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Introduction

Integrated flood risk management is a complex and complicated matter. Legal aspects, technical requirements, ecologic, economic, spatial planning and crisis management aspects are to be considered as well as political demands. Additionally, decisions should be made in a participatory way, including either representatives of the public or the public at large.

Administrators, politicians on the national, regional and local level, representatives of farmers, hunting, fishery and tourism, NGOs, land owners, energy suppliers, civil protection and lay people: all their interests should be respected and considered. As the legal and technical requirements for integrated flood risk management are often complicated, possibilities for public participation sometimes arise only when taking a closer look. But often it is possible to find and use a scope for public participation also in such complex technical matters – if there is an honest intention to do so (Stickler, 2008).

In the complex flood risk field a well-balanced, focussed participation and communication strategy on different levels is essential. It is important to overlook participation as a strategy on different levels and to connect to other responsibilities and processes. Participation is a key instrument for involving administrations, interest groups and individuals in the development of plans and to capitalise on their expertise and views in order to improve the quality of policy and decisions, thus reinforcing the social basis. Consultation and collaboration with other authorities, civil society organisations and the business community are essential to create, maintain or expand social and administrative support for the implementation of flood management plans. Participation leads to faster decision-making processes, better decisions and, most important, supported decisions that enhance the implementation. This guidance document describes in general terms the most important steps to plan participation activities for Flood Risk Management.

Legal Background

For this guidance document it is important what is written in the Floods Directive (2007/60/EC).

There are 2 Articles referring to participation in Chapter V of the FD:
• Art. 9.3:
  – The active involvement of all interested parties under Article 10 of this Directive shall be coordinated, as appropriate, with the active involvement of interested parties under Article 14 of Directive 2000/EC (which is the Water Framework Directive).

• Art. 10.:
  – 10.1 In accordance with applicable Community legislation, Member States shall make available to the public the preliminary flood risk assessment, the Flood Hazard maps and the flood risk management plans.
  – 10.2 Member States shall encourage active involvement of interested parties in the production, review and updating of the flood risk management plans referred to in Chapter IV.

An interested party could be representatives of authorities in related fields, stakeholders like non-governmental organisations (NGOs), people and institutions who/might be affected and the general public who could be affected by the flood risk management issues and impacted by measures.

In case of the EU Floods Directive, public participation can be seen as mandatory because information, consultation and active involvement are required or should be encouraged respectively (Evers, 2012). The implementation process itself, however, is not prescribed.

The phrase “public participation” does not appear in the Directive. However, since the FD refers to the WFD, we can refer as well to the Guidance document No 8 on Public Participation in Relation to the Water Framework Directive (EU Water Directors, 2008) in relation to the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC). In this document three forms of public participation with an increasing level of involvement can be mentioned:

1. Information supply;
2. Consultation; and
3. Active involvement or participation in the decision-making process.

According to the Directive, the first two are to be ensured, the latter is to be encouraged. These three forms can be interpreted as “public participation”, although public participation usually covers a wider range of activities than prescribed by the Directive. This is described in this guidance document as well.
Participation and involvement as understood by the WFD and the FD are mandatory but also informal processes. These participation processes are different from formal processes.

Formal processes are defined by law. In formal participation processes legal regulations lay down the rules on who takes part in the process, how far the rights of participation extend, how the process is structured and what is done with the findings. Participants have a legal status as e.g. a party with clearly defined rights.

**The interface between formal and informal participation:**

All additional voluntary participatory activities that are not required by law are informal. Informal processes should not be seen as a substitute or competing with formal processes, but can supplement them. These kinds of participatory activities have to take place within the framework of existing legal requirements. Any participation has to be in line with the given legal context. Informal and formal procedures should be adjusted in a way that no parallel or, in the worst case, impeding processes can happen.

Informal processes like stakeholder participation can exist in and can take many forms. Who takes part, which methods and which rules are used are either determined in advance by a project team or agreed upon by the participants of such an activity (Arbter et al., 2005). How binding the solutions or results of a voluntary participatory process can be, depends on what has been agreed upon on how to treat these results.

**Benefits of participation**

High-quality public participation requires commitment, time, resources, and energy as inputs – but it also produces numerous benefits and, in the end, the investment may pay multiple dividends:

- Public participation involves those affected in the search for results.
- Public participation helps strengthen the climate of trust between politics, administration, those concerned and participants.
- Public participation raises people’s interest in political participation and fosters lively democracy.
• Public participation activates; it makes those concerned participants of the process and dynamises the development processes and participation projects.

• Public participation supports the community and mutual respect between politics, administration and participants as well as among the participants. Services rendered are to a greater extent mutually recognised.

• Participation processes are mutual learning processes and thus strengthen awareness-raising.

• Public participation makes the values and attitudes of participants as well as their interests and needs visible.

• Public participation fosters the comprehension for different standpoints and for the problem to be solved. The flow of information is improved. The work of the administration is citizen-oriented, solution-oriented and need-based.

• The cooperation between public administration and interest groups concerned reduces the pressure due to expectations and lobbying by individual interest groups.

• Public participation leads to innovative solutions, as all participants offer their knowledge, their practical experience and their creativity.

• Public participation facilitates the development of an accepted strategy. It fosters long-term solutions and therefore ensures planning security.

• Public participation designs decision-making processes in a way that they are transparent and traceable.

• In processes of public participation the fields of competence of the participating groups are clearly described and perceived.

• Public participation allows the involvement of the public in the process of decision making. Results can thus be accepted and backed on a broader basis. Thanks to the intensive cooperation participants can identify themselves better with the result.

• The intensive exchange between all participants permits the integration of different points of view, which improves the backing of results. In this way public participation also contributes to quality assurance and easier implementation. This means that public participation can have time- and cost-saving effects (Standards for Participation, 2008).
Presentation of the Draft Flood Risk Map for stakeholders in Karlovac
1. Organisation of participation processes

A successful communication and participation process consists of a preparation, planning, implementation and evaluation phase and in particular it needs to:

- Identify your own position
- Identify your strategic partners
- Decide on measures
- Implement
- Evaluate

1.1 Define the aim of the participation process

Before starting with a communication and participation process the goals of this process have to be defined. To that end, persons responsible for flood risk management have to ask themselves what is the aim of the participation process. This is not about the objectives of certain flood risk management measures but rather the objectives of the involvement.

In the Floods Directive it is stated in Article 10 that “Member States shall encourage active involvement of interested parties in the production, review and updating of the flood risk management plans”.

The appropriate way of a potentially successful active involvement of the interested parties has to be defined as a goal of the process and it also determines its scope. This of course depends on the existing resources. Derived from this goal, several sub-goals shall be defined that make the process of active involvement more transparent and operational. These sub-goals should cover the following topics:

- Definition of the territory made by?
- Definition of the target group: Who shall be informed? Stakeholders, potentially affected people or all people within a community? In which intensity should they be involved?
- Is there a need to present information differently according to different target groups?
- Which information shall be distributed? Hazard maps, risk maps or management plans?
- When shall the information be distributed? Shall the information be distributed completely at once or consecutively?
- When shall the objectives be reached? What is the timely perspective? (Firus et al, 2011a)

➔ Do you know exactly what you want to achieve by means of public participation (clear-cut goals)?

1.2 Multi-level Governance and participation

If we talk about participation we distinguish on the one hand the involvement of (other) governmental institutions (multi-level-governance) and involvement of stakeholders and the public on the other hand. To differentiate between the public as a whole and more or less organised groups of the public, very often the terms “broad public” for all citizens and “stakeholder” for representatives of organised interest groups or the administration are used. It is necessary to get a
clear picture which institutions and persons have to be included in which phase of the participation process in order to achieve the aims.

1.2.1. Multi-level governance and mainstreaming

Flood risk management is not only focused on flood risk management measures, but it also addresses strategies and activities in e.g. agriculture, spatial planning or crisis management. In this complex field a well-balanced, focused participation strategy on different levels is essential to mainstream flood risk management.

It is important to consider participation as a strategy on different levels and a connection to other responsibilities and processes. A benefit of the use of different forms of participation on different levels is the activation of parties in the field and the integration of the concept of flood management in their own procedures and planning. The effectiveness and efficiency will be strengthened by connecting flood management issues to the existing responsibilities and processes on different levels, different sectors and in different time scales.

Multi-level governance is about shifting between vertical and horizontal approaches for preparation of decisions, decision-making and measures and is highly depending on a solid system of communication, knowledge exchange and dialogue. Not only institutions and stakeholders in the field of water management are involved, but also related institutions and stakeholders in the field of spatial planning, crisis management (civil protection) and/or economic affairs.

Graph 2: Example for the structure of multi-level governance

Participation on the level of multi-level governance:

Multi-level governance systems have in most cases already existing formal and informal cooperation structures (e.g. legally defined consultation processes where written statements can be given within a predefined time-frame). It is recommended to perform an analysis of the weak points within information exchange, cooperation and coordination and to decide on what can be done to improve it. Very well designed measures often have absolutely no effect because of the existence of typical
planning-related problems (like problems of fit, interplay and scale). Interplay is an especially crucial factor for mitigating flood risks (Young, 2002). A problem of interplay can arise due to the existence of a multitude of actors. The aspect of institutional vulnerability can in principle be understood as lack of ability to involve all relevant stakeholders and effectively co-ordinate them from the very beginning of the decision-making process and according to risk communication processes. It refers both to organisational form and function as well as to guiding legal and cultural rules.

Participation processes can build upon these formal requirements of multi-level governance. Involving already known institutions of the multi-level governance, where the cooperation already exists, is a basis for participation processes. But this cooperation within multi-level governance should be extended by involving additional stakeholders (e.g. interest groups, NGOs, associations...), affected persons and the broad public. Depending on the level of the flood risk management there are different responsibilities for initiating and performing participation processes on various levels of governance:

For the national level - the institution responsible for flood risk management on the national level should invite appropriate participants for a dialogue for plans and activities on the national level. Participation process on regional and local levels may involve completely different institutions or persons.

1.3 Definitions: Stakeholder and the public

1.3.1 The public

The public is an open and unlimited circle of persons. It consists of individuals just as much as groups of persons. The broad public is everybody. The inclusion of the public means the participation of citizens that are not united in more or less strongly organised groups, but advocate their individual interests.

A good example of such an unlimited circle is the term “water users” – no one can be excluded from that description.

1.3.2 Stakeholder

Often the term stakeholder is used for groups with a specific long-term objective and clear organisational structure (= organised public, e.g. chambers). It is also used for organizations of civil society like human rights and environmental organisations (Non-Governmental Organisations – the NGOs). These (organised) groups represent specific interests (“stakes”).

So you may have:

a) formal decision makers that are involved in flood risk management in case of study areas and that have official tasks (“administrative” or “decision-making” stakeholders) and

b) stakeholders that influence decisions more indirectly (interest groups, NGOs etc.).

Stakeholder is a much used term and can be used in a narrow sense of the word or with a broader understanding (Carina & Keskizalo, 2004), e.g. IPPC or World Bank have a broader understanding of stakeholders (everybody that is affected or interested by a project/activity).

What do you mean in your project with the term stakeholder?
1.4 Stakeholder analysis

The main criterion for the selection of participants is: What is the goal of the involvement of the public or of stakeholders?

- Do you want to get a feeling about opinions and moods, needs and trends?
- Do you want to activate the participants?
- Do you need them for additional information or data?
- Do you want to speak about conflicts?
- Do you want them to participate in the problem solving?
- Do you need them for the implementation of activities?

Other criteria for the selection of participants are:

- The level of the project/process: local, regional, national, international.
  Participation of the public can be done at international, national, regional or local level. In contrast to a rather low interest of the public in activities on the national and international level, the motivation to engage on regional and local levels is relatively high. Activities on the local level are closer to the social reality of people; impacts of decisions can be easier understood and seen.

- The geographical spread of a project: it impacts the number of people that should or could be invited, the methods that can be applied and the theme of the activity.
  Time frame: The time frame of a project is influenced by the resources available for the project (personnel and money) and the theme for the involvement of the public. It takes less time to gain insight in the interests, views and possible reactions of the public at the beginning of a project than to achieve a solution in a complex and long-lasting conflict. The narrowness of time resources is not only a problem for project teams but also for participants that engage themselves in their spare time. A timetable to give orientation on how much engagement is required from the public helps the participants with the decision if they should take part in a process or not. (Fleischhauer, 2009)

1.4.1 Step I – First selection of stakeholders:

A preliminary stakeholder analysis can be done by the Flood Risk Management project team. There are different tools for stakeholder analysis. Some of them are shown and described in this guidance.

In order to identify the relevant stakeholders on a territory subjected to floods, it should be distinguished:
- the territory directly impacted by the inundation
- the territory of vulnerability, impacted because of its relation to this territory (roads, electricity, phone, fuel...),
- the territory of solidarity (or of resilience), source of repair and rehabilitation

So, the territory must be identified by priority.

Main stakeholders (key persons) in a project concerning flood risk are:

- administration (federal, regional, local level)
- politicians (federal, regional, local level)
- interest groups (chamber of commerce, forestry and agriculture, tourism, hunting, fishery...)
- land owners/leaseholders, NGOs (mostly nature protection groups at local, regional, national or international level)

Furthermore, the broad public that is affected by or interested in environmental decisions plays a decisive role in the interactions with the before mentioned stakeholders.

Stakeholder selection has already been designed, concerning stakeholders for crisis management these can be:

- private sector, which plays a major role during crises, because the employees must be informed of the danger: should they stay at home or come to their job with enough security conditions?
- schools which must be secured because of children in the flooding areas and in order to avoid misbehaviours by their parents
- NGO are not of the same profile: one must distinguished environmental organizations (which can be focussed on risks) and social organizations. Their different skills should be taken into account.
- networks operators (electricity, fuel, roads...) must closely be included in the expert panels

Example 1 of tools for stakeholder analysis:

On the vertical axe you score the influence/power of the stakeholder and on the horizontal axe you score the interest. At the end the stakeholders are grouped in 4 categories and each category expresses the way you have to intercommunicate with them:

1. Red area: much interest and much power in the process. These are the key players; you have to involve them in every step/decision.
2. Green area: poor power and low interest. These are the least important; when you have to make choices, they have the least priority.
3. Yellow area: much power and low interest. You have to care for them in a way that you meet their needs. Don’t ignore them.
4. White area: much interest and low power. You have to show consideration; take care that they have influence on public opinion as well.
1.4.2 Step II – Recommendation of further stakeholders

Often the selected stakeholders that are involved in the project as initiators of a project/process or as members of the project team name the key players of a region. These key players can be contacted and requested to recommend other stakeholders if necessary (snowball system).

1.4.3 Step III – Representation

To get an overview on which interests are represented by whom and what contribution stakeholders can bring for a project, it is recommended to be systematic. Such systematisation can look like some of the below introduced tools for stakeholder analysis.

Such a diagram can also be used to document the process of your stakeholder selection to guarantee the transparency and traceability of your decisions on whom to involve in a project and why. The question of the representation of all possible interests is a crucial one in all participatory processes. The acceptance and the result of a process can be undermined by criticism concerning the valid representation of concerns.

It can happen that persons from a political background have a slightly different understanding of participation and representation. Politicians are part of the representative democracy and see themselves as representatives of the people, empowered by the number of votes they got. A stakeholder process is a medium of the participatory democracy. If you decide to choose a
participatory method where all participants have the same influence or the same vote on a decision, it could happen that it stands in sharp contrast to the self-image of a politician. This can also happen with persons from administration or with other technical experts: they do not (yet) see it as their role to communicate on eye level with e.g. the public. (Fleischhauer, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Influence affected by project</th>
<th>Legal status</th>
<th>Organisation degree</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>local data, knowledge, support, implementation, end user</td>
<td>Forecast for planning, risk management, economic development, low</td>
<td>high, medium, low</td>
<td>e.g. party.</td>
<td>high, medium, low</td>
<td>local, regional, national, international</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport/ Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydropower plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 4: Example 2 for a tool for a stakeholder analysis (Stickler 2008 after Hostmann et al., 2005, Junker & Buchegger, 2005).

1.4.4 Step IV – Roles of stakeholders

The roles of stakeholders within a project lifetime can vary. Think about whom you will need, when, in which role and in which intensity. During the last decade it became quite trendy to involve stakeholders in research projects. Some stakeholders have mixed experiences with this kind of participation and might be rather willing to participate if they get a clear picture of what is expected from them and how much effort it will be for them to participate.

Stakeholders can have different roles (Carney et al., 2009), they can be:

- Initiators: Stakeholders involved in the development or financing of a project
- Shapers: Have a role in consolidating a project plan, supporting it or directing it in an early stage
- Informants: secondary data providers, interviewees, focus groups etc.
- Central: play a central role during a project, can have a multitude of roles (shaper, informant etc.), can act as an advisory group
- Reviewers: contribute to the final output (workshops, questionnaires etc.)
- Recipients: not directly involved in a project but assumed to have an interest in the outcome
- Reflectors: give feedback to project results, ideas for further activities
- In-directs: not directly involved, but may be influenced by outcome of the project
1.4.5 Step V - Context analysis

A context analysis can help to get a first impression for the historical, political and social preconditions and backgrounds of a project, e.g.:

- Inventory of political-administrative settings in the case study area
- General description of national political-administrative system
- Legal framework for coordination in case of river floods
- Implementation of legal framework (especially Floods Directive) into practice
- Main characteristics of organisational structure in the area of river floods
- Funding structure for protection measures
- Current instruments/approaches of public participation/risk communication
- Inventory of data in case study area
- Existing data, maps and plans
- Existing flood hazard and risk maps
- Existing flood risk management plans

This approach can be – if needed – extended with:

- Historical context of the problem/conflict
- Conflicts with adjoining political areas
- Established and successful political practices, barriers and hurdles
- Trust or conflicts between the foreseen participants (Fleischhauer, 2009)

Example 3 of a tool for stakeholder analysis in the force field of the project.

Project manager or project should be placed in the middle. Divide the paper in 4 quadrants as shown below in graph 6. Each stakeholder should place him/herself in one of the quadrants. If you call them by name (the stakeholders) it will make the exercise more powerful. After that, the moderator asks each stakeholder if he/she has a positive or negative attitude towards the project.
Ask yourself these questions:

- What do you observe in their behaviour?
- What did you hear or read about them?
- What are their interests, expectations and images about the project?

Next step is to score them with smileys:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive, supporting</th>
<th>green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral or not important</td>
<td>orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After that, use coloured arrows to illustrate the quality of their relation:

- <> good relation
- <> serious problems
- <> neutral

Finish with discussing the risks and chances and how you can use your insights to influence the process in a positive way.

---

Graph 6: Example 3 of a tool for stakeholder analysis (Bos et al, 2010)
The sociogram: You can also perform interviews to find out more about the relationships between stakeholders and analyse the interrelations between stakeholders by drawing sociograms. The basis for the interviews is an interview manual which is used in a flexible way during the interviews. The interviewees are questioned about their interactions with other stakeholders, examples of cooperation and conflict potential, their role in Flood risk management as well as their perceptions, concerns and interest (Evers et al, 2011).

Graph 7: Example 4 of a tool for sociogram (Evers et al, 2011)

A context analysis can be started with a literature research (scientific literature, legal texts, newspapers, websites) and completed with exploratory talks and workshops with regional project partners/core stakeholders.
A context analysis is a snapshot of a current situation as it is seen by project partners; the context can change quite quickly due to e.g. new legal regulation or new political persons/decisions, but also due to results of the public participation process.

1.4.6 Step VI - Final stakeholder selection phase

In many participation processes the goal of the project and the chosen method prescribe roughly the number of stakeholders. It is always better to start with a slightly lower number of stakeholders and to add later – if needed – new stakeholders with the approval of already participating stakeholders, than to exclude some stakeholders after the project start.

1.4.7 Step VII - Involving the broad public

Additionally to the stakeholder participation, broad public can be included. The broad public as a whole is not easy to reach and to motivate.

Many projects suffer from believing that it is possible to reach all possible target groups within a population with one kind of information material. Reality and social marketing show that it is not possible to reach everybody with only one singular mean and that all information and participation activities must be designed for the target group or the target groups you want to reach with your message.

Decide if you want to invite everybody possibly concerned or interested in your activities or if you want to work with a randomly or statistically selected representatives of the public.

Possible target groups of the broad public could be:

- persons that experienced a flood in the past or will be affected with a future flood
- persons that do see themselves/their family/their region endangered by floods
- persons that never experienced a flood and do not see themselves at risk
- age
- geographically spread, e.g. population of a river basin (Fleischhauer, 2009)

For example:

With the development of social networks the public is becoming more and more involved in crisis management. These new possibilities give the opportunities to get real time information from official services as well as to give feedback information from the field (Hurricane SANDY: 20 millions of tweets, 500 000 photo exchanged), (LONDON: 200 hackers have developed a web platform for public information gathering)

So the public can be considered as a specific type of stakeholder.

1.5 Intensity levels of participation

Participation can take many forms. It can be done with varied participants and can have different degrees of intensity: ranging from noncommittal activities with a focus on information activities to
consultation activities up to an active involvement - a real inclusion in the decision-making process or at least in the pre-decision making (Firus et al, 2011).

![Graph 8: Intensity degrees of participation processes / Source: after Arbter et al., 2005, p. 9](image)

The kinds of intensity of public participation can vary within a process. Basis for all participation processes is access to free information. But simple information activities as a website or an information flyer cannot be regarded as participation. Information activities are one-way communication only and they lack the main characteristics of participation activities: the dialogue.

Did you define how intensively you would involve
a) the stakeholders and
b) the public?

do To find the right participants for your project is one of the crucial points in participatory projects. The next hurdle you have to take is to motivate them to get their commitment to take constantly part in the process.

**1.6 Methods**

Participatory processes are a form of social learning and the methods used can be quite diverse. But whatever method you choose, it is recommend for all processes and projects to plan with the well-known tools for project planning and to agree on time schedule, the most important milestones and the allocation of resources including time buffers. An experienced moderator can help you with this task. Participation is not easy to do. Opening a discussion about risk to a wider range of stakeholders or the public may expose fear, emotions and conflicts. Participation needs additional resources of time, persons, money and implies a greater coordination and administration effort as well as commitment, moderating skills, flexibility and patience on the side of the project team.

New technologies like social networks can be relevant to distribute information and to encourage public participation.
The decision which method should be used depends on:

- The aim of the project: what do you want to gain from a participatory process? Better information to the public? Information and data from selected stakeholders? The solution of an actual conflict?
- The number of participants that are expected or desired – the group size. The group size depends on the theme and goal of the participation process. The bigger the group, the less intensive working is possible. The smaller the group, the better the social learning. But: all interests that have to be considered must be represented.
- Do you want to include persons that are not used to participate in processes or to make them be heard? If you want to motivate people e. g. with a low formal education level, migrants or socially deprived groups, you will need low threshold approaches.
- Time and money available (for catering, renting rooms, moderation, information material, events, websites, excursions, additional expertise)
- The depth of participation is one of the most influential factors for choosing a special method. Do you want to act on the level of information or consultation or are you planning a joint decision-making process (cooperation)?
- Think about whether it will make sense to combine more than one method, or to employ isolated components of a given method. The methods can be used creatively and in combination. By using a range of methods to cross-check information (triangulation), the data might get a better quality or additional inputs can arise.
- The method used alone may not be the single important feature of the participation process. The attitudes and behaviour of the project team/the moderator while dealing with the participants is quite influential, too (Fleischhauer, 2009).

There are a lot of different methods for small, medium and large groups. Possible participation methods can also be related to the type of stakeholders, intensity and aim of participation, as it is shown in the following graph:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type target group</th>
<th>Type participation</th>
<th>Possible result</th>
<th>Suitable for innovation</th>
<th>Required resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media contact</td>
<td>Intense contact (regional/local) media</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Inform Advice</td>
<td>Media know of the process and the possible plans</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Well informed PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time ++ Money -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel interviews on TV/radio</td>
<td>Arrange interviews with stakeholders</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Citizens know of the process and</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>PR spokesmen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guidance Document on the Participation of the Public and Stakeholders in Flood Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Officials</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Maps (website/brochure) and action framework</strong></td>
<td>Openness on probabilities and risks of flooding + practical info on action framework (what to do)</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Time - Money +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequent newsletters</strong></td>
<td>Information on progress and actions</td>
<td>Citizens, stakeholders and officials</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Citizens know of the process and the possible plans</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Time - Money +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lobby</strong></td>
<td>Influence on decision making process</td>
<td>Organised stakeholders from social field and business</td>
<td>Inform Consult Co-produce</td>
<td>Interest of stakeholder becomes part of decision making</td>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td>Lobbyist Time ++ Money -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road shows</strong></td>
<td>With information on informal events (i.e. markets)</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Inform Consult</td>
<td>Citizens know of the process and the possible plans</td>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td>Quality information material Time ++ Money ++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living room conversations</strong></td>
<td>Informal individual conversations</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Inform Consult</td>
<td>View on needs and interest</td>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td>Time + Money -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public walk-in evening</strong></td>
<td>Informal information meeting with a lot of individual contact</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Inform</td>
<td>Citizens know of the process and the possible plans</td>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td>Well informed PR Time + Money -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debate</strong></td>
<td>Formal debate with contact</td>
<td>Citizens, officials</td>
<td>Inform Consult</td>
<td>Citizens know of the process and the possible plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Time ++ Money +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Guidance Document on the Participation of the Public and Stakeholders in Flood Risk Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil panel</th>
<th>(Randomly chosen) citizens’ representatives; Citizens</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Advice on current affairs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Time + Money -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal competitions</td>
<td>Informal competitions to gather info or ideas: - stories - design - etc.</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>Citizens actively involved</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Surveys on awareness and interest</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Consult</td>
<td>Citizens actively involved</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up workshops</td>
<td>Joint exploration of the challenges, the system and existing projects/processes</td>
<td>Experts and stakeholders (Officials: kick off and final presentation/debate)</td>
<td>Consult Co-produce</td>
<td>Shared view, joint responsibilities, shift actions</td>
<td>Hardly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario workshops</td>
<td>Exploration of possible strategies for the future</td>
<td>Experts and stakeholders (Officials: kick off and final presentation/debate)</td>
<td>Co-produce</td>
<td>Shared view, joint responsibilities, shift actions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sketch ‘n Match</td>
<td>Integration sessions: design,</td>
<td>Experts and stakeholders</td>
<td>Co-produce</td>
<td>Shared view, joint</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Construct and implementing strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(Officials: kick off and final presentation/debate)</th>
<th>responsibilities, shift actions</th>
<th>Time ++ Money +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Conference (incl. debate)</td>
<td>Information on progress and actions</td>
<td>Citizens, stakeholders and officials</td>
<td>Inform Consult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 9: Examples for methods for participation processes

#### 1.7 Expectation management

Organising or taking part in a participation process means getting involved in a different way of reaching decisions. Participation is a chance to live democracy in one’s own surroundings, but it also makes demands on all those taking part. Frequently expectations that turn out to be unrealistic lead to disappointment and misunderstandings.

Expectations have to be discussed (“expectation management”) so that many unrealistic expectations can be dispelled in advance and misunderstandings be avoided. The fact is that frustrated expectations can lead to a loss of confidence in the participation process; and once that happens, it is very difficult to re-establish such confidence.

As a civil servant or facilitator organising the participation process you should make it clear right at the start that, with rare exceptions, a participation process cannot fulfil the expectation of enforcing one’s own ideas across the board.

It is important to reach agreement at the start of the process that everyone is willing to listen to the others’ views, and to discuss ways in which disparate views could be brought closer together. (Strategy group participation, 2009)

- Have you talked with your participants about their expectations to the process?
- Has been made clear which scope for influence you offer to the public and to which extent the results of the participation process are binding?
- Did you describe the scope for influence realistically so as to avoid exaggerated expectations in the public? (Include here frame with possible expectations)
- Did you point out clearly who would take the final decision on the topic and which part the result of the participation process would play in it?

#### 1.8 Provide feedback loops

Participants need a feedback in order to show if their involvement had any effect.
For stakeholders this feedback can be rather easily given after the end of a workshop or in written form.

There are different ways of how a feedback to the public can be organised:

- websites of authorities (e. g. in the news area),
- via social networks (Facebook etc.),
- official publications of the political-administrative authorities (official gazettes),
- newspaper articles,
- direct feedback, e. g. after a workshop or a discussion event. (Fleischhauer, 2009)

→ How will feedback be given to the stakeholders (and if relevant also to the public?)
2. Barriers

Participation processes are impeded if those (potentially) affected and interested fail to take part because:

- People are afraid of being “pocketed”.
- People see other routes as more promising as regards getting their own way.
- People do not anticipate any (personal) benefit from participation.
- There is a shortage of resources (time, information, money etc.).
- Channels of communication and people’s ability to express themselves are inadequate.
- People have already had off-putting experience of participation.

Participation processes are impeded if politicians do not identify with / support the process, because:

- Politicians are afraid that their scope for action and decision may be restricted.
- The outcome of the participation process conflicts with the politicians’ general approach.

Participation processes are impeded if there is no scope for action / organisation, because:

- Those involved are confronted with faits accomplis.
- Key decisions have already been taken.

Participation processes are impeded if social asymmetries persist throughout the process, because:

- Many of those (potentially) affected and interested are not reached; the participation process is not organised in a way that all segments of the population are in a position to take part.
- No specific efforts have been made to reach, invite and support segments of the population who have difficulty in articulating their interests.

Participation processes are impeded if there is a permanent stalemate, because:

- Some of those involved feel that a participation process would weaken their own position.
- Some of those involved doubt that participation process would lead to a solution acceptable to everyone, so they simply defend their own position tooth and nail.

Additional barriers do occur:

- if an unsuitable level is selected for application
- if it is not clear what will happen to the results
- if information is missing or is not presented in a comprehensible form
- if sources of friction interfere with people’s working together
- if expectations are aroused but not fulfilled
Participation processes are misused / instrumentalised if...

- a single individual or group presents solutions that have been worked out collectively as their own achievement in public,
- some extraneous idea is presented as if it were part of the solutions that have been worked out collectively,
- the outcome of the process is presented only selectively and incompletely, the results achieved are not treated in the way agreed,
- the aim is purely to gain time – to put off a decision seen as unfavourable for a particular group as long as possible,
- the process is employed as “occupational therapy” for groups with scanty resources (after: Strategic Group on Participation, 2004; Pfefferkorn et al., p.83)
3. References


Annex 1

Stakeholders Participation in Karlovac, 4th December 2013

Introduction
In Article 10 of the FD it is said that MS shall encourage active involvement of interested parties in the production, review and updating the FRMPs.

The FRMP in Croatia, like in other MS is still in progress, but the Flood Hazard Maps and Flood Risk Maps are important instruments for making the FRMP.

To have an experience with active stakeholders participation during the Twinning project “Flood Hazard Maps and Flood Risk Maps”, a workshop was organised in the city of Karlovac, one of the pilot areas with several stakeholders.

Objectives of the workshop
• To inform the stakeholders
• To build up a better understanding between CW and stakeholders
• To get feedback

Stakeholders/participants:
1. Deputy City Mayor / Head of Protection & Rescue HQ Karlovac
2. Head of CW Branch Office Karlovac
3. Commander of the Karlovac Fire Department
4. Public institution Management of protected natural values of Karlovac County
5. Head of EKO PAN - Association for environment and nature protection
6. Croatian Waters
7. National Protection and Rescue Directorate - Head of regional office Karlovac
8. Croatian Mountain Rescue Service – Head of regional office Karlovac
9. Local government official
10. Senior official for environmental protection
11. Head Dept. for environment and nature protection of the County of Karlovac

Exercises with different forms of participation:

Positioning Game
In order to see and experience the force field of Flood Risk Management, when you are part of it, a position exercise was done. Every stakeholder was asked to position him/herself around the topic Flood Risk Management in Karlovac, which was pictured by a white paper in the middle of the room. Also important was that the stakeholders positioned themselves with reference to each other. When this was done, they were asked how it felt to be there in that position, if they could explain why this...
was their position and if they would/could change something, what would that be, and if their own position had to change now, they overviewed the whole force field. This exercise can be done as a start in a participation process, to get to know each other and the position to the subject and to start a discussion.

Presentation Flood Hazard Maps and Flood Risk Maps with discussion

A presentation of the draft FHM and draft FRM was given by experts of CW.

After that there was time for questions, feedback and discussion. The responses were as follows:
1) National Rescue Service recommended to give the maps to the National Rescue Directorate to be included in their GIS; response CW: will be done when maps are finalised.

2) The drinking water sources shall be depicted on the maps. Response: are depicted.

3) Deputy Mayor asked about the criteria behind the maps. Answer Darko and Alan: HQ25, 100, 1000, based upon statistical data. The Deputy Mayor responded that the maps should have a practical use for the local community.

4) The Mountain Rescue Service found the maps useful and good information for training activities.

5) The fire brigade knows what to expect when floods come because of experience, but maps make their life easier. The have a water depth map from the flood of 2 years ago.

6) The VGI asks if it is possible to update the maps when measures are finished and effective (which will be the case for Karlovac in about 6 months’ time). Answer Alan: maps will be updated in a 6-year cycle.

7) The Deputy Mayor suggests adding water levels on the maps for the operational services. Also the altitudes which are safe for building purposes should be communicated to the municipality for spatial planning purposes. Croatian Waters will see what is possible.

8) The Deputy Mayor says that the water levels are not the only information that is relevant, as aspects like soil conditions and the hydrological year play a role as well. The maps are welcome; all information needed is on them.

Sketch and Match

Sketch and Match is an instrument, developed by DLG Netherlands, for interactive planning with stakeholders. Instead of long meetings with a lot of papers, a Sketch and Match session is based on the idea that images say more than a thousand words.
With a Sketch and Match session the rules of the game are very important, but also the central question/task to be answered:

- Postpone judgement
- Be open, feel free, no hierarchy
- Every idea is a good idea!
- Build on the ideas or remarks of others
- ‘YES BUT’ BECOMES ‘YES AND’

For this Sketch and Match the following question/task was prepared:

The Risk Map gives an overview of the general risks in the area based on the Flood Hazard maps and information gathered

Please bring together more focus and prioritise in the risk maps.

Are there special areas of interest (‘hot spots’) taking into account the different interest and sectors?

Why are these areas more important?
To inspire the participants also the head of the local CW office Karlovac presented the designed measures and discussed them with the audience.

Under the lead of a landscape architect and moderator, participants started to gather around the map and this was the beginning of an interactive process. Because this was an exercise, this time it only took 45 minutes. In real situations, a Sketch and Match would take at least a half day, depending on the complexity of the problems. But even now it was surprising what you can call “the harvest” of the day.
guidance document on the participation of the public and stakeholders in flood risk management
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**Evaluation**

Finally, the participants were asked to give their picture of the event by putting Post-its with remarks on a scale of “how did I like the event (very much – very little)”. The remarks were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🎉</td>
<td>A Smiley as a sign of a good and successful cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🎉</td>
<td>The good thing of this workshop is that it brought the holistic approach and included all the sectors (Croatian Waters, Municipality, nature protection, NGOs,...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🎉</td>
<td>Innovative and something new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🎉</td>
<td>It is a good thing that I was able to speak with people from Croatian Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>I liked the last exercise the most because people of different backgrounds could express their views of the same problem but from different perspectives. The whole presentation was very interesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>A very good presentation based on real-life data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>A scientific approach whereby the opinions of all participants were taken into account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the presentation and the active and creative role of all participants. I am not sure whether the results of it will take hold in real life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2 - List of abbreviations on Twinning project “Floods”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ENGLISH</strong></th>
<th><strong>CROATIAN</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act.</td>
<td>activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHN</td>
<td>Actueel Hoogtebestand Nederland (The Up-to-date Height Model of The Netherlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSFR</td>
<td>Areas with Potential Significant Flood Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCII</td>
<td>American Standard Code for Information Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Beneficiary Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Croatian Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Component Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Corine Land Cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Croatian Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dbf</td>
<td>DataBase File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Digital Elevation Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGPS</td>
<td>Differential Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLG</td>
<td>Dienst Landelijk Gebied (Dutch Government Service for Land and Water Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>Digital Surface Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTAP</td>
<td>Development, Testing, Acceptance and Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM</td>
<td>Digital Terrain Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWG</td>
<td>DraWinG (a file format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETRS</td>
<td>European Terrestrial Reference System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUD</td>
<td>European Union Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Floods Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRM</td>
<td>Flood Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRMP</td>
<td>Flood Risk Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTP</td>
<td>File Transfer Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDB</td>
<td>Geodatabase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEC</td>
<td>Hydrologic Engineering Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEC-RAS</td>
<td>Hydrologic Engineering Centre River Analysis System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEP</td>
<td>HEP (Group), Croatian national electricity company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIC</td>
<td>Hydrographic Institute of the Republic of Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTRS</td>
<td>Croatian Terrestrial Reference System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIS</td>
<td>Internet Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPPC</td>
<td>Integrated pollution prevention and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPL</td>
<td>Junior Project Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHSC</td>
<td>Meteorological and Hydrological Service of Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoA</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSCoW</td>
<td>Must/Should/Could/Would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Member State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPRD</td>
<td>National Protection and Rescue Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Pilot area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFRA</td>
<td>Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>Project Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Project Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPT</td>
<td>PowerPoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBD</td>
<td>River Basin District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBMP</td>
<td>River Basin Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QR</td>
<td>Quarterly Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QS</td>
<td>Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA</td>
<td>Resident Twinning Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTAA</td>
<td>Resident Twinning Advisor Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTAI/T</td>
<td>Resident Twinning Advisor Interpreter/Translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGA</td>
<td>State Geodetic Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQL</td>
<td>Structured Query Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STE</td>
<td>Short Term Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIN</td>
<td>Triangulated Irregular Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNA</td>
<td>Training Needs Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic of Zagreb</td>
<td>TVZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>Testing, Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Twinning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFD</td>
<td>Water Framework Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISE</td>
<td>Water Information System for Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMD</td>
<td>Water Management Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMI</td>
<td>Water Management Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>