implementation of the management scheme?
    Prospects for the EMS management structure and scheme;
    In what ways could the process have been improved?

3. The telephone interviews were undertaken on a structured basis employing the above issues/questions. Notes were prepared drawing on the tapes of the telephone

interviews and sent to the RA/stakeholder representative in question to ensure that the main points had been accurately captured. Anonymity was guaranteed.

4.3   Findings

4.3.1   Plymouth Sound and Estuaries

Introduction

This site encompasses Plymouth Sound as well as the estuarine reaches of 5 rivers, and supports a large number and diversity of uses, including a Royal Navy dockyard, many marinas and three commercial harbours. There were a number of conflicts in the early 1990's which led to the establishment of two EMP initiatives: the Tamar Estuaries Consultative Forum and the Port of Plymouth Liaison Group. These partnerships developed well and the EMS has built on their success, with the Queen's Harbour Master taking a strong lead role. Recreational boating interests are represented through an umbrella group: the Port of Plymouth Sailing Association.

Interview findings

The interviewees endorsed the view that the EMPs were a success and that the EMS benefited by building on this foundation of cooperation. It was felt that the positive and proactive participation of a wide range of stakeholders through the EMP had led to the development of an EMS management scheme which has considerable support, and the EMP is perceived as a positive initiative which delivers practical benefits. There were concerns about the problems of involving non-organised stakeholders.

There were also concerns about the dependence of the management structure on the good will of representatives, and there may be a need for a stronger statutory duty being placed on RAs along with a long-term funding provision in order to maintain commitment. It was also felt that there was a need for the NCA to take a more positive, constructive approach, as opposed to a prescriptive, cudgelling approach. This would provide for the development of a sense of local ownership of the EMS and the management scheme, particularly with regards to compliance and condition monitoring, and this is important as such local ownership is critical to the success of this initiative. It was also considered that there was a need to provide for the consolidation and stabilisation of the management structure, and the development of required information systems, before new challenges are addressed, *ie* it is too soon to expect EMS management structures to address the need for new features and sites arising from the EC moderation process.

4.3.2   NE Kent

Introduction

This EMS encompasses the coastal towns of Ramsgate and Margate, which were heavily dependent on tourism and port activities, both of which are now in decline. The area is recognised as one of the most economically depressed in SE England. There has been a history of conflicts between the LA and the NCA over planning proposals which it was considered would have damaged the conservation interests of the chalk cliffs, and local sentiment supported such proposals in the interests of much needed job creation. The

Environment Council were employed to facilitate a consensus-building process involving both stakeholders and RAs, the findings from which were used as the basis for the EMS management scheme and a wider coastal action plan.

Interview findings

The interviewees considered that the consensus-building process had been very beneficial in bringing people together on a face-to-face basis, which allowed for participants to listen to each other's opinions and concerns in a way which broke down fixed views and provided for a foundation of agreement and an exchange of ideas. There was a good representation of stakeholders through the collective efforts of the RAs to identify appropriate people who should be involved. The approach whereby invited stakeholders were asked to identify any other stakeholder representatives who they thought should be involved was particularly effective.

However, it was considered that it would have been beneficial if some information, concerning what activities occur where, had been tabled for discussion and revision by the RA/stakeholder group, rather than starting with an ideologically correct 'blank sheet of paper'. Similarly, the full reporting of every point raised by every discussion group meant that the reports were too large and unwieldy, making it difficult to pull out the main points, and it was felt that there was a need to synthesise the main points. It was also felt that the period of time between the workshops and the publication of the draft management scheme/coastal action plan was longer than might have been desirable.

There was a minority of representatives of single issue/objective pressure groups who were not prepared to be swayed, and the stakeholder dialogue approach provided them with a platform to expound their views and potentially be disruptive, whilst not listening or constructively participating. However, the approach was robust and able to move forward despite this minority.

The splitting of the participants into sub-groups meant that the RAs were sometimes spread too thinly and that there was a lack of appropriate RA representation in some groups. Though the RA/stakeholder dialogue group was the main decision-making forum, it was recognised that there was a need for an RA steering group to implement the decisions where appropriate, and that there is a need for the LA to lead such a group. It was also felt that there were unrealistic expectations as to the environmental data that RAs could gather and bring to the process, and these expectations had to be managed and constructively addressed. The process was particularly effective in developing the participation and securing the commitment of LA elected members, which is often lacking in similar initiatives. This commitment in turn provided for the LA to adopt a lead role in the implementation of the management scheme and coastal action plan.

In the longer term it was felt that the foundation of agreement and understanding generated by the process will minimise objections to the management scheme and promote cooperation, which will help when addressing future conflicts. It was argued that there will continue to be a need for a dedicated project officer with a secure funding base to maintain the momentum that the process has generated, and to coordinate the implementation, monitoring and revision of the management scheme/coastal action plan. To this end there is a need for a greater impetus for RAs to contribute funding in the longer-term to support such a project officer.

4.3.3 Strangford Lough

Introduction

There has been a long history of management initiatives in Strangford, beginning in 1975 when parts of it became recognised as a voluntary marine nature reserve. In 1986 it was proposed that the Lough be designated a statutory marine nature reserve, whilst between 1988-1989 a number of intertidal conservation designations were proposed. These proposals generated significant objections and conflicts, discussions to address which led to the establishment of the Strangford Lough Management Committee (SLMC) in 1992, comprised of both RAs and stakeholders. Many of the potentially contentious issues related to the EMS had thus been aired and largely resolved as a result of previous proposals.

The SLMC subsequently became the main structure for the development of the EMS management scheme. The RAs also formed a Liaison Group, the main focus of which was to coordinate the implementation of the management scheme. The Strangford Lough Office of the SLMC adopted an intermediary role whereby it supported the SLMC and acted as the official link to the Liaison Group. Specific tasks were devolved from the Liaison Group to the Office, and were undertaken in partnership with the SLMC, and it was found that the devolution of such tasks was important in developing the SLMC's ownership of the management scheme.

Interview findings

It was felt that having a wide range of stakeholders and RAs involved at an early stage in the EMS, through the pre-existing SLMC, created interest and provided for their constructive input, as well as building good relations, leading to commitment to the process and the management scheme. Some stakeholders have argued that they should have been involved even earlier, *eg* selection discussions, but it clear that this is politically and administratively difficult in reality. It was also felt that it might have been better if responsibility for the production of the draft management scheme had been devolved to the Strangford Lough Office earlier in the process.

It was considered that more scientific information was needed at the outset of the project to guide the development of the conservation objectives, etc, rather than the findings of the LIFE funded studies being delivered near the end of the management scheme preparation process. The SLMC have established an Information Network which has been developed alongside the management scheme. The Network's activities bring together staff from the RAs and other bodies on collaborative communication projects, and it has produced useful publications such as handbooks, guides and contact directories, which will further promote participation and cooperation.

In the longer term it is critical that initiatives arising from the EMS are seen to be happening on the ground in order to maintain the participation and commitment if stakeholders. There are concerns that inactivity may set in and/or actions taken will not go far enough, particularly given that no one organisation is responsible for the management of the Lough and that there is no long-term commitment to funding.

4.3.4   Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau

Introduction

This is a rural site which encompasses 230 km of coastline. The rocky reef features around the Llyn Peninsular to the north are relatively discrete from the estuary and boulder reef features to the south. There were no previous site management structures and an RA management group was established. There was an initial lack of responses to invitations to join a stakeholder advisory group. A series of three public meetings led to the establishment of a stakeholder Liaison Group to discuss issues related to the development of the management scheme.

Interview findings

It was argued that the management structure that should be adopted for the EMS should have been openly discussed with the participation of stakeholders from the outset, rather than them being brought in for a role which had been pre-determined by the RAs.

The NCA and Sea Fisheries Committee took a strong lead in the management group, which was considered to have been successful in strengthening relations between the RAs and providing for the management of the site to be considered in a holistic manner. However, the interviewees noted that certain RAs did not participate as much as might have been appropriate. It was considered that the meetings were too formal and often got bogged down in legal and administrative issues, and that there was a need to inject some energy into these meetings to keep discussions moving.

Stakeholder participation was considered to be sufficient as far as was practicable, in that it is difficult to secure complete representation in such a geographically wide site. Difficulties of providing for the participation of non-organised stakeholders, such as personal water craft users, could lead to conflicts when the management scheme is implemented.

Some interviewees felt that here was an initial lack of recognition of the importance of stakeholder participation by certain RAs. Initially, the management group stated that they would take responsibility for implementing the management scheme, but some stakeholders were concerned that the RAs might not adequately take account of their interests, and this motivated them to become involved in the Liaison Group. Initial meetings of the Liaison Group were well attended, though participation declined at later meetings. It is uncertain whether this was because of poor publicity or because stakeholders were happy with progress and with their representation on the Liaison Group, and felt that the designation posed no threat to their interests and livelihoods. It was felt that the deliberative and participative consultation role of the stakeholders in relation to the draft management scheme was appropriate, as it would not have been realistic to expect them to take on key tasks such as writing sections of the management scheme. However, it was also felt that providing for more meaningful stakeholder participation, through a flat management structure whereby stakeholders worked in partnership with RAs, might have stimulated their participation.

In the long-term, it is felt that the NCA and Sea Fisheries Committee need to step-back from their strong lead role and encourage other RAs to take collective action in order to reduce the risk of loss institutional momentum. Inaccessibility and lack of understanding of the

conservation features could also undermine momentum, as could the nebulous nature of the EMS management objectives and measures. More innovative means of bringing the conservation features alive, *eg* live video footage of marine life, might increase such understanding. It was also argued that longer-term resources are needed if the management scheme and related potential initiatives are to be taken forward, and that there should be less emphasis on a legalistic/institutionalised approach in order to bring the management process alive.

4.4   Additional points arising

It is significant to note that there is a resonance between the issues raised through the project officer interviews and those raised through these interviews with representatives of the wider RA and stakeholder community. This raises confidence in the validity of the findings gleaned from the project officer interviews, though this is caveated by the fact that the telephone interviews were only conducted for 4 of the 15 case studies, and that each involved telephone interviews with just 3 representatives that had been nominated by the project officers. It is also significant to note that similar issues were raised in these four case studies despite the different contexts, indicating that some issues are common to EMSs in general.

Stakeholder participation through appropriate representation was generally regarded as sufficient, though the problem of involving non-organised stakeholders, such as personal water craft users, who could be important when the management schemes are implemented, was raised. Asking the stakeholders themselves whether they might be able to suggest other stakeholders who should be involved appears to be a particularly successful approach to increasing representation.

More participative approaches to involving stakeholders, such as consensus-building, were generally felt to have built a stronger basis of RA/stakeholder support. Where more traditional models were applied, there was support for higher levels of participation.

A critical issue in the longer term was the vulnerability of the EMS management structures, as they largely rely on the willingness of stakeholders and RAs to participate, and it is uncertain whether the momentum can be maintained, especially if the lead role played by certain RAs is lost. Several interviewees stressed the importance of long-term funding to support project officers, and the need for a greater onus on the RAs to maintain their participation into the crucial implementation phase. It is anticipated that a significant proportion of funding will need to be resourced by central government. It was also argued that it is critical that tangible initiatives and measures are seen to be put in place in the near future, if the interest of stakeholders and RAs is to be maintained.

5.   Key lessons from the 15 EMS case studies

5.1   Introduction

In this final section of the report, general and specific points related to the engagement of RAs and stakeholders in the development of the 15 EMSs are drawn out and summarised. One purpose of the project was to find examples of approaches to RA and stakeholder participation which had been successful in particular contexts, and to bring these to the attention of a wider audience. It is argued above that all participation processes must be designed to suit the particular economic, social, and political contexts in which they will be implemented, and the case studies have revealed how much variability there is between EMSs. But the points set out below do represent more general points of principle and practice which may be helpful to progress the establishment of EMSs elsewhere.

5.2   Geographical contexts

The distribution of the case studies with different geographical attributes suggests a number of specific trends:

- EMSs which are large and consist of a number of geographically disconnected units pose a particular challenge in generating a sense of partnership amongst RAs/stakeholders. In such sites, efforts need to be focused on identifying ways of developing RA/stakeholder awareness of the importance of managing the site as a whole, and/or of exploring the potential for 'federated' management structures which are geographically split or devolved into management units which RAs/stakeholders can identify with more readily.

- Certain conservation features with cultural resonance, such as seals and dolphins, might be expected to promote a greater sense of management responsibility. This would not appear to have had a significant influence in these case studies with particular regard to the appropriateness of different participation techniques.

- In rural sites where there are fewer potential stakeholders, there is a much higher expectation and need for participation by a greater proportion of stakeholders, as they are 'closer' to the marine environment. In urban sites where there are more potential stakeholders, there is a lower expectation and need for participation of a smaller proportion of stakeholders as many may live by the sea but are not particularly close to it. This needs to be taken into account when considering the appropriateness of participation-building techniques. Many of the more successful techniques can only be applied to a relatively small number of people. However, this problem may be overcome in urban sites by the selection of key and representative stakeholders, and the adoption of more innovative participatory techniques.

5.3   Pre-EMS management history

- Where social capital has been generated through a previous management initiative this is more likely to be maintained and enhanced if the EMS is integrated with the previous initiative through adoption/adaptation of the management structure and

approach. This also avoids concerns about increasing the number and complexity of management structures. This 'building-on' approach was recommended by the DETR (1998).

- Where a previous management initiative has been unsuccessful in generating cross-sectoral social capital, it would appear to be advantageous to assess the underlying causes of this previous lack of success and focus efforts on addressing these, and/or, in extreme cases, to pursue the EMS separately.

5.4   EMS Management structures

It is beneficial if the management structure that should be adopted is openly discussed at the outset with the participation of stakeholders. The following management structures were adopted in the case studies:

- **Two-tier management structures**, such as those developed under EMPs, where decision-making responsibilities essentially rest with the RAs on the management group and the stakeholders **collaborate** through advisory group/topic groups, would appear to be **particularly appropriate to sites with a large number of potential stakeholders.** It is a realistic approach to provide a role for stakeholders where their numbers are so high (*Solway, Solent, Plymouth Sound and Estuaries, Essex Estuaries, Morecambe Bay, Cardigan Bay, Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau*).

- Two-tier management structures which are relatively bottom-up in that stakeholders are, **to a degree, empowered** by devolving decision-making powers and related responsibilities to stakeholders in partnership with RAs, appear to have been **particularly appropriate where stakeholder numbers are high but social capital was low** (*Wash and North Norfolk Coast, Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast*)

- **Flat management structures** on which stakeholders are **empowered** to work in partnership with RAs in a single group to deliberate on issues and take decisions, with the RAs often forming what amounts to an implementation group, would appear to be **particularly appropriate for coastal areas where stakeholder numbers are relatively low and their stakes are relatively high** (*Loch Maddy, Papa Stour, Sound of Arisaig, Strangford Lough*). But **this structure was also successfully applied to a site with many stakeholders** (*NE Kent*)**, so should not be ruled out for such sites**.

It is also interesting to note that a variety of RA representatives have adopted the role of chair and that this is very much a case-by-case decision depending upon the local political context:

- LA Officer: Solent, Morecambe Bay, Solway, Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast, Cardigan Bay
- LA Councillor(s): Papa Stour, Sound of Arisaig
- Sea Fisheries Committee: Wash
- EN: Chesil and the Fleet
- Ministry of Defence (Queens Harbour Master): Plymouth Sound and Estuaries
- Flat Management structure with no chair: Loch Maddy
- Chair rotated each meeting: Llyn Peninsular and the Sarnau, Essex Estuaries

- Environment and Heritage Service within the DoE(NI): Strangford Lough
- None (NE Kent)

5.5   Initial Consultation

- There were general concerns over the **lack of information included in EMS consultations** on the initial proposals to designate the sites. The packs included only outline maps showing boundaries and lists of main conservation features with some supporting data. The *Marine Natura 2000* booklets produced by the national NCAs were useful in illustrating the context of the national EMS initiative. Consultation packs **should include as much information as is feasible concerning potential management implications**.

- The fact that the possible **EMSs being consulted upon were essentially *fait accompli* also led to concerns**: this is a difficult problem to overcome where EMSs are selected on a purely scientific basis and therefore the potential for stakeholder input is limited.

- Many people objected to the 12 week consultation period, even though this was extended for EMSs from 6 weeks.

- Confining the consultation to owners/occupiers alienated some stakeholders, particularly fishermen**: all direct stakeholders should be consulted**.

- Surgeries to which consultees are invited to drop-in and discuss the EMS proposal can be effective in developing relations, particularly in small rural communities.

5.6   Meetings

- It would appear to be advantageous to have as many face-to-face meetings with RAs and stakeholders as early in the process (preferably before initial consultation) as is feasible in order to personally engage/recruit people and build trust and confidence in the process. Consultations, letters, questionnaires and joint meetings do not seem to be particularly successful in this respect. However, there is a limit to the extent to which this can be done in complex sites with many RAs and stakeholders and only one project officer.

- In general, it is important to get the venue right, as this can affect the mood and productivity of meetings, and to appoint an experienced chair who can command the respect of the participants and keep the proceedings moving with direction.

- It is important that the meetings do not become bogged down in pedantic discussions over legal, constitutional or scientific issues, as this will be a significant deterrent to participation. Efforts should be made to try and keep discussions moving in a lively and constructive fashion.

5.7   RA partnership-building approaches

5.7.1   RA Responsibility workshops

These were mainly used in England to explain the new responsibilities upon RAs and involved local and national NCA staff. Some were subsequently undertaken with the input of

a planning consultant retained by EN. Several issues about the workshops arose in the interviews.

- The workshops appeared to have over-emphasised the legal responsibilities of the RAs and the potential consequences of non-compliance, which was less than optimal in developing a sense of partnership and shared responsibility amongst the RAs. This was especially so where the workshop represented a first or early meeting, when the management group has not yet generated its own identity and was vulnerable to being de-motivated by legalistic presentations.

- The **lack of national governmental steer** on the responsibilities of the RAs under the Habitat Regulations, coupled with the fact that the responsibilities workshops were organised by the NCAs, **gave many of the RAs the impression that the NCA was primarily responsible for EMSs. Arguably, this perception undermined the RA partnership-building process in some cases**. There is a need for RAs to be made aware of their responsibilities under these Regulations through central government means.

- Liaison between the EMS project officer and the national NCA can avoid many potential problems by ensuring that workshops are presented in a manner which is sensitive to the local RA context.

5.7.2   RA Participatory workshops

- These can be problematic where RAs are used to a very formal approach and may not be familiar with more participatory, creative approaches. This problem may be exacerbated where such workshops are run by NCA project officers with relatively little training and experience in facilitation.

- Where RAs are more open to such workshops, or where specialist facilitation skills are employed, they can be very successful in 'breaking the ice' and developing a sense of partnership amongst the RAs, as well as generating information and ideas concerning the EMS. Such workshops can be focused on tasks relating to the development of the management scheme. Examples include the preliminary identification of operations in relation to specific conservation features employing a matrix, and the assessment of the distribution of different activities using moveable sticky labels on EMS maps. Breaking the RAs into sub-groups can help in developing dialogue and achieving these tasks.

5.7.3   Other issues

- **Assigning RAs specific, tangible responsibilities related to the development of the management scheme**, eg organising stakeholder participation initiatives, joint survey and assessment exercises, developing responsibility signpost tables, reviewing extant consents, **as early as possible in the process helps generate a sense of focused partnership amongst the RAs**.

- It is important to **try and secure an RA representative who speaks for, and reports back, to their organisation** to as great a degree as possible. There is also a need for intra-RA partnership and integration.

- Where a particular RA has taken a strong lead role in the initial development of the management scheme, it is important that they step back and encourage and provide

for other RAs to take collective action in order to promote inter-RA cooperation and reduce the risk of loss of institutional momentum.

5.8   Stakeholder participation-building approaches

- Stakeholders are more likely to feel that they are partners in the EMS, rather than victims of it, if they are, as far as is feasible, able to work in **collaboration** with the RAs **through devolved two-tier management structures** or are **empowered through flat management structures.** However, the latter approach may be resisted where RAs are unwilling to relinquish power.

- In some cases, the **input of stakeholders is restricted to discussion, advice, consultation and information provision** through advisory groups, topic groups and/or annual forums in two-tier structures. Progress updates, information provision, issues discussion and management scheme input often essentially reduce their participation to that of **consultation** only. Outcomes of real and/or perceived disempowerment of stakeholders can include apathy; a lack of willingness to cooperate with the management scheme; or even protests and active defiance. It could be argued that **for urban sites**, where stakeholders are accustomed to institutionalised decision-making processes through consultation, **such apathy is an acceptable cost** associated with taking an appropriate top-down approach, provided that this apathy does not progress to non-cooperation, protests and defiance. However, for **rural sites**, for the reasons discussed above, it is **both appropriate and feasible to work in collaboration with stakeholders or to actually empower them**.

- It must be accepted that it is **rarely possible to involve representatives of all stakeholders**. It can be **particularly difficult to involve non-organised stakeholders**, such as personal water craft users who may travel into the area, who could be important when the management schemes are implemented. It is important to **try and identify appropriate representatives of such stakeholders**, and to recognise that efforts may need to be focused **on making them aware of relevant use restrictions in a manner which will maximise their potential to cooperate**.

- Asking the stakeholders identified through initial efforts whether they might be able to suggest other stakeholders who should be involved appears to be a particularly successful approach to increasing representation.

- Where there have been problems developing stakeholder participation in the management scheme, the **consultation on the draft management scheme can be used as an opportunity to engage stakeholders.** More participative consultation approaches, such as targeting stakeholders for liaison and discussion groups, provide for significant participation through feedback, rather than simply mailing out the draft management scheme. However, it is important that this is seen as an opportunity to develop the management scheme and to gain wider stakeholder acceptance of it, rather than a tokenistic exercise. *Caveat:* **such latter stage approaches should not be relied upon as stakeholder participation should be provided for as early in the process as is feasibly possible**.

- In several cases it is planned to hold a high profile public launch of the management scheme, including in some cases a party to celebrate the EMS. Again, this is a **good opportunity to engage stakeholders** and develop their sense of ownership of the EMS and the management scheme. *Caveat:* again, such latter stage approaches should

not be relied upon as stakeholder participation should be provided for as early in the process as is feasibly possible.

- As with RAs, **assigning stakeholders specific, tangible responsibilities related to the development of the management scheme**, such as participating in surveys and assessments; advising RAs on the feasibility of different management options; providing their knowledge on activities; and participating in workshops **can develop social capital and provide for constructive stakeholder participation**.

- Integrating the identification of opportunities for compatible development and regeneration opportunities promotes stakeholder (and some RA) participation. It balances the negative, potentially restrictive conservation aspects of the EMS with the positive opportunities it presents, in keeping with the concept of sustainable development and the aims of the Habitats Directive. This approach was specifically employed in *NE Kent* where a coastal action plan was developed in parallel with the management scheme. Similarly, the *Sound of Arisaig* EMS established tourism and economic development topic groups to identify such opportunities.

- Project officers need to be aware of existing, perhaps latent, conflicts amongst stakeholders/RAs which the EMS may be drawn into. For example, a stakeholder group may attempt to use the designation as a means of supporting their position and achieving their objectives, thus potentially exacerbating conflict through the protests of the opposing stakeholders. Simply being aware of such conflicts can go a long way to minimising their impacts on EMS social capital-building processes. Fore-warned is fore-armed; officers can mobilise the network to handle the potential conflicts more quickly and effectively.

- **If consulting on a draft document, do not make it look too glossy and finalised**: a professionally presented and bound consultation draft can give stakeholders the impression that it is a *fait accompli*. It may also lead to resentment, especially in economically-impoverished areas, that money is being 'wasted' on trivial things.

- When mailing stakeholders to invite expressions of interest in participating in advisory group/topic groups, do not rely on the statutory consultation lists. These often miss non-owner/occupier stakeholders; nor should reliance be placed on reaching wider stakeholders through groups such as Parish Councils, as these often do not represent the interests of 'non-organised' stakeholders. The local media (especially the free papers) may be a means of reaching such wider stakeholders.

- **Signpost tables prepared by RAs** are a useful means of identifying which RA stakeholders should approach in relation to a specific EMS issue, and of generally learning about the different responsibilities of the different RAs in the context of the EMS.

5.9 General approaches

- There is a need to achieve a balance between meeting deadlines and keeping the EMS moving forward, and not pushing the process too fast in a manner that may alienate some stakeholders/RAs.

- Clash of personalities can be a problem, but this can be overcome by the appointment, tactfully requested if not coincidental, of a new representative of the RA/stakeholder group in question.

- It is important to strike a balance between not overplaying the legal commitments, *ie* avoid relying upon these to force RA/stakeholder cooperation; and underplaying them to the degree that agreed positions have subsequently to be backtracked upon in the face of such commitments.

- Given considerable uncertainty as to whether funds will be available to support a project officer post-LIFE, the **EMS structure and processes need to be designed from the outset as self-supporting** in the longer-term absence of a dedicated project officer. This should involve the development of a **proactive exit strategy and the cultivation of certain contacts who can be influential in driving the process forward**.

- Stakeholders and RAs are less likely to participate in EMSs if they perceive that the initiatives will fade away when LIFE funding ends and when the initially flurry of policy enthusiasm subsides. It is therefore **important to secure and demonstrate the commitment of central government and RAs in order to provide for the institutional and economic sustainability of the initiative.** This might include the stressing of the legal basis of the EMSs, which is not going to 'go away', though this should not be over-played.

- It is important that a **culture of honesty and trust is developed** amongst RAs/stakeholders to provide for a generally positive and constructive political environment, *eg* listening to each other, admitting uncertainties, mistakes and weaknesses, avoiding hidden agendas.

- It is important to **emphasise nature conservation as a partnership process** rather than reducing it to a matter of science, and legal responsibilities.

- In the longer term it is critical that initiatives arising from the EMS are seen to be happening on the ground in order to maintain the participation and commitment of RAs and stakeholders.

5.10 Role/value of specific participatory techniques

Three specific workshop approaches were employed amongst the case studies to develop and provide for RA/stakeholder participation. The essential attributes of the approaches are summarised below.

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): employed in *Plymouth/Solway* EMPs, whilst a similar approach was employed in Loch Maddy EMS. PRA was found to be useful in providing a preliminary focus and tasks for initial meetings. This broke the ice between the RAs and stakeholders, as well as providing information on the views of participants concerning the EMS (generally positive and negative aspects and related issues), and on the EMS itself (distribution of activities and conservation features, etc, which can be particularly useful for objectives and operations advice). As such, **it is a good means of gathering preliminary information on the site and the views of the participants on management issues, but not a means of facilitating deliberations concerning the resolution of conflicts and the development of a management scheme.**

Future Search: used in a constituent EMP of the *Essex Estuaries* EMS. Again, useful for providing a focus for initial meetings, and also for enabling participants to get to know each other to a greater degree than just breaking the ice. Future Search is essentially a means of gaining information on the hopes, aspirations and visions of the participants for the site, as

well as their fears and concerns about obstacles to realising these aspirations. However, in a similar fashion to PRA, this technique is **a good means of gathering preliminary information on the views of the participants concerning the site, but is not a means of facilitating deliberations concerning the fulfilment of objectives (hopes), the resolution of conflicts, and the development of management measures.** Unlike PRA, it does not provide for specific information concerning the site to be gathered.

Consensus Building through stakeholder dialogue: on the basis of the single case in which this was employed (*NE Kent*), **this approach would appear to be effective in gathering initial information concerning the site, discussing conflicts, identifying opportunities and developing a management scheme which has the sustained support of stakeholders and RAs**. This is essentially because this technique focuses on how processes can be facilitated through consensus-building, rather than on the achievement of specific tasks. It is thus able to work throughout the management scheme development process.

5.11   Role of Central NCA

5.11.1 General role

Tensions arose in several instances over the input of the central NCA to the local process of developing a management scheme. This was particularly the case where local ownership of the EMS and the management scheme preparation process was high; or where there has been a history of conflicts with the NCA over previous nature conservation designations; and/or where there is a cultural resistance to outside interference. **These tensions could, to a degree, be overcome by**:

- ensuring that central NCA presentations and documents are sensitive to the local RA/stakeholder culture;
- avoiding scientific terms and acknowledging and respecting the knowledge and aspirations of stakeholders;
- ensuring that central NCA interventions are fully explained and preferably made in person, so that the local project officer is able to maintain some independence;
- ensuring that a positive, constructive approach is taken in order to support local initiatives and engender a sense of local ownership.

5.11.2 Objectives and operations advice

The inter-NCA differences in the form of the conservation objectives and operations advice led to a problem in that **certain national organisations**, such as Associated British Ports, **have picked up on the inconsistency between NCAs and have used this as a means of criticising the scientific basis of EMSs**. For the two cross-border EMS case studies (*Solway Firth, Berwickshire and North Northumberland Coast*) these differences were more apparent as a compromise had to be reached between EN and SNH as to what form the objectives and operations advice should take for such sites. However, **at an EMS specific level for most cases a more significant issue was the delays in the delivery of the objectives and operations advice**, to which the inter-NCA debates contributed, and the different stances that were adopted to deal with these delays.

Overall, it would appear that the **following approaches were generally successful in providing for stakeholder/RA input into the objectives and operations advice development process and of dealing with the delays.**

- **Provide for the input of stakeholders/RAs in the preliminary draft of the advice** through workshops to employ their knowledge of the distribution of conservation features and of different activities employing sensitivity matrices.

- Provide for the input of stakeholders/RAs through informal and formal consultations, paying particular attention to demonstrating that stakeholder/RA input is being incorporated, and providing sufficient time for deliberation and response.

- **Devolve appropriate aspects of the development of the advice to a sub-group** consisting of both stakeholders and RAs, under the scrutiny and guidance of the NCA.

- **Ensure that stakeholders/RAs have other tasks related to the development of the management scheme** and to wider EMS issues whilst the objectives and operations advice is being further developed. This tactic is necessary to avoid apathy through a loss of momentum, and alienation through a sense that the EMS is primarily the responsibility of the NCA. Very general objectives and operations may be employed during such tasks to keep the process moving without prejudicing the formal objectives and operations advice

- **Ensure that the RAs/stakeholders know what to expect** in terms of the level of detail of the objectives and operations advice and its role in the management scheme preparation process. This avoids over/under expectations which can exacerbate the impact of delays;

- **Ensure that the objectives and operations advice are intelligible** to non-marine ecologists, and are not presented in a negative manner which may heighten fears of potential restrictions - *eg* avoiding the use of the term Operations Likely to Cause Disturbance or Deterioration (OLCDD).

- As far as is practicably possible in the face of deadlines, **ensure** through good project management that the **process proceeds in a steady step-wise manner in order to avoid it having to be rushed**.

5.12   Role of project officers

- The **skills and competencies of project officers need to match the social and political culture of sites**, *eg* on a rural site with close-knit communities, people skills and local knowledge may be particularly important, whilst on a complex urban site, political and scientific expertise may be particularly important.

- Project officers with **appropriate experience of the local political culture** should be employed where possible, particularly for sites which are likely to be politically sensitive or contentious.

- Where practicable and appropriate, EMS tasks should be undertaken by project officers as this develops their knowledge, experience and standing: capacity-building, rather than letting such tasks to consultants;

- It should be **determined to whom the project officer is primarily responsible** and serves, on a case-by-case basis if appropriate: is it the management group, stakeholders, local NCA or national NCA? Where there are joint responsibilities, their

relative weighting or importance should be clearly ranked. A lack of clarity on this issue can lead to the project officer being torn, stressed, compromised and overloaded.

- Similarly, the **precise and realistic responsibilities of the project officer should be agreed** on a case-by-case basis, paying particular attention to their relative responsibilities to develop a science base and a social capital base for the EMS.

- Required project officer skills and training should be balanced between developing social/political capacity and in developing a scientific base for the management scheme. Where necessary and feasible, these roles should be allocated to appropriate officers rather than assuming that a single EMS project officer can optimally fulfil both roles.

- It should be **ensured that adequate project officer guidance, support and training is available**: tensions, stress and work overload were experienced by some project officers, especially those who adopted participative but labour intensive techniques.

5.13   The role of champions/opponents

Clearly, there is little that a project officer can do to affect whether champions/opponents exist in relation to a given site, but there are **different way in which such agents can be managed.**

- In two cases (*Sound of Arisaig, NE Kent)*, LA representatives who had **originally opposed the EMS in question became key supporters**, largely through working with them to develop flat management structures which allayed their fears that the EMS would be imposed on stakeholders and would restrict development opportunities.

- In three cases (*Solent; Morecambe Bay, Plymouth Sound and Estuaries*) the **chair of the previous EMP became an important ally** as the EMS was integrated with the EMP, which provided for the chair's reputation and knowledge of the local situation to be constructively employed.

- In two cases (*Wash and North Norfolk Coast, Chesil and the Fleet*), the local RSPB warden played an important role in mediating between the NCA and potential opponents of the EMS with whom the warden had developed good relations. Generally, **it is important to identify those individuals who have the trust and respect of certain factions of the stakeholder/RA community ('gatekeepers') and to build their support for and understanding of the EMS**.

- Many opponents are arguably driven by fear, mistrust and an unwillingness to relinquish a degree of autonomy in relation to the management of their activities. **These concerns should, as far as is feasible be proactively identified in order that EMS processes can be designed with these factors in mind**. In particular, efforts should be focused on establishing a particularly early dialogue with such stakeholders through one-to-one meetings in order to minimise the impacts of these factors.

- Overall, it is important to remember that champions/opponents are essentially critical stakeholders and that the way in which they are engaged can influence whether they have a positive or a negative effect on EMS processes.

5.14   Role of Science

- There was often a dilemma in that detailed site surveys employing the LIFE funding, or NCA funding in non-LIFE sites, could not go ahead until the EMSs had been delimited, consulted upon and submitted as candidate sites to the EU. But such survey information would have aided site delimitation, provided more information for the consultation and provided a stronger scientific case in the face of potential challenges. **Such scientific information should be made available as early in the EMS process as is possible, in order to maximise the impact of such information**, particularly where it is reasonable to assume that the site is appropriate for designation.

- It should be recognised that **challenges to EMS science may be demanding in the short-term, but will often be constructive in the long-term**, even where such challenges are motivated by political rather than scientific concerns.

- The **scientific rationale underpinning site selection and delimitation should be made as clear and transparent as possible**, including an openness in cases where selection was based on relative judgements in the absence of comprehensive scientific information.

- Scientific evidence was very supportive in some cases, where it clarified the relationship between certain activities and conservation features, particularly in resolving disputes as to the threat or otherwise of specific activities. **The potency of good, and often existing, scientific information in resolving conflicts should not be under-estimated**.

- It should be made clear where there are gaps in the scientific knowledge in order to identify research and monitoring priorities, and where decisions have to be made under a degree of uncertainty.

- As is discussed above in relation to the participation of RAs and stakeholders, their involvement in scientific assessments and monitoring exercises, including the recognition and utilisation of their ecological and other local knowledge, should be maximised to help establish partnerships and to use available resources in the most efficient manner. Establishing scientific advisory groups can be particularly effective in this respect.

- **GIS systems can be very useful in collating and analysing scientific information**, identifying gaps, and enabling such information to be presented in a comprehensible manner, etc.

5.15   Role of interpretation and publicity

A variety of techniques have been employed in the 15 case studies. Overall, a key finding is that **information sharing activities are a pre-requisite for higher levels of participation and not a substitute**. With this important proviso in mind, the main types of information sharing techniques that were employed with considerable success are as follows (in no particular order).

- Use of press releases to generate local media coverage and develop wider stakeholder awareness of and, potentially, participation in the EMS.

- Slides, posters, underwater photos/videos, aerial photographs, artist prints, etc to illustrate the EMS and its features: particularly useful at initial meetings to make

stakeholders/RAs more aware of the reasons the site is being proposed for designation and to generate interest in and ownership of the EMS and its features.

- Newsletters circulated as widely as possible to update RAs/stakeholders as to progress and generate interest.

- Colour leaflets introducing the EMS.

- Larger booklets to explain EMS issues in more depth.

- Black-and-white EMS briefing papers which can be photocopied by and circulated amongst RAs/stakeholders.

- Web sites which are well designed to incorporate as wide a diversity of up-to-date information as possible, drawing on GIS where appropriate.

- School education and craft projects.

- Distribution of interpretive materials that stakeholders will want to use and/or display, *eg* calendars/posters featuring illustrations of EMS features, videos, artist drawings/paintings, CD-ROMS, etc.

- Chartering a glass-bottomed boat to show the EMS to stakeholders/RAs at first hand.

- Marine aquaria displays.

- Poster displays which tour libraries, community centres, etc.

- Proposals for an EMS interpretation centre.

- Development of an awareness raising sub-group of stakeholders/RAs.

Three important points of general relevance emerged from the case studies. These are:

- **glossy and expensive information sharing initiatives may alienate some RAs/stakeholders** as they are too high-powered and corporate, increasing the sense of outside interference. They may also alienate stakeholders who are struggling to make a living, as a bureaucratic 'waste of money';

- support can be promoted through the *process* of developing interpretive and publicity material by **using local people in such initiatives and employing other local resources**;

- it is important to achieve a balance in presenting the need for conservation with the need for compatible traditional activities and development opportunities.

5.16 Summary

This report has been primarily based on an analysis of interviews with the project officers (and colleagues, in some cases), in the 15 case study sites around the coast of the UK. The findings of a later programme (February and March 2001) of telephone interviews with a small sample of RAs and stakeholders for four case studies were also employed to gain wider views on the participation approaches employed. As was stressed in section 1 of the report, the project officer interviews were conducted at a relatively early stage in the process, so as to be able to record some of the initiatives that were being pursued to build stakeholder support and cooperation from RAs in the development of the management schemes.

It must be noted that this report is an **interim, partial** account. The main interviews were conducted during July and August 1999, when the majority of EMSs were reaching the stage of agreeing their conservation objectives and beginning the design of the management scheme. Much will have subsequently happened in the localities. Given time and resource constraints, it was not possible to carry out in-depth analyses of each case study. The researchers were not present to observe the conduct of meetings of management, advisory or topic groups. Also, it was only feasible to interview a limited number of RAs and stakeholders in order to explore their views about the participatory approaches employed in their locality, though these views generally resonated with those of the project officers. More work could be done to elicit judgements about the processes described in the report from RA and stakeholder participants.

The report has introduced a key concept from social science research on voluntary organisations and public involvement in local environmental planning. The idea of understanding social and policy networks, in terms of their 'productivity' in producing social capital, has provided an analytical tool through which the 15 case sites have been classified. In all cases, evidence has been found of increasing trust and confidence between the RAs, stakeholders, and the EMS project officers. In some sites, it has been more challenging to build relations and officers have had to work extremely hard to bring sometimes sceptical people to the table. In other cases, the officers have been able to devote more time to innovative outreach work to develop local ownership of the conservation features and management scheme. In all 15 case studies, the research team were impressed by the depth of professionalism and commitment shown by the officers to their EMS. It is hoped that the quality of their work has been adequately captured in this report.

6. References

AYCRIGG, W. 1998. *A review of the World Bank's approaches to participation*. World Bank internal publication.

BRYSON, J. & CROSBY, B. 1993 Policy planning and the design of forum, arenas and courts. *Environment and Planning B*, **20**(2), pp. 223-252.

BURGESS, J., COLLINS, K., HARRISON, C.M., MUNTON, R. & MURLIS, J. 1999. *An analytical and descriptive model of sustainable development for the Environment Agency*. R & D. Report, No. 132. Bristol: Environment Agency.

CLARK, J., BURGESS, J., STIRLING, A. & STUDD, K. 2000. *Multi criteria mapping of outreach relationships.* Consultancy Report for the Environment Agency, (in preparation).

COLE-KING, A. 1995. Marine Protected Areas in Britain: a conceptual problem? *Ocean & Coastal Management* **27**(1-2), pp. 109-127.

COLEMAN, J.S. 1988. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, **94** (Supplement), s95-s119.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND THE REGIONS. 1998. European Marine Sites in England and Wales: a guide to the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 and to the preparation and application of management schemes. Rotheram: DETR Publications Sale Centre.

EDWARDS, S.D., JONES, P.J.S. AND NOWELL, D.E. 1997. Participation in coastal zone management initiatives: a review and analysis of examples from the UK. *Ocean & Coastal Management* **36**(1-3), pp. 143-165.

ENGLISH NATURE. 1998. Advice on European Marine Sites: some common questions answered. Peterborough: English Nature.

FISKE, S.J. 1992. Sociocultural aspects of establishing Marine Protected Areas. *Ocean & Coastal Management* **18**, pp. 25-46.

GOODWIN, P. 1998. 'Hired hands' or 'local voice': understandings and experience of local participation in conservation. *Transactions, Institute of British Geographers*, NS 23, pp. 481-499.

HEALEY, P. 1997. *Collaborative Planning*. Harlow: Longmans.

JONES, P.J.S. 1999. Marine Nature Reserves in Britain: past lessons, current status and future issues. *Marine Policy* **23**(4-5), pp. 375-396.

JONES, P.J.S. (under review). Marine Protected Area strategies: issues, emerging divergences and the search for middle ground. Submitted to *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*.

KELLEHER, G. AND RECCHIA, C. 1998. Lessons from marine protected areas around the world. *Parks* **8**(2), pp. 1-4 (Editorial of special issue on MPAs).

KENCHINGTON, R.A. 1990. *Managing Marine Environments*. New York: Taylor and Francis, pp. 28-39.

MILTON, K. 1991. Gaining support for Marine Protected Areas: a sociologists view. p19-22 in *The Challenge of Marine Protected Areas*. Proceedings of a conference organised by the Marine Conservation Society, 22 May 1991.

OSTROM, E. 1990. Governing the commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OSTROM, E., SCHRODER, L. AND WYNNE, S. 1993. *Institutional incentives and sustainable development*. Colorado: Westview Press, Boulder.

PENNINGTON, M. AND RYDIN, Y. 2000. Public participation and local environmental planning: the collective action problem and the potential of social capital. *Local Environment* **5**(2), pp. 153-170.

RHODES, R.A.W. 1990. *Policy networks: a British perspective.* Journal of Theoretical Politics **2**(3), pp. 293-312.

ROWE, G. AND FREWER, L.J. 2000. *Public participation methods: a framework for evaluation science.* Science, Technology and Human Values 25, pp. 3-29.

Appendix 1. Glossary of participation techniques

Words **in bold** represent techniques which are also listed in this table

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
Action Plans	To plan next step in process	- Define task or action - Set deadlines for achieving task - Set clear roles of responsibility - Define resources needed - Set criteria for success	- Works well where task(s) can be clearly defined and is divisible into clear roles. - Best at end of a participatory process for drawing up a 'to do' list. - Requires the devolvement of power and responsibilities
Advertising	To inform people of proposal or project. To make new contacts.	A variety of techniques include - radio - television - pamphlets - videos - local press - workshops **exhibitions** - personal contact - networking	- Control over information - Informing rather than participating. - Good at increasing awareness if done well - Best used with other methods. - Timing is important - should plan when most appropriate to involve different participants from different stakeholder groups
Agenda Formation	To make explicit what the group is trying to achieve To gain feedback into group process	- Label 3 flip charts: 'content' 'format' and 'practical details' - Ask group to place post-it notes onto charts with the following criteria: - what is to be discussed - how the decisions should be made - which items are most important. - Use agreed agenda to steer and evaluate process	- A good technique for opening up hidden agendas - Promotes trust and ownership. - However, devolves power - Agency will no longer have control of 'agenda' - Process can loose purpose if not handled well - Agenda formation should be undertaken with **aims and objectives**.

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
Aims and objectives	To establish aims of group To maintain focus of group To give clarity to process	• Ask participants to complete the sentence 'why does this group exist?' • Discuss differences and agree joint statement • Break aim into components and develop means of achieving them • Prioritise them into **action plans**	• Good at forming a vision for the group. • Good at maintaining group focus • Can open up wider framework for debate • May sit uneasily with statutory guidelines if process badly managed
Alternative Dispute Resolution	A generic term used for different method used for resolving disputes, rather than going to court	• See, for example, **mediation** and **arbitration**	
Arbitration	A method in which a neutral third party decides a dispute	• This method would only be undertaken by a neutral and trained facilitator • The individual will listen to the evidence from the opposing arguments and reach conclusions • Conclusions need to be drafted so both sides to review • A broader, more public approach to **arbitration** is undertaken with **Citizens Juries**	• Should only be used where decision is needed and the participatory process has broken down • One party will loose in the resulting decision • Needs resolution from both sides for commitment in the outcome
Brainstorming	To generate ideas To link ideas	• Best done in groups of 5-20. • Get group to think up as many ideas as possible to resolve problem • Process should not be too structured • Write suggestions on board • Ideas should not be judged during process; regardless of quality	• Gets a number of ideas from variety of perspectives. • Can illustrate the awareness of the group to the problem • Can be fun
Break out groups	A technique to break larger groups into small groups Aims to focus people minds on specific issues and problems that would best be debated in small numbers	• Groups can consist of anything from 3 to 10 people depending on nature of task • Facilitator needed for each of the groups • Raporteur needed to feed back information to whole group during a plenary session	• An effective way to divide tasks • An effective use of space • Used in conjunction with other techniques, for example see **public meetings**, **Kolb's cycle**, **Stakeholder decision analysis**, and indeed any technique where the group feels the method offered would lend itself best to a smaller setting.

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
CATWOE	To clarify the start of stakeholder process To review an ongoing stakeholder process	• To identify the following elements through **brainstorming** • **C**ustomers - who wins and who looses • **A**ctors - who does the activities • **T**ransformations - what things change as a result of activities • **W**orldview - what are the views of the activity • **O**wners - who can stop the activity • **E**nvironment - what constraints (*eg* rules) may exist that might constrain activities	• Works well in complicated situations that need a systematic appraisal • Takes time to do well • Promotes thinking on ways for and barriers to progress.
Citizens Juries	To engage participants in the consideration of specific public policy issues	• 15-20 individuals from a community are selected • The whole process usually occurs over a number of days (4-5), as such the jurors are usually paid • Participants are sent briefing material before the start of the sessions • Jurors listen to evidence from expert witnesses, each mooting different evidence for specific options • The jurors then adjourn to reach a decision over the policy option	• This method works well where large scale policy options of public interest need to be legitimated • They are expensive to run • They rely upon a clear mandate from the legal decision making institution to seriously consider implementing the jury findings.
Deliberative polling	To engage communities or stakeholders in discussion with expert groups	• A random sample of a population in question is interviewed • They are then briefed with materials and information as the basis for discussion • Participants are asked to enter discussions n randomly assigned small groups • These consist of Q&A sessions with policy makers and advisors	• Time and money needed • Time commitment needed from participants • Useful through snapshots f opinion prior to and after policy discussions
Design Game	To give participants a visual method to evaluate actions at a specific site project	• A scale plan of the site is provided. • Moveable pieces can then be used to define areas of activity or the design of an area	• Of use when project is going ahead • The site needs boundaries • Participants need good knowledge of the site • Can involve large number of people in complex design process

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
Exhibitions	To provide information with limited consultation. Good to highlight an issue, survey or report.	• Less is more - make exhibition clear and concise • Use familiar terms and avoid jargon. • Be imaginative - use both illustrations, photographs, and if possible video.	(see **Advertising**)
Focus Groups	A broad technique for meeting people and discussing ideas Typically meetings are one off. Good for generating ideas or gauging the areas of broad agreement as well as contention	• Preferably 6-10 individuals should comprise a focus group (range 4-15). • A subject will be discussed in the presence of a facilitator • The conversation should be fairly free-flowing with ideas coming from the participants.	• Takes time to identify 'the public'. • Can be a good way to adapt a traditional public meeting, by dividing up whole group into smaller groups where all get the chance to talk • Role of the focus group needs to be made explicit: is it consultation or participation.
Force Field Analysis	A visioning technique. Finds solutions to problems	• Group describes the problem • Group gives unconstrained vision of situation as they would wish to see it • Forces for and against group are listed • How to increase the forces for and reduce those against is **brainstormed**	• Aims to reduce the forces against you through imaginative thinking rather than entrenching positions. • Only works well where there is group identity and ownership of solution to the problem
Future Search	A large scale method involving typically 8 groups of 8 people (or multiples thereof) The method allows a group of people with a diverse range of interests to create a shared vision of the future	• Within **break out groups** of mixed interests (8 groups of 8) : • The past is reviewed to give the context to the present • The present is explored to examine trends from the past: the group to discusses what they are happy about, and where they believe there is room for improvement • A vision of the future is idealised. Barriers to this vision are discussed • Action plans are then generated to achieving this vision	• Time is needed both for the event, and the recruitment of interested parties • The idea needs support for acting upon the shared vision through relevant authorities • Often undertaken where large scale support from wide range of interests needed to implement plans
Games and simulations	Allows imaginative solutions Helps reveal positionality Views problems from others perspective	• Take a situation and participants asked to adopt different roles. • Game design should include all the different interests • Potential problems should be played out	• Helps understand interests of different stakeholders • May not be appropriate in formalised environments.

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
In-depth Groups	To glean an in-depth knowledge of participants views and opinions To forge lasting partnerships and networks	• The In-depth group is a generic term for a small group of people who meet over a number of weeks for a particular purpose. • Like **focus groups** they may be used to discuss a variety of themes. The main difference is that the time available allows the group to explore in-depth its views, as well as build relations between participants	• In-depth groups need a clearly defined roll • Participants can be drawn from the general public or a more specifically defined group of stakeholders • They take time • They will often require some commitment of all sides to the outcome. Various methods (for example **stakeholder decision analysis**) will formalise the discussions with in-depth groups toward more specific decision making processes.
Information	To provide background to the project to inform and consult others of your plans	• May be conveyed through many of the techniques mentioned in **advertising** • Should be clear and accessible.	• Not a substitute for participation. • Useful when resources and time are tight
Kolb's cycle	A four minute method to make decisions Used when quick decisions are needed	With a clock, undertake the following: • Think of problem (1 min) • Reflect on feelings towards that problem (1 min) • Ask yourself why you feel that - what you expect to happen • Reach a decision (30 secs) • think about actions (30 secs)	• Works well with small decisions in small groups. • In larger groups, can be used to generate ideas by breaking into small **break out groups** (2-3 people) . The process is undertaken and decision made. The decisions from all of the groups can then be pooled at the end of the break out sessions.
Mediation	To assist parties in dispute To identify differences To design solutions	• Needs trained, neutral facilitator. • Attempts to move from peoples positions to reasons behind positions. • Helps to define the problem and reason behind it • Allows people to unload past feelings of mistrust	• Needs time • Best where dispute has reached deadlock, and parties need to co-operate to move process on.

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
Mind maps	When variety of ideas are needed to categorise and approach problems. A means of graphically listing ideas and exploring links between them	• The method basically maps out the problem visually using pens and paper. • A large sheet, or sheets, of paper are often required. • The problem should be bubbled in the centre. • The participants should broadly categorise different approaches to the problem around themes • Where the problem is complex, different coloured pens should be used to link categories	• Effective way of realising complex problems • Needs to be large enough for all to see. • Good at information gathering • Can act as a record for discussion or argument • Analysis of the maps needs to be undertaken reasonably soon after the meeting for the context in which points were raised in to be fleshed out
Nominal Group Technique	Used to generate ideas to specific and defined questions May be used as an alternative to **brainstorming**	• Set questions • Form **break out groups** (6-8 people) • Either individually, or in pairs, answer the questions for 15 mins • Participants read out lists, and facilitator writes them up • Group votes for their top 5 • plenary session held to gather information from all groups • people then may be asked to vote, using stickers, for their overall favourite options.	• Works well where questions can be specifically defined. • Needs careful time keeping
Past and Future	A method for de-briefing and feedback. Generating new issues to be examined	• Form **break out groups** (3-4 participants) • Give each group a large piece of paper, labelled past and future, and 20 post-it notes. • Each group member writes about something in the group that they thought was successful, and what they should be tackling in the future. • Break-outs feedback to larger groups	• For use near the end of a particular cycle of the process. • See section upon ending processes more generally
Priority Search	A technique to more meaningfully construct **questionnaire** surveys Specific in this case for constructing priorities	• Identify issue • Undertake **focus groups** with about 20 people to develop solutions • Solutions form basis of questionnaire • Questionnaires sent to wider public • analysis should include the priority for all of those surveyed, as well as themes and trends.	• A bridge between consultation and participation • An effective means of using time. • Does not allow wider consultation on the issues. • Devolves power to the wider public for the decision making process.

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
Public meetings	To inform and get (some) feedback to plans, or proposed actions.	• Public meetings can be used more creatively, with the following format: • Introduction and clarification of meeting as a whole group • Break up into focus groups to discuss the format • Whole group plenary with reports back and summing up. • Opportunities for comment at the end	• Public meetings take time to organise well. • If done badly they can deteriorate into platform speaking. • The venue needs to be carefully chosen, especially if a group format is followed. • It is important to make explicit what the output and the purpose of the meeting will be: is it consultation or participation?
Questionnaires	To survey a population of people to gain either knowledge, support, or ideas over proposed plans or actions.	• Questionnaires need to be designed with the target audience in mind • Language should be kept simple. • Questions can follow both closed and open answer formats. • Personal information should be gleaned from the questionnaire to classify respondents • Questionnaires trials should be undertaken	• Good at reaching a large audience • Good at informing people of plans. • More problematic in getting an in-depth understanding of respondents support of plans • Can be expensive if production costs high. • See also **village appraisals** and **priority search** for including wider communities in questionnaire design
Regulatory Negotiation	This method provides a platform in which administrative agencies bring together representatives of interests effected by a rule before the agency makes decision on the content of the rule	• 15-25 stakeholders are selected (typically those most effected by the regulation) • Briefing papers are sent • Negotiating sessions are usually held over 4-6 sessions (2-3 days) • At the start of the sessions, the agency makes clear its remit and the purpose of the method: specifically that a consensus must be achieved over a proposed rule • The sessions are whole group • Within the group a leader is elected • The first session is usually devoted to the terms, definitions and concepts within the proposed rule • The working application of the rule within that framework is then negotiated • The final session(s) is devoted to debriefing the process and ensuring consensus	• The goal of this method is not to replace the conventional regulatory mechanism, but rather to reach a consensus that the agency can use in issuing a proposed regulation • The agency retains the right for a judicial review of the finalised rule • This method explicitly shares decision making authority • Not all issues would be suitable for RN - strong and emotional decisions may well preclude negotiation • The method takes time

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
Round tables	A method for **brainstorming** ideas around themes that are often technical, or require forms of expert knowledge	• Participants are sent briefing material informing them of the day, including relevant technical information • To the whole group, technical presentations are given • In **break out groups** of approximately 7-10 people, ideas are brainstormed about the presentation, and recorded on flip charts. • A final plenary session require reporting back from each of the groups	• The technical nature of the meeting, and the often expert nature of some of the participants in the group, requires awareness of alienating certain participants. Placing people around **'round tables'** helps to minimise power relations, and allows face to face contact • The method should be carried out on neutral ground, and may often require trained, neutral facilitators if the process is to be a success; as a result these are often costly processes.
Stakeholder decision analysis	To prioritise a list of possible actions within a plan	• Stakeholders are defined, and the process is split into a series of 4 workshops • Workshop 1 should scope the problem and make sure all the issues have been included. • Workshop 2 should attempt to develop a set of criteria to evaluate the issues. • criteria may be ones concerning biodiversity, or local economy, or statute, or partnerships etc. The criteria would then be weighted. • Workshop 3 should evaluate issues to such weighted criteria • Workshop 4 should check the evaluation and debrief the process	• This is an intensive, though rewarding method • It should only be used where parties are willing to act upon the final decision. • It devolves the decision but not how the actions will be undertaken.

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
Strategic Assumption Surface Testing	To examine options for action and to develop an action plan	- The main group develops potential options - The main group splits into **break out groups** - Each of these smaller groups takes an individual option. Each group then has to present to the whole group for 15 mins to sell that option - During the presentations the main facilitator make notes upon the presentations under the headings of actions and advantages - After the presentation the rest of the group can challenge the presentations; this debate being noted by the facilitator under the heading of debate - Finally all the ideas a brought together and: actions are turned into an action plan; advantages are turned into criteria; debates are listed under uncertainties through which more investigation may be needed before they can be translated into the action plan	- Good for examining positionality - An intensive task - May not be appealing for all participants to present an idea to a whole group. - Perhaps best undertaken with a more specific group of stakeholders who know each other reasonably well
	A complicated method for planning in situations with many uncertainties and options available May be undertaken with computer software known as STRAD or within workshop sessions	There are four main phases to strategic choice - Shaping: where the main areas for decision making are identified to give focus to the problem - Designing: where ways forward are mooted through combining options from decision areas - Comparing: where the implication of different options are assessed through the strategic problem - Choosing: where key areas of uncertainty are reviewed in the move towards action plans	- A complicated method that takes time and commitment from all involved - Requires someone familiar with the method to be undertaken well - For a more detailed description of the method see *Planning Under Pressure*

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
Sustainability models	To assess the current sustainability of an area To assess how plans and projects may effect that sustainability	• A three by three matrix is developed under the following categories: • On the y axis the themes of environment, community and economy are listed • On the x axis the states of robust, stable and fragile are listed • The definitions of these terms will be determined through the group • The current state of affairs can thus be defined, and possible projects assessed through their effect on the model. This assessment is undertaken through scoring	• Encourages people to engage in trade-off • Encourages a common assessment • Combines qualitative and quantitative approaches • Care needs to be taken to avoid arguments due to conflicts in trade-offs.
SWOT	A common technique for reviewing where you are and how to take a process forward. The acronym stands for: **s**trengths, **w**eaknesses, **o**pportunities and **t**hreats	• Brainstorm under each of the four SWOT headings. • Within the group decide how to: • Build on strengths • Overcome weaknesses • Exploit opportunities • Eliminate threats	• Generally strengths and weaknesses are matters related to the group internally • Opportunities and threats are related to external factors effecting the group
Team syntegrity	This method enables participants to share a wide amount of information on complex issue; and explore a number of solutions over a three to five day period	• Typically involves around 30 people from a variety of interests • First the method **brainstorms** ideas over an issue • These ideas are broken down to about 25 potential topics • These are then voted upon and the top 12 topics selected	• This is a complex and time consuming method • It is particularly suited where participants are able to commit time and energy to the process • It will require a good number of staff and facilitators to undertake

Technique	Application	Method	Characteristics
		• A number of **break out groups** are formed, each consisting of about five members. The break out groups have two main roles: as topic groups and as critic groups. Each participant will belong to one of each. The topic group will each discuss a topic. The critic group will listen to and comment upon the topic recommendations. The idea is to let ideas from one group permeate and circulate • Finally statements are shared with the whole group as a vision for action.	
Village appraisals (aka community appraisals)	Used as a means to design a survey for the appraisal of village/community life These are local resident initiatives supported by other organisations	• A public meeting is held to set the aims and the scope of the appraisal • Issues important to the community are listed • These are then written through into a **questionnaire** • The appraisal is then reviewed and actions are recommended • The report is acted upon in collaboration with other organisations and authorities	• A bottom-up approach that engages well with local publics in the management of their area • Perhaps of best use where projects and plans significantly effect village life, and there is a need to work collaboratively with the public in seeing such plans through • Requires time and a willingness to act within the framework of the appraisals

Sources:

ALDRED, J. & JACOBS, M. 1997. *Citizens and wetlands: report of the Ely Citizen's Jury*. Lancaster: CSEC.

CLARK, J., BURGESS, J., DANDO, N., HEPPEL, K., JONES, P., MURLIS, J. & WOOD, P. 1998. *Prioritising the issues in Local Environment Agency Plans through consensus-building with stakeholder groups*. R&D Technical Report W114, WRc, Wilts.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT. 1994. *Community involvement in planning and development processes*. London: HMSO. ISBN: 0 11 753007 7

LGMB AND ENVIRONMENT TRUST ASSOCIATES. 1994. *Creating involvement: a handbook of tools and techniques for effective community involvement (v 1.03).* ISBN: 0 7488 9693 7

NEW ECONOMICS FOUNDATION. 1998. *Participation works! 21 participatory techniques for the 21st century.* London. ISBN: 1 899407 17 0

RENN, O., WEBLER, T. AND WIEDEMANN, P. 1995. *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Evaluating Model for Environmental Discourse.* London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

STATE BAR ARIZONA. 1999. *Alternatives to trial: a guide to alternative dispute resolution.*
Available at: http//: www.aznvlaw.com/faqadr.htm

UK CEED. 1998. *Special Focus: Public Participation.* Bulletin No. 55, Cambridge. ISSN 0268 7402

WILCOX, D. (1996). *The guide to effective participation.* London: Partnerships books. Available at: http://www.communities.org.uk/