



## **Stakeholder Mapping Report**

### **Deliverable D6A.1**

30 July 2014

Marc Gramberger and Katharina Zellmer

*Prospex bvba, Vlugestal 6, 3140 Keerbergen, Belgium*



**Prepared under contract from the European Commission**

Contract n° 603416  
 Collaborative project  
 FP7 Environment

Project acronym: **IMPRESSIONS**  
 Project full title: **Impacts and Risks from High-end Scenarios: Strategies for Innovative Solutions**  
 Start of the project: 01 November 2013  
 Duration: 60 months  
 Project coordinator: University of Oxford  
 Project website: [www.impressions-project.eu](http://www.impressions-project.eu)

Deliverable title: Stakeholder Mapping Report  
 Deliverable n°: D6A.1  
 Nature of the deliverable: Report  
 Dissemination level: Restricted

WP responsible: WP6A  
 Lead beneficiary: Prospex bvba

Due date of deliverable: Month 9 (July 2014)  
 Actual submission date: Month 9 (July 2014)

Deliverable status:

Version	Status	Date	Author(s)
1.0	Final	30 July 2014	Marc Gramberger and Katharina Zellmer Prospex bvba

The content of this deliverable do not necessarily reflect the official opinions of the European Commission or other institutions of the European Union.

## Table of contents

Preface .....	4
Summary .....	4
1 Background to the stakeholder mapping in IMPRESSIONS.....	5
2 Stakeholder mapping process .....	6
3 Agreed stakeholder criteria.....	7
3.1 Key sectors for IMPRESSIONS.....	7
3.2 Geographical scope of activity of participants and respective organisations.....	8
3.3 Organisational affiliation.....	8
3.4 Age and gender balance.....	9
3.5 Overview of agreed criteria per case study.....	9
4 Results of the mapping.....	11
5 Next steps.....	13
6 Acknowledgements.....	13
7 References.....	13

## Preface

This Deliverable Report has been prepared as part of the reporting requirements set by the European Commission for all projects funded under the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme for Research (FP7). Each FP7 project is required to submit progress reports on the implementation of the project. This particular report has been written for the project “Impacts and Risks from High-end Scenarios: Strategies for Innovative Solutions” (IMPRESSIONS). The report describes the stakeholder mapping process carried out for this project and details its outcomes.

This report is mainly directed at project partners of the IMPRESSIONS consortium and is therefore restricted in its dissemination level. It will inform any stakeholder engagement activity throughout the project’s lifetime and should therefore be regarded as an important stepping stone for the implementation of the IMPRESSIONS project.

## Summary

Stakeholder identification is inspired by a search for participants who can provide insightful, original and credible input into a study or (research) project. Although the capacity of a study involving a constrained number of stakeholders to offer reliable representativeness of the various angles of society is inevitably limited, the methodology for stakeholder identification should still be designed to be as inclusive as possible: a balanced inclusion of several individual profiles ensures the plurality of insights and backgrounds of stakeholders, thus limiting biases against certain views and improving the outcome legitimacy.

For the IMPRESSIONS project it was therefore decided to carry out a highly methodological stakeholder mapping and identification process for each of the five case studies recognising those decision-makers that can enable or leverage change due to their position or function in organisations or society at large. The identified decision-makers will be mainly engaged in two separate, but linked project activities: a decision-maker survey and three series of workshops. The mapping process described in this report is geared towards identifying stakeholders for both of these activities.

The approach applied to carry out this mapping follows the Prospex CQI-method that focuses on the identification of criteria (C) and quota (Q) for stakeholder identification before zooming in on the detection of individual (I) (Gramberger et al. 2014). This method has been slightly adapted for the exercise described in this report, focusing first on the agreement on criteria and identification of individuals. Quota will then be set for specific stakeholder engagement activities in a later step of the project.

The stakeholder mapping and identification followed six distinct steps: 1) definition of case study objectives for each of the five case studies; 2) discussion of stakeholder criteria matching the objectives; 3) agreement on criteria per case study and for the decision-maker survey; 4) construction of the stakeholder database; 5) completion of the database; and 6) check of stakeholder balance and discussion on relative importance of the criteria.

Following the first three of these steps in each of the five case studies resulted in 8 main stakeholder categories, comprising a total of 50 stakeholder selection criteria. Whereas all main stakeholder categories are applied in all five case studies, the stakeholder criteria are classified in two ways: (i) criteria (in total 32) that are applied in all five case studies, e.g. “male”, “affiliated to civil society”, “individuals working at a national level”, and (ii) criteria (in total 18) that are applied in only a few of the case studies, e.g. “individuals working in the tourism sector” or “organisations working at the international level”. These two sets of classifications allow for the necessary level of comparability, while at the same time ensuring a certain level of flexibility to account for specific objectives within each case study.

After completion of the other remaining three steps, the mapping resulted in the identification of 310 individuals in total spread over the five case studies. Only four of the criteria could not be fulfilled in one of the case studies yet, e.g. identifying individuals under the age of 30 in the Scottish case study. However, considering the evolving nature of the IMPRESSIONS project, the mapping will continue and more individuals will be added to the database throughout the lifetime of the project.

At this point the mapping will firstly inform the selection of interviewees for the decision-maker survey in each of the case studies, which will in turn provide further input to the stakeholder database and the selection of participants for the workshops. For the latter, the Prospex-CQI method will be applied, when defining specific quota for each of the stakeholder criteria that need to be met in order to reach a balanced group of stakeholders during the workshops.

## 1 Background to the stakeholder mapping in IMPRESSIONS

The FP7 project IMPRESSIONS (“Impacts and risks from higher-end scenarios: Strategies for innovative solutions”) aims to provide empirically grounded, transformative science that quantifies and explains the consequences of high-end climate scenarios for both decision-makers and society. The project will do so by developing and applying a novel participatory methodology that explicitly deals with uncertainties and strong non-linear changes focussing on high-end climate change. Details of the methodology and its implementation can be found in the project’s Description of Work and on its website ([www.impressions-project.eu](http://www.impressions-project.eu)) and will therefore not be the focus of this deliverable. However, an integral part of the approach is the close interaction and direct engagement of stakeholders in the research process. This will be achieved through a series of in-depth professionally facilitated workshops that aim to maximise active stakeholder participation in defining high-end scenarios, adaptation and mitigation pathways, as well as analysing the inherent risks and opportunities of new policy strategies.

Within IMPRESSIONS stakeholders will be engaged in all five linked multi-sectoral case studies at the global, European and regional/local scales (Scotland, Iberia and Hungary). The engagement is set-up as two components: (i) direct stakeholder engagement; and (ii) complementary online engagement. Originally the former was planned to be implemented with the help of a decision-maker survey and a series of 3 workshops in each of the five case studies (15 workshops in total), with each series focusing on:

- The development of integrated scenarios (workshop set I)
- The development of adaptation and mitigation pathways (workshop set II)
- The development of risks/opportunities and exploration of new strategies/policies (workshop set III).

Although the overall set-up of this engagement remains as described in the project's Description of Work, the project team jointly decided that three adaptations are beneficial to the overall outcome of the stakeholder engagement process in particular and the project in general:

- Workshop set I: It was decided to skip the workshops for the Scottish and European case studies, as scenarios have been developed for those case studies as part of a previous project (CLIMSAVE). Both case studies will step into the engagement process during workshop set II.
- Cross-scale workshop: Not envisioned in the original planning the project team has decided to bring stakeholders from all five case studies together in a final workshop at the end of the project that compares and analyses results across the case studies, thereby truly aiming for cross-scale interaction and comparability. This is possible due to the savings made by no longer needing Workshops I for the Scottish and European case studies.
- Global case study: The global case study consists of two parts: (i) global modelling to provide boundary conditions for the European and regional/local case studies; and (ii) an assessment of indirect effects from outside of Europe on the EU. It has been decided to focus the latter part of the "global" case study around the Central Asian region (comprising Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) based on consultations with key stakeholders in Brussels from various parts of DG CLIMA and the European External Action Service. The impacts of climate change in this region are of strategic importance for Europe because of their strong ties to Russia and (increasingly) China. Stakeholder engagement for the global case study will focus on this Central Asian region and, thus, the case study is called "EU External" for the purpose of this deliverable. This shift in focus necessitates a different approach to the workshop series, where more focus will be put on the development of scenarios and less on the other topics.

Whereas the first two adaptations do not have any influence on the stakeholder mapping process, the third point does. The "EU External" case study will be the only one that by design will (partly) engage different stakeholders in the different workshop rounds. Consequently the stakeholder identification will comprise a bigger group and will evolve from workshop to workshop (more so than in the other case studies).

## 2 Stakeholder mapping process

Developing criteria and a method for stakeholder selection aims to establish groups of participants, which encompass a wide range of different viewpoints, sensitivities, interests and values. The identification and selection of stakeholders has been undertaken with the help and input of a variety of IMPRESSIONS consortium partners, especially the case study leaders, WP1 and the Project Steering Committee.

The IMPRESSIONS stakeholder mapping process roughly followed six steps:

- 1) Definition of case study objectives;
- 2) Discussion of stakeholder criteria matching the objectives;
- 3) Agreement on criteria per case study and for the decision-maker survey;
- 4) Construction of a stakeholder database per case study;
- 5) Completion of the database per case study;
- 6) Check-on stakeholder balance and discussion on relative importance of criteria.

To start the process of defining the stakeholder categories, Prospex made a number of suggestions based on preliminary discussions during the project kick-off meeting in Oxford in January 2014, the logics of the scenario process and best practices in the field. These criteria kept in mind:

- The objectives of each case study;
- The scenario workshop methodology;
- The models linked to each case study;
- The cross-scale interaction between case studies.

Each case study leader and other relevant project partners reviewed the suggested categories and defined those which are pertinent for specific case studies. The outcome of this process is described in the next section.

### 3 Agreed stakeholder criteria

The first step in the design of the stakeholder identification process is to outline a set of selection criteria, to ensure the scientific and societal relevance of stakeholder inputs. The selection criteria are established to cover the overall set of workshops. The aim is to enable a balanced selection of stakeholders from different societal contexts, with diverse individual backgrounds.

#### 3.1 Key sectors for IMPRESSIONS

Each of the IMPRESSIONS case studies are unique and focus on sectors of interest and relevance within their region. Nevertheless, the project overall is aiming for a multi-scale integrated assessment approach across all case studies, making it necessary to strike a balance between case study specificity and a level of generalisation. Thus, the most difficult criterion for reaching this balance is the “sectors” relevant in each case study. Next to a few generally agreed sectors – infrastructure, water, energy, finance/insurance – there are also a number of sectors that are unique to a smaller number of case studies or even unique to one:

- Agriculture
- Food & Nutrition
- Whisky
- Forestry
- Biodiversity conservation
- Tourism

- Health
- Land use/land use management
- Land owners
- Trade
- Security
- Migration
- Disaster risk reduction
- Humanitarian relief

### 3.2 Geographical scope of activity of participants and respective organisations

A geographical criterion is applied in order to reach a balance with regard to the scope of activities of stakeholders and their organisations. Given that stakeholders' opinions towards high-end climate change scenarios and adaptation issues are inevitably diverse, due to differences in their living environment, education and work experience, multi-level geographical representation of stakeholders is very important: municipal/local, regional, national, European and international levels respectively. The IMPRESSIONS methodology also draws a distinction between the individual's geographical scope and the one of the organization he/she works in. For instance, a representative of a large multinational company could be located in Brussels and be in charge of the Belgian energy market only. That would lead to an interesting confrontation of a global organisational perspective and a national individual one. In the workshop, a stakeholder fitting into the example above is likely to bring in both perspectives.

In four out of the five case studies the same set of stakeholders is proposed to participate in the all three workshops. Only the "EU external" case study will have a core group of stakeholders that will be complemented by a different set of stakeholders in all three workshops: The first workshop will be focused on stakeholders with a strong national and regional focus in Central Asia, the second workshop will invite more stakeholders from an international (Chinese, Russian) background and the third workshop will centre around European level stakeholders.

### 3.3 Organisational affiliation

Organisational affiliation has been divided into four main categories, namely: (i) government, (ii) economy/enterprise, (iii) civil society, and (iv) research. These four broad categories aim to offer an exhaustive representation of the different settings of society, in particular including stakeholders experienced with research, policy and societal aspects of impacts, risks and responses to high-end scenarios.

The further elaboration of each of these categories led to the following taxonomy:

- Government
  - Political assemblies
  - Ministries
  - Service providers (e.g. education, health, police)
  - Legal authority
  - Inter-institutional network/association



- Economy/enterprise
  - Companies and enterprises (incl. SMEs)
  - Business organisations
  - Professional organisations
- Civil society
  - Consumer groups
  - Trade unions
  - NGOs
  - Clubs/associations
  - Charities
- Research
  - Research centre or department of a university
  - Think tanks and research institute
  - Technology platforms

For any of these categories it is important that they consider sectors of central importance to the case studies.

### 3.4 Age and gender balance

Age categories have been set to include participants that reflect the overall societal age balance. In the identification phase, the distinction will be made to locate people in three groups, respectively representing age groups under 30 years, between 30 and 50 years and above 50 years. At the same time, as far as gender is concerned, the equal representation of both males and females is strongly recommended.

### 3.5 Overview of agreed criteria per case study

Due to the different nature of the case studies not all criteria are applicable in all case studies. Whereas more general criteria, such as organisational affiliation and age, are the same across all case studies, other criteria, such as sector and geographical scope, are case study specific. Table 1 shows in which case study each criterion is applied.

**Table 1: Overview of agreed criteria per case study.**

Criterion	EU external	Europe	Scotland	Iberia	Hungary
<b>Organisational affiliation</b>					
- Government	X	X	X	X	X
- Economy/Enterprise	X	X	X	X	X
- Civil society	X	X	X	X	X
- Research	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Level of operation of the organisation</b>					
- Municipal	-	-	X	-	X
- Local	X	X	X	X	X
- Regional	X	X	X	X	X
- National	X	X	X	X	X
- European	X	X	X	X	X
- International	X	X	X	-	-

Criterion	EU external	Europe	Scotland	Iberia	Hungary
<b>Function of the stakeholder</b>					
- Politician	X	X	X	X	X
- Policy makers/ experts/advisor	X	X	X	X	X
- Regulators	X	X	X	X	X
- Practitioners	X	X	X	X	X
- Technical expert	X	X	X	X	X
- Advocacy/lobbyists	X	X	X	X	X
- General public	X	X	X	X	X
- Other	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Level of operation of the stakeholder</b>					
- Municipal	-	-	-	-	X
- Local	X	X	X	X	X
- Regional	X	X	X	X	X
- National	X	X	X	X	X
- European	X	X	X	X	X
- International	X	X	X	-	-
<b>Sector</b>					
- Water	X	X	X	X	X
- Infrastructure	X	X	X	X	X
- Energy	X	X	X	X	X
- Finance/Insurance	X	X	X	X	X
- Agriculture	X	X	X	-	X
- Food & Nutrition	-	-	X	X	X
- Whisky	-	-	X	-	-
- Forestry	-	X	X	-	X
- Biodiversity conservation	-	X	-	X	-
- Tourism	-	-	X	-	-
- Health	-	X	X	X	X
- Land use/land use management	-	X	X	X	X
- Land owners	-	-	X	-	-
- Trade	X	-	-	-	-
- Security	X	X	-	X	X
- Migration	X	-	-	X	-
- Disaster risk reduction	X	-	-	-	-
- Humanitarian relief	X	-	-	-	-
- Other	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Age</b>					
- 30 years and under	X	X	X	X	X
- 30-50 years	X	X	X	X	X
- 50 years and above	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Gender</b>					
- female	X	X	X	X	X
- male	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Relevance for</b>					
WP1 (decision-maker survey)	X	X	X	X	X
WP2 (scenarios)	X	X	X	X	X

Note: Crosses refer to relevance of the criterion for the case study; dashes refer to non-relevance.

## 4 Results of the mapping

After agreement on the criteria had been reached in each of the case studies and with the leaders of the decision-maker survey, the mapping process could be started. This was done with the help of one online stakeholder database per case study allowing entry and registration of potential stakeholders according to the criteria mentioned above.

The databases enable an effective, efficient and methodologically sound selection of stakeholders for the different project activities, i.e. workshops and the decision-maker survey. Selection criteria can be filtered and clustered thus making the process of stakeholder identification and selection transparent, efficient and reliable, thereby strengthening the overall credibility and legitimacy of the IMPRESSIONS project.

In order to obtain a database with an adequate number and diversity of stakeholders, a minimum number of individuals for each case study was defined (between 40 and 80 individuals) and case study leaders were asked to contribute to the database. Next to this input, Prospex has also actively contributed to the five databases through its own network and exploratory research. Table 2 shows the initial identification of individuals per case study, which will be further elaborated as the project evolves (see also section 5).

**Table 2: Number of initially identified individuals per category and case study.**

Criteria	EU external	Europe	Scotland	Iberia	Hungary
<b>Organisational affiliation</b>					
- Government	36	33	12	32	37
- Economy/Enterprise	5	16	12	6	19
- Civil society	7	15	8	8	13
- Research	6	16	8	25	9
<b>Level of operation of the organisation</b>					
- Municipal	-	-	18	-	17
- Local	17	33	26	10	45
- Regional	48	42	23	36	38
- National	49	48	36	48	31
- European	30	38	8	7	8
- International	43	15	8	-	-
<b>Function of the stakeholder</b>					
- Politician	1	4	0	9	4
- Policy makers/ experts/advisor	20	23	6	20	14
- Regulators	1	7	3	5	34
- Practitioners	14	8	9	5	40
- Technical expert	19	32	15	34	4
- Advocacy/lobbyists	2	10	14	7	6
- General public	0	15	2	0	4
- Other	0	5	1	0	0
<b>Level of operation of the stakeholder</b>					
- Municipal	-	-	-	-	21
- Local	17	29	26	10	48
- Regional	48	37	23	36	41
- National	48	47	37	48	23
- European	16	42	5	7	7

Criteria	EU external	Europe	Scotland	Iberia	Hungary
- International	37	18	6	-	-
<b>Sector</b>					
- Water	23	37	6	27	25
- Infrastructure	22	34	9	6	22
- Energy	22	25	5	7	13
- Finance/Insurance	4	8	1	3	4
- Agriculture	12	2	3	-	24
- Food & Nutrition	-	-	8	5	8
- Whisky	-	-	5	-	-
- Forestry	-	11	12	-	2
- Biodiversity conservation	-	27	-	18	-
- Tourism	-	-	10	-	-
- Health	-	3	4	3	10
- Land use/land use management	-	2	6	28	20
- Land owners	-	-	11	-	-
- Trade	10	-	-	-	-
- Security	22	13	-	2	6
- Migration	7	-	-	0	-
- Disaster risk reduction	35	-	-	-	-
- Humanitarian relief	24	-	-	-	-
- Other	8	27	17	14	22
<b>Age</b>					
- 30 years and under	1	6	0	4	3
- 30-50 years	45	43	31	46	27
- 50 years and above	8	9	8	6	22
<b>Gender</b>					
- female	19	26	16	30	23
- male	35	51	23	37	51
<b>Relevance for</b>					
WP1	45	34	28	32	48
WP2	54	72	39	61	71

**Note:** Numbers indicate the number of identified individuals for each criterion per case study; dashes indicate non-relevance of the criterion for the case study.

In total the following numbers of individuals could be identified per case study:

- EU external: 54 individuals
- Europe: 77 individuals
- Scotland: 39 individuals
- Iberia: 67 individuals
- Hungary: 74 individuals

The difference in number is due to the different set-up as well as the different level of evolution of the case studies. The Scottish case study, for example, can build on a dense stakeholder network that has been working with the project partners in the past and has already indicated their commitment to the IMPRESSIONS workshops. As mentioned above the “EU external” case study has a slightly different, more evolving set-up compared to the other case studies, therefore instead of focusing on identifying individuals for the entire workshop series, this initial stakeholder mapping focused on the identification of participants for the first workshop and the decision-maker survey. The identification of individuals for the next workshops will be done in due course.

As described below, the authors consider the stakeholder mapping to be an ongoing process and the results presented here are purely intermediate outcomes that will be complemented as the project and the case studies evolve.

## 5 Next steps

The quality, saliency and representativeness of the envisioned participatory processes highly depend on the way stakeholders are selected. Furthermore, the choice of participants should aim to reflect, in an equilibrate setting, diverse sensitivities, points of view and sectoral perspectives.

Due to process design and budget limitations, a small number of participants will attend each workshop (between 20 and 25 participants). This restriction introduces a key methodological challenge for stakeholder selection. In order to be inclusive of different views and perspectives, systematic and consistent sets of minimum quotas of participants from each stakeholder category will be established.

The aim of the quota is to reduce the biases and distortions that could derive from over-representation of certain typologies of participants or societal sectors. The specific quota will be set during the next stages of the project when preparing the individual workshops in each case study. Whereas quota for general criteria will be the same in all case studies, i.e. 30% of male and female participants per workshop; other quota will differ amongst case studies depending on the relevance of the criterion, e.g. despite being relevant in all case studies, the relevance of the sector “energy” compared to other sectors is different in each case study.

Considering the developmental nature of the IMPRESSIONS project, the stakeholder mapping will continue throughout the entire life time of the project allowing for any adjustment in the focus of the case studies to be reflected in the stakeholder groups to be invited to the workshops.

## 6 Acknowledgements

The writers of this deliverable greatly appreciate the contributions of the IMPRESSIONS project team, in particular the case study leaders, work package 1 co-leaders and the Project Steering Committee that have significantly advanced the stakeholder mapping described in this deliverable.

## 7 References

Gramberger, M., Zellmer, K., Kok, K. & Metzger, M. (2014). Stakeholder Integrated Research (STIR): A new approach tested in climate change adaptation research. *Climatic Change*, accepted.