Bringing in stakeholders’ perspectives when establishing objectives: experiences from the AQUACROSS case studies

Pierre Strosser

Final Conference – 10/10/2018
Do forgive me: I will capture only a small fragment of what has been done in Aquacross...
Two reminders (1)

= key principle of EBM
It can take place at any stage of a « planning process » (early, coherent, dynamic...)

Two reminders (2)

- Objectives
- Challenges
- Potential solutions
- « Best » solutions
- Implementation
- Monitoring & evaluation
Mobilising stakeholders under EBM... can be « a bit » challenging 😊
A recognition (2)

... in particular when addressing large scale (transboundary) territories
What can stakeholders bring in relation to « objectives » (setting the target) ?
Inspiration from.... Ireland

Added-value?

- Additional objectives than those specified in policies (in particular on « impacts »)
- Capturing « ex-ante » potential tradeoffs between different objectives
- Priorities between different (potentially conflicting) objectives
Inspiration from... Sweden

**Added-value?**

- «local» operational targets that translate general policy objectives

- Capturing responsibilities in relation to set objectives, along with potential areas of «friction» (governance => successful implementation)
Inspiration from... the North Sea

« Infiltrating » on-going (formal) processes

Choice to focus on....

**Added-value?**

- Prioritizing among (too many conflicting) policy objectives

  - food security (fisheries and aquaculture)
  - renewable energy (mainly wind)
  - (planned) nature protection areas

  .... And on their interactions/tradeoffs!
Sufficiently clear (practical/operational) objectives (moving away from sustainable development.... ) => how to accompany/facilitate it?

Contributing to the emergence of new targets in “formal processes” (often one-policy or one-issue focused) => Possible? How?

Representativeness (bringing absent relatives to the table) => priority setting, transparency

Making contradictions explicit (transparency) and account for them => ensure assessments make “tradeoffs” explicit

Doing it at every scale – or there some “preferred” (decision making scales) at which “setting objectives right” is essential”

As researcher: What about “objectives” you cannot assess?

Does it help? – gaining interest in your work, enhanced ownership and more effective implementation of measures?
More generally, what are your experiences?

- Main challenges you face when you ask (how) stakeholders: what do you think the objectives/targets could (should) be? (and why...)
- “Does it add value?” Or “dis-values”?

Many thanks 😊
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