Grant agreement n°: **266546**

Project acronym: **BiodivERsA2**

Project title: **Cooperation and shared strategies for biodiversity research programmes in Europe**

Instrument: Coordination and support action

Thematic Priority ERA-Net

Start date of project: **1st November 2010** Duration: **4 years**

Coordinator: Xavier Le Roux - Fondation pour la Recherche sur la Biodiversité (FRB)

Stakeholder engagement in biodiversity research: BiodivERsA workshop report Milestone MS10

WP2: The European biodiversity research landscape and science-policy integration

WP2 leader: Henrik Lange, Swedish Research Council Formas (FORMAS)

Task 2.1: Developing guidelines to support research project teams in stakeholder engagement

Task leader: Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC)

Due date of deliverable: M42

Organization name of lead contractor for this report: JNCC

For further information on this report contact:

BiodivERsA@jncc.gov.uk

Authors:
Emma Durham (emma.durham@jncc.gov.uk)
Elizabeth Moore (elizabeth.moore@jncc.gov.uk)
Helen Baker (helen.baker@jncc.gov.uk)

Report date: August 2013

For further information on the ERA-NET BiodivERsA2, please contact:

Coordinator: Xavier Le Roux
xavier.leroux@fondationbiodiversite.fr

BiodivERsA Secretariat
Fondation pour la Recherche sur la Biodiversité
195, rue St Jacques
75005 Paris
France
Tel: +33 (0)1 80 05 89 37
Fax: +33 (0)1 80 05 89 59
www.biodiversa.org

Executive Manager: Frédéric Lemaître
frederic.lemaitre@fondationbiodiversite.fr

Stakeholder engagement in biodiversity research: BiodivERsA workshop report

Summary

The BiodivERsA Stakeholder Engagement Workshop was held by JNCC, on behalf of BiodivERsA, in Peterborough in April 2013, to consider how and when to engage stakeholders in biodiversity research.

The main aim of the workshop was to test a draft version of the *BiodivERsA Stakeholder Engagement: Best Practice Guidance*[1]. The guidance is intended to support those planning and carrying out BiodivERsA research in identifying the relevant stakeholders for their work, and in designing and planning an appropriate engagement plan. However, it is anticipated that the guidance will have a far wider relevance than just for BiodivERsA research.

Additionally, the workshop considered two other components:

(i) Policy relevance – how research teams might develop their understanding of the policy relevance of their research; and

(ii) Criteria for assessment – how stakeholder engagement might be evaluated in the BiodivERsA research call process.

Over 30 participants were involved in the workshop, including representatives from over 20 BiodivERsA-funded projects, as well as several other invited experts on stakeholder engagement. Participants were encouraged to discuss their experiences and share their knowledge of engagement with different stakeholders.

The workshop used a combination of presentations, invited speakers, discussion, and break-out group sessions with specific questions and activities to address the different stages in the draft guidance.

The overall conclusions on the draft guidance were:

- The guidance was useful and comprehensive.
- Make it a 'toolkit' rather than a guidance document.
- Draw attention to other tools, and where they can be found.
- Take care with the language being used – think about how different stakeholders will perceive the toolkit and provide a glossary of terms.
- Don't make it too prescriptive – people want to pull out what is useful for them.
- Stakeholder engagement is a dynamic process and the toolkit should take that into account.
- Don't forget to consider the challenges and difficulties of stakeholder engagement – it is not always easy and it can be expensive.
- Include examples and case studies to illustrate the approaches taken.
- Test the ideas with a range of stakeholders and not just the research community.
- Do we need a complete behavioural change in the way we approach research?

The organisers of the workshop at JNCC would like to thank all those who attended for their participation and useful contributions.

[1] In draft so unavailable for circulation but link to Executive Summary can be found here: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-6059

Stakeholder Engagement in biodiversity research: BiodivERsA workshop report

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The second phase of the EU project BiodivERsA includes a task to strengthen stakeholder engagement in the biodiversity research funded by the project. The task has two key outputs: best practice guidance; and, criteria for assessing stakeholder engagement in research applications. A draft version of *BiodivERsA Stakeholder Engagement: Best Practice Guidance* was first produced by JNCC in April 2012 as part of its commitment to BiodivERsA. The aim of the guidance is to support those planning and undertaking research in biodiversity, in particular BiodivERsA-funded research, in identifying the relevant stakeholders for their work, and in considering how and when to engage.

The draft guidance is primarily based around five steps, which consider why, who, when and how to engage:

Step 1: Define the outcomes desired from the engagement (why);
Step 2: Identify the stakeholders (who), including assessing, analysing, prioritising and understanding;
Step 3: Identify the best times and ways to engage with your stakeholders (when and how), including types of engagement and timing;
Step 4: Create a stakeholder engagement plan, and initiate it;
Step 5: Review and assess the process to demonstrate what the engagement has achieved and to learn for future engagement exercises.

To develop the guidance further, a 2-day workshop was hosted by JNCC in Peterborough in April 2013. This report captures the views of the participants and draws out key messages for improving the guidance. The guidance will be refined during 2013 with the aim of publication by April 2014; an additional consultation, including with the BiodivERsA Partners, will take place in November 2013.

1.2 The Stakeholder Engagement Workshop

The Stakeholder Engagement Workshop, organised by JNCC on behalf of BiodivERsA, consisted of three components:

(1) The *BiodivERsA Stakeholder Engagement: Best Practice Guidance* – how can the draft guidance and its 5 steps be improved and amended to be of use and value to those involved with biodiversity research?
(2) Policy relevance – how do research teams develop their understanding of the policy relevance of their research?
(3) Criteria for assessment – how might stakeholder engagement be evaluated in the BiodivERsA call process?

Over 30 participants attended the workshop, including representatives from over 20 BiodivERsA-funded projects, several BiodivERsA partners, and representatives from other relevant research organisations, including BiodiversityKnowledge, SPIRAL and LWEC (Living With Environmental Change).

The workshop used a combination of presentations, invited speakers, discussion and breakout group sessions with particular questions and activities to address the workshop agenda.

Peter Bridgewater (Chair, JNCC), who chaired the 2008 BiodivERsA call evaluation committee, opened the meeting by discussing the importance of making an impact on policy, and considering how to ensure research leaves a useful legacy, through forging appropriate working relationships with relevant stakeholders.

Juliette Young, representing the EU project SPIRAL, followed Peter's presentation by discussing the science-policy interface and how to make this fit for purpose. Juliette discussed the need for flexible and adaptive communication approaches, and the need for a change in mindsets and behaviours.

Catherine Jolibert from the University of Barcelona, Spain, gave an overview of some of the stakeholder engagement that is already being carried out, or has been carried out, in biodiversity-related projects. Her in-depth analysis discussed the types of stakeholders usually engaged with, and the roles that stakeholders might play. Additionally she noted that the most successful projects are those that communicated early and throughout the project, and have acted on the communication where appropriate.

First-hand experience of the practicalities of stakeholder engagement was provided by Penelope Lamarque, Université Joseph Fourier, France, who discussed the approach to stakeholder engagement adopted within the BiodivERsA-funded VITAL project. Her presentation demonstrated the importance of stakeholders to the VITAL project, and described how stakeholders had been selected, the methods used to engage with them, and the benefits of the engagement to both the stakeholders and the research project.

Mark Reed from Birmingham City University and Anna Evely from Project Maya gave an overview of the recently published knowledge exchange approach developed for the Living With Environmental Change (LWEC) programme in the UK. Their approach focussed on the importance of sharing information, and how much of an impact the sharing of knowledge could have. They discussed how the sharing of knowledge enables people to learn from and influence others, and allows us to tackle the big problems, by asking more relevant questions and coming up with more-informed answers.

Marie Vanderwalle, representing the EU BiodiversityKnowledge project, discussed the creation of successful stakeholder engagement practices. Marie described how the BiodiversityKnowledge project, an initiative including researchers and practitioners, aims to help all potential stakeholders within the field of biodiversity and ecosystem services make better informed decisions.

As well as the invited speakers, representatives from JNCC gave a brief overview of policy relevance, the five steps of the guidance, and the criteria for assessment. In order to discuss particular aspects of these areas further, a number of breakout group sessions were held, with particular questions or issues to address.

Participants were encouraged to feedback comments and where possible to share information and experiences on stakeholder engagement that have been both successful and unsuccessful. When considering the steps used within the guidance, participants were asked to consider what worked, what didn't work, and what could be done differently or included. The aim of the breakouts and discussions was to ensure that the best procedures could be taken forward, and to obtain real-life examples of researchers' experiences, in order to ensure that the process of stakeholder engagement can be of benefit to both the researchers and the stakeholders involved.

1.3 Report structure

The key points from the discussions and breakout session are recorded in the following sections of the report:

Section 2	Breakout 1: Policy relevance
Section 3	Breakout 2: Step 1 – The scoping phase – why engage with stakeholders
Section 4	Breakout 3: Step 2 – Identification of stakeholders
Section 5	Breakout 4: Step 3 – When and how to engage with stakeholders
Section 6	Breakout 5: Step 4 – The engagement plan
Section 7	Breakout 6: Step 5 – Assessing the outcomes of engagement
Section 8	Plenary discussion: Overall evaluation of the whole guidance
Section 9	Breakout 7: Stakeholder engagement as part of the BiodivERsA call process, and criteria for evaluation

Additional information is provided in the Appendices, which include the following:

- List of participants (Appendix 1)
- Agenda (Appendix 2)
- A copy of the preliminary breakout group questions and activities, distributed to participants prior to the workshop (Appendix 3)

1.4 Next steps

This report is to be distributed to all workshop participants for comment and review. Note that the report is a record of the proceedings of the workshop, so does not provide details of how the guidance will be developed and amended. Participants are invited, however, to consider again the questions posed at the workshop (see Appendix 3) and to provide additional responses and examples where appropriate. A further draft of the guidance will be sent out for consultation later in 2013.

JNCC would like to thank all those who attended the workshop and participated in the discussions.

2 Breakout 1: Policy relevance

The first session of the workshop focussed on the topic of policy relevance, especially barriers to understanding the evidence needed to support policy implementation and development.

2.1 Questions

The following questions were posed to both breakout groups:

- How is the relevance of policy considered within your research?
- What are the benefits and risks of undertaking policy relevant research?
- What are the barriers to understanding policy relevance?

2.2 Summary conclusions from breakout groups on policy relevance

The main points from the breakout sessions are summarised below.

2.2.1 How is the relevance of policy considered within your research?

- Through direct questioning, by the use of questionnaires/interviews to find out what already exists/is known and what is required.
- By gaining an understanding/knowledge of the policy cycle (e.g. work with someone with policy knowledge).
- By building on previous research programmes/projects.
- Through the identification of key influential groups and decision makers and communicating early in the research process. Clarifying who to communicate with can be the key to ensuring successful dialogue.

2.2.2 What are the benefits and risks of undertaking policy relevant research?

i Benefits

- Improved impact (research findings are immediately meaningful).
- More funding sources are available to access.
- Increased interaction which can lead to resolved issues.
- Easier access to information which can enhance the research.
- Best practice guidance – development of a process that works (and can then be re-used).
- Opens the door – more willingness by policy makers to participate in the future.

ii Risks

- Unpalatable results (which may require censorship) – the results may not be what the policy makers are expecting.
- Scientific excellence at risk. By adapting the research to address a particular policy need, the researcher may feel like the project has to be compromised.

- Different timescales of policy setting and research outcomes – the outcomes of the research may not be ready in time to influence policy.
- Changes in opinion/people – with different agendas and different policy goals (moving targets).
- Policy makers may not be interested in obtaining information from researchers.
- Increased conflict – due to differences in desired outcomes, changes in opinion, differing time-scales.
- Stifling innovation – the policy agenda may be too restrictive/prescriptive.
- Lack of independence – researchers may feel their research is being led by the policy makers who want to address a particular issue.

2.2.3 What are the barriers to understanding policy relevance?

- Lack of clarity/accessibility on national policy priorities – how can researchers find out what the key priorities are? (and don't forget that these may change).
- Differences in opinion/policy priorities at different scales (regional versus national).
- Lack of clarity in terms of how to communicate with the policy side (e.g. lack of identification of key people). This is compounded when the key contact leaves post as the vital link is broken.
- The perception that policy makers don't want to engage, for example they may be suspicious of the motives for the engagement.
- Slow progress of research projects. There is a need for more immediate results to be able to share with policy 'audience'.
- Clash of ideology between researchers and policy advisors.
- Policy makers won't necessarily make decisions on the outcomes of the research/science, particularly if the results/outcomes aren't what they anticipated or hoped for.
- Think about actual implementation – the outcomes of research may not necessarily be appropriate to influence policy or to be implemented – this may be an additional step, and there are barriers in terms of understanding how this happens.
- Complexity – the whole process can be complex and time-consuming.

2.3 Overall conclusions/comments

It was noted that often successful engagement with policy makers is through the identification of the right people, and also knowing how to communicate with them and building lasting relationships. Policy makers are likely to require information of direct relevance to them, and are unlikely to have time to read through a research report trying to identify the information they might require.

There was some discussion about how researchers can 'break-in' to the policy world, but without compromising their research, and whether policy makers actually want to be informed by research. The issues of scientific independence and room for innovation were particularly important to researchers, and ways of managing the expectations of policy makers in this context was seen as particularly important in developing good relationships.

However, it was also noted that it might be time for a change in approach in research – many researchers now accept that research needs to have an additional 'element' or impact to it, beyond its scientific value, in order to attract funding.

3 Breakout 2: Step 1 – The scoping phase – why engage with stakeholders?

The first and most critical step in the stakeholder engagement process is to begin to identify why engagement is necessary, what it is hoped can be achieved from the engagement, and to start to outline the scope and context of the engagement.

3.1 Break-out group activities and questions

The following activities were undertaken by participants to consider the first step of the engagement process:

- Activity 1: Consider reasons for engagement, and desired outcomes.
- Activity 2: Consider the scope and context of the engagement:
  (i) Scope – what questions could be asked to help define the scope of the engagement (e.g. how are stakeholders to be involved? What can engagement realistically achieve? What are the costs of engaging?).
  (ii) Context – what questions could be asked to outline the context of the engagement (e.g. what networks already exist, and can they be used? What wider decision-making processes need to be considered?).

3.2 Summary conclusions from breakout groups on Step 1

The main points from the breakout sessions are summarised below.

3.2.1 Reasons for engagement and desired outcomes

- To take a more holistic approach.
- Societal reasons, to provide equal rights and privileges to science ('democratising science').
- To build networks and break down boundaries.
- Potential insurance arrangement to reduce conflict ('diffuse bombs').
- To seek clarification/clearer definitions from stakeholders.
- For co-design, and to define the purpose of the research project.
- To gain impact and relevance in accordance with objectives.
- For personal development; to build new skills.
- For peer review/validation, to ensure research is focussing on the right issues which can lead to better biodiversity outcomes.
- To apply research in other areas (e.g. technical assistance).
- To increase understanding of how biodiversity knowledge can be used.
- For access to additional 'resources', such as data, information, people, places.

3.2.2. Scope and context

How are stakeholders to be involved and what can stakeholder engagement realistically achieve?

- Build trust.
- Enter into dialogue, ask stakeholders if and how they'd like to be involved.

- Well-organised stakeholder groups are easier to engage with and other projects can access the group (e.g. piggy-back ride on other projects with similar stakeholders).
- Directionality (one-way versus two-way engagement).
- Formal and informal engagement.

What are the costs of engaging?

- Funders need to consider additional costs required for stakeholder engagement.
- When dealing with conflict resolution there might be the need for a professional facilitator, which could significantly increase costs.

What existing networks are available and how can they be used?

- Networks of stakeholders should be used where possible (for example to save costs/time), but these may not be specific enough to the individual project.
- The network needs to be clarified. It may be that the underlying group is of specific relevance to the project, yet the network itself removes the link to the underlying group.
- Specific/individual voices within groups might go unheard; try to ensure this doesn't happen.

3.3 Key points

It was agreed that the involvement of stakeholders may often lead to a more pragmatic approach to research, rather than one that is idealistic and based purely on scientific excellence – it will necessarily involve some negotiation and compromise, in order to make the research both relevant to the stakeholders and of high quality.

There was also some discussion of the process being rather 'chicken and egg', and the need for it to be dynamic – how can you define the objectives of the research without involving stakeholders to some extent, but also, how can you decide which stakeholders are appropriate without first defining the objectives of the research?

It was recognised that one of the key benefits of stakeholder engagement is the value added by data, information and other resource contributions. However, the issue of contradictions between stakeholders was raised. How can different requirements and viewpoints, not only between researchers and stakeholders, but also between stakeholders be easily managed? Effective stakeholder engagement can be critical to successful research on controversial issues, but means extra costs.

4 Breakout 3: Step – Identification of stakeholders

This step considers how to identify, categorise and understand relevant stakeholders. The final selection of stakeholders is likely to be dependent on the research being carried out, its potential outcomes and impacts, the resources available, and the objectives of the engagement.

4.1. Questions and activities

The following activities and questions were posed to start discussion in the breakout groups:

4.1.1 Activity 1: How do you identify your stakeholders?

- Do you use key questions, if so what information is of most importance?
- Do you consider different sectors or groups of relevance, or roles/functions?
- Do you include reasons for engagement?
- Do you use another process – if so what?

4.1.2 Activity 2: Mapping stakeholders

Table showing mapping of importance against interest

IMPORTANCE		INTEREST: Low	INTEREST: High
	High	**DIALOGUE (3)** Keep these stakeholders adequately informed, and maintain regular contact to ensure no major issues are arising	**FULL PARTICIPATION (4)** These stakeholders are essential and must be fully engaged with, managed. Enlist their help and support, and make the greatest effort to keep them satisfied.
	Low	**INFORM (1)** Monitor these stakeholders and keep them adequately updated as and when required.	**CONSULT (2)** Provide these stakeholders with enough information and interaction to keep them updated, and to address their concerns, but don't bombard them with too much information.

What is good about the mapping approach and what doesn't work or is missing that could improve it?

- Should importance always be considered?
- What other factors could be mapped against importance?
- What questions could be asked to help complete the grid?
- Are the levels of engagement appropriate/assigned correctly to the boxes?
- Are the levels of engagement adequately defined?

4.1.3 Activity 3: Understanding stakeholders

The guidance shows a table that displays the answers to a series of questions used to help understand stakeholders. Factors to consider in the table include: existing relationship;

relationship with other stakeholders; knowledge of project; likely opinion of project; best means of communication; capacity to engage; willingness to engage.

What is good about this approach and what doesn't work or is missing that could improve it?

- Is it helpful and clear to tabulate the information or too confusing?
- How easy would it be to complete this sort of process?
- How useful would this process be (e.g. would it help to see links, share information with others)?

4.2 Summary conclusions from breakout groups on Step 2

The main points from the breakout sessions are summarised below.

4.2.1 How do you identify your stakeholders?

- Through the use of pre-defined 'valid' categories (e.g. 9 categories from Catherine Jolibert[2]).
- By understanding society and interest groups (e.g. who has an interest or should have interest, who would expect to be involved, etc.). This needs to be re-assessed regularly.
- Early dialogue with other scientists (for example social scientists).
- Early dialogue with groups that may not welcome the research, which might help to identify where there may be conflict.
- Undertake a scoping exercise including other stakeholders.
- Participatory network analysis (e.g. who is influencing biodiversity conservation).
- Having a clear definition of 'stakeholder'.
- Having a clearly defined project to identify the key issues, match against the key stakeholders then broaden out. This needs to be re-assessed and changes may occur throughout the process so flexibility is required.
- May be based on key holders, for example relating to data-needs or people with leverage.
- Stakeholders are identified at different steps of the research process.
- Need additional 'blind spot' approach (people you wouldn't normally engage with) – ask who's missing.
- Pay company to identify them for you (particularly if involving the public).
- 'Organically' – it just happens.

4.2.2 'Mapping' stakeholders

- Mapping can be useful, but care is needed over definitions and interpretation.
- Re-consider the terms and consider how stakeholders may react to being grouped within specific categories, for example what does 'importance' mean to a stakeholder?
- Provide clear examples perhaps from a pre-existing project.

[2] Jolibert, C. and Wesselink, A. 2012. Research impacts and impact on research in biodiversity conservation: Influence of Stakeholder Engagement. Environmental Science & Policy 22,100–111.

- Need very clear definitions of the terms employed.
- Are as many as four categories required?
- How would different types of stakeholders be considered: (e.g. stakeholders with ‘power’ to influence other stakeholders; stakeholders which are objects of study/actors in the system versus agents of/for change).
- If there was a legitimate need to exclude/not to engage with a particular stakeholder, how might this be considered?
- Could three mapping categories be considered instead of 2 (an additional (‘Z’) axis)?
- How is ‘power’ accounted for/defined – is it the same as importance?

4.2.3 Understanding stakeholders

- The tabulated approach set out in the guidance could be helpful, often this process is undertaken in a less systematic way, for example knowledge/information can be held in researchers’ heads (but what happens, if that knowledge is somehow lost or confused?).
- Formalised approach carries risks in terms of the language used and perceptions. Care is needed with defining terms.
- Useful to challenge our views and perceptions and move out of our comfort zone!

4.3 Key messages

It was agreed that there is a need to be careful in the approach being taken, particularly if it is to be transparent – if stakeholders were to see mapping diagrams or tables, how might they view the assumptions being made about them and what impact on relationships could that have? Is it instead useful to allow stakeholders to analyse themselves?

Additionally, there was some discussion over the language being used, and the terms being employed. For example, is ‘inform’ really a form of engagement? It was agreed that the terms should be clearly defined, and distinct from one another.

Several participants advised that many research projects don’t really have a clearly defined approach – the process ‘just happens’. Often researchers may use stakeholders they have engaged with in previous projects, or ask other projects, or other stakeholders, for recommendations. This may be appropriate, and it may work, but is not of particular use for researchers with very little previous stakeholder engagement experience.

Finally, there was some discussion over whether some stakeholders should be purposefully excluded from engagement and, if so, how this could be justified and managed.

5 Breakout 4: Step 3 – When and how to engage with stakeholders

Step 3 starts to consider when and how to engage. Engagement doesn't need to involve all stakeholders all of the time, and different methods can be employed to engage different stakeholders.

5.1 Questions/activities

The following questions/activities were posed to the breakout groups to start discussion:

- Can the role or task that stakeholders take (e.g. data provider) and stage of engagement be readily identified? Brainstorm a variety of different roles/tasks and timescales.
- What methods would participants use to engage stakeholders at different project timescales? List methods used for stakeholder engagement.

5.2 Summary conclusions from breakout groups on Step 3

The main points from the breakout sessions are summarised below.

5.2.1 Role or task that stakeholders can undertake

- Decision maker.
- Co-design or provide ideas to current or future projects.
- Raising awareness – at different stages in the project.
- Lobbyist or champion, possibly acting as an advisory group.
- Knowledge broker.
- The role of scientists should be clarified.

How to assess stakeholder's role and timescale

- Community/stakeholder driven (ask stakeholders how they want to be involved).
- Maintain neutrality – don't use preconceptions to fit stakeholders into particular roles.
- Share results and provide information early in project. Perhaps provide opinion or options paper at the start of the exercise, before much data is available.
- Consider stakeholders expectations of time-scale of engagement and the potential for stakeholders to take advantage of the position (e.g. by access to information/contacts).
- Remember it's a complex set of relationships, which need to be clearly understood in order to get the most effective results.
- It is typically an iterative process; communication can lead to engagement with other stakeholders and groups.
- Share experience with other projects.
- Build on previous projects and past relationships; maintain communication in the long-term.
- Consider stakeholders' levels of experience, understanding and influence.
- Consider whether stakeholders will be able to afford to engage (e.g. because of costs or time), and what this means for their role and the methods of engagement chosen.

5.2.2 Methods of engagement

- Emails and text messages to key individuals.
- Think creatively about engaging ‘hard to reach’/all stakeholders. Creative opportunities include use of opera, computer games, twitter, social media, etc.
- Know your stakeholders, and use appropriate methods.
- Share success stories.
- Use the media.
- Consider working with other projects for cost efficiency.
- Consider a range of options including use of humour or other incentives/’softeners’ (e.g. wine, scenarios, etc.) to help dissipate tensions or make things simple. Be empathetic to stakeholders (consider audience).
- Parliamentary sessions.
- Consider use of professional support (e.g. for conflict with media). However, this could be costly and may not be factored into funding/project design.
- Use of key individuals for conflict situations (e.g. representatives who are well respected, sympathetic).

5.3 Key messages/points

A variety of different roles and different methods of engagement were identified. These need to be appropriate to the particular project and the engagement required or desired, and stakeholders themselves could be asked to consider the roles they might wish to play, or the methods that could be used to engage. In particular it was agreed that it was necessary to ensure the engagement is efficient and directed to make the most appropriate use of the stakeholders’ time. Additionally it was important to consider novel ways of engagement, and incentives where necessary to encourage stakeholders to engage.

6 Breakout 5: Step 4 – The engagement plan

The aim of step 4 is to give guidance on creating an engagement plan, implementation and monitoring.

6.1 Questions and activities

The following questions/activities were posed to the breakout groups to start discussion.

6.1.1 Activity 1: Creating an engagement plan

- What should an engagement plan include?
- Would example templates be useful?
- Could we use the matrix approach shown in Table 2.3 of the guidance in some way and how?
- What are the key logistical issues?
- How do you get buy-in to the plan from your stakeholders?

6.1.2 Activity 2: Monitoring and dynamic planning

- Checking that engagement is on track – what are the best methods?
- Auditing of progress, problems and resolutions – what are best methods and what tools might be helpful?
- What communication methods can be adopted to ensure the plan itself is a successful living document?
- Are case studies useful?

6.2 Summary conclusions from breakout groups on Step 4

The main points from the breakout sessions are summarised below.

6.2.1 The engagement plan, why create/use one, and factors to consider when creating one

- The plan needs to be dynamic; it needs to evolve and is subject to constant change.
- Regular reviews of the plan need to be scheduled. There was a concern over how to get stakeholder buy-in every time changes are made; there needs to be trust established between funders and researchers; stakeholders' expectations and needs should be reflected in the plan.
- It could be difficult to manage the plan and undertake the engagement!
- Clarity is required over what the plan can or will do. It could be used as a basis for dialogue; have internal and external uses; be used to raise awareness (e.g. with public); help manage expectations (e.g. of other stakeholders); provide an opportunity to clarify constrains/problems; become a communication tool (e.g. for data providers); synthesise information and facilitate communication; support work across various programmes and help integration with research (participatory impact pathways analysis); help consider different levels and types of engagement (e.g. local – EU).
- Members of the research group from different countries could create their own culturally specific engagement plan which could link to an overarching project plan.

- The plan needs to start with stakeholder analysis – clarify the objectives of stakeholder engagement and identify deliverables.
- The Project proposal could include a basic engagement plan.
- There may be new ideas/demands which arise and cannot be planned. Impact can come from opportunities that are not planned (e.g. from existing good relationships).
- Use of milestones, specifically on engagement (rather than deliverables) might be useful.
- Are the costs of an engagement plan too high compared with the value it could deliver? Or can the plan be used to help define and justify budgets? It was suggested that funding agencies should have seed money for development of full proposals (including stakeholder engagement plan). The challenge is to find the correct balance within the project for biodiversity science and engagement.

6.2.2 Monitoring and dynamic planning

- Essentially project management – having a 'plan B' (contingency planning).
- Stakeholders can leave!
- Need to utilise facilitator (as project partner?).
- Possibly serving a cluster of projects (as is a question of scale).
- Role could include media engagement.
- Societal outcomes enhanced.
- Needs to depend on the intended legacy of the project – set aside budget; integrated into the process.

6.3 Overall key points

It was agreed that any engagement plan needs to be flexible, and to be adapted as and when necessary. There was some concern over who needed sight of the plan, and who would need to agree any changes, as this could be time-consuming. There was agreement that a plan could have a number of uses, and that it could help give clarity to the engagement process. However, an important point was that it should be proportionate to need.

An idea of including a stakeholder engagement plan in research proposals emerged and a simple format could be included as one of the tools within the guidance.

7 Breakout group 6: Step 5 – Assessing the outcomes of engagement

Step 5 considers the need to evaluate the outcomes of stakeholder engagement to consider whether or not the process has been successful.

7.1 Questions/activities

Participants were posed the following questions and activities:

7.1.1 Activity 1: What to assess?

- Whether the engagement process met its own aims.
- Whether the process met the explicit and implicit demands of stakeholders.
- Whether the levels of participation were appropriate.
- Whether the methods of engagement were successful.
- Whether the costs were reasonable.
- Are there any other factors that should be assessed?

7.1.2 Activity 2: Assessing the outcomes of engagement

- What methods could be used to determine the effectiveness of engagement?
- Should stakeholders be involved in the assessment?
- What value might stakeholders place on an assessment?
- Should an assessment be published and if so what are the best dissemination methods?
- Are there other stakeholders for the assessment itself?

7.2 Summary conclusions from breakout groups on Step 5

The main points from the breakout sessions are summarised below.

7.2.1 Assessing the outcomes, what do we assess? 'Indicators of success'

- Transparency of process.
- Specific measures (e.g. indicator criteria derived from initial targets). Build criteria network at the start of the project
- Outcome based: Need for any weightings? (e.g. Outcome = outputs (including reports) + learning, capacity building, policy impact/usability). The BiodiversityKnowledge project describes 13 criteria that could be used.
- Outcomes can be assessed with more indirect indicators, but, how to tease out what resulted from your project. Very difficult/easy to be your own assessor (self-evaluation is cheap).
- Bring in external assessor, if valid.
- Stakeholders to provide the feedback. Need to be clear to stakeholders about why assessment is taking place and how it will be used.
- Ethical issues; confidentiality (be clear, set out principles of confidentiality) – some stakeholders may not wish to be identified.
- How do we measure 'things that didn't work'?

- Use of deliverables and milestones plan (equivalent to outcomes) – on time? Reached an objective? Clear and precisely written. But is there a risk of subjectivity?
- Do stakeholders want to engage again? – why/why not?
- Assess reactions! How to measure?
- Publication of assessments – does it happen? If so how?
- Remember, stakeholders do want feedback.
- What about wider stakeholders? Allow them opportunities to express views?
- Stakeholders should be involved in assessment (e.g. were their expectations met?).
- Question whether cost/benefit is measurable in biodiversity research – % of costs on SHE versus whole project cost.
- Assessing impact of SHE may be on a different timeframe from the impact of research.
- A lot of outcomes are too remote – impact not immediate or explicit.
- Consider long-term impact assessment – opportunities to take outcomes into future projects; lessons learnt, what worked, how knowledge taken up.
- Consider at broader scale (e.g. other projects; networking).
- Impact of engagement on research itself is important to funders.
- Outputs/products of research – publications.
- Feedback from other scientists.
- Need measurable criteria for assessment (for funders) – need to be fairly immediate results, tangible impacts.
- Acknowledgement/success stories very powerful for future engagement and to demonstrate impact.
- Demonstration of added value of stakeholder engagement is important, but is not a precise science.
- Need clarity on expectations of stakeholder engagement.
- Informal engagement can be difficult to measure.

7.3 Key points from breakout

It was agreed that an assessment of the engagement is important, and that stakeholders could be included to help with this assessment. Some simple indicators or metrics could be developed at the beginning of a project, based on milestones, but including the less tangible outcomes expected from the research. Care would be needed in communicating the reasons for assessment and in publishing results. However, it was recognised that many of the benefits of the engagement may be quite long-term and therefore need to be assessed in the future, but this would be extremely challenging within the normal life of a research project.

8 Overall evaluation of the whole guidance

8.1 Questions

Participants were posed the following questions and activities, with the aim of identifying some key comments on the guidance as a whole:

- Do the five steps work?
- Are they in the correct order?
- Do we need to break any of them into smaller components?
- Do we need to merge any of them?
- What else should we consider? Have we missed anything?
- How useful is each step?

8.2 Summary conclusions from breakout group on overall evaluation of the whole guidance

The following suggestions were made regarding the guidance:

- It IS useful!
- Rename the guidance as a ‘toolkit’, so it feels less prescriptive.
- Could long and short versions be created?
- Remove numbered steps, but keep the different sections and objectives.
- Include a decision tree.
- Validate it?
- Provide suggestions for further reading.
- Consider why <u>not</u> to engage.
- Include mention of difficult relationships.
- What about stakeholders we’d rather not engage with?
- Consider how to ensure an appropriate level of engagement.
- What makes biodiversity research different? What are our specific needs/challenges?
- More context on the importance of ShE.
- Make it more explicit to BiodivERsA-related research.
- What is the added value to biodiversity research/the stakeholders/BiodivERsA?
- Explain your ‘level’/’strategy’ of engagement.
- Projects versus programmes – what engagement can be conducted at a programme level (e.g. by BiodivERsA)? (videos, policy briefs).
- Provide examples/case studies (and ensure they are representative and capture the breadth of BiodivERsA research).
- Make it clear there are different ways to engage – but these are not necessarily ‘good’ or ‘bad’.
- Include a glossary of the terms being used.
- There is a danger of creating a ‘recipe’ which may not be appropriate.

8.3 Key messages

The key messages which came out of the discussion were that the term ‘guidance’ was a little too prescriptive; the step approach seems to suggest that researchers should follow the whole process sequentially and completely. It was agreed by participants that they would prefer to view the guidance as a ‘toolkit’, from which they could extract relevant information or advice as and when required. It was also agreed that the language being used should be clear, and that a glossary could be provided to define the terms being adopted.

Additionally it was noted that the guidance should clarify what makes the experience of biodiversity research different from other research, and finally and most importantly, the need for examples was highlighted – particularly from BiodivERsA projects. Examples can really give researchers using the guidance a clear idea of what others have undertaken, and what might be achieved or undertaken in their own research.

The role of the BiodivERsA Partnership itself was discussed and whether there were stakeholder engagement activities that could be done at a higher level by the Partnership to support the individual research projects in engaging with certain stakeholder groups. Engagement at a pan-European level, for example with the European Commission, was extremely challenging for a relatively small project, and national engagement in some countries was also difficult.

9 Breakout group 7 – Stakeholder engagement as part of the BiodivERsA call process: criteria for evaluation

This final session of the workshop addressed the BiodivERsA criteria for assessment, and the need for these to incorporate stakeholder engagement. Participants were asked for their views on how to evaluate stakeholder engagement.

9.1 Criteria for assessment

Participants were asked to consider a set of proposed areas to consider in developing criteria, based on the '*BiodivERsA Stakeholder Engagement: Best Practice Guidance*' which included the following:

i. Reasons for undertaking (or not undertaking) stakeholder engagement.
ii. Desired outcomes of stakeholder engagement.
iii. Identification of appropriate stakeholders; and identification of stakeholder groups that will not be engaged with.
iv. Understanding of the role(s) of the stakeholders within the research project.
v. Understanding of the needs and requirements of the stakeholders.
vi. Methods/activities proposed for engagement.
vii. Evidence of management, planning, resources.
viii. Evidence that the necessary skills to engage are available or will be obtained (e.g. through relevant training, or the use of external sources).
ix. Identification of potential challenges and risks, and ways of managing and mitigating them.
x. Support from appropriate stakeholders towards the research, and commitment to engage.

9.2 Scoring

It was noted that currently, two scores are provided: scores for both scientific excellence and policy relevance range from 5 (outstanding) to 1 (poor). Participants were asked to consider:

- How to score stakeholder engagement?
- How to use the Stakeholder Engagement score; how important is it?
- Should scores for policy relevance and stakeholder engagement be combined?

9.3 Questions

Participants were asked to consider:

- What are the most relevant Stakeholder engagement criteria?
- Which are essential and which desirable?
- How could they be scored?
- How might we use the Stakeholder engagement score?

9.4 Summary workshop conclusions

The following points were raised:

9.4.1 Criteria

- The ten proposed criteria are too many and should be simplified;
- Policy relevance criteria should be re-branded as stakeholder engagement and termed something like ‘societal relevance’ or ‘societal impact’;
- Need to ensure that the difference between stakeholder engagement and policy relevance is maintained – they are very different things;
- Criteria should consider how to reflect the added value from stakeholder engagement to both researchers and society;
- Criteria could consider: level of engagement; methods for engagement; and, stakeholders identified;
- Who, what, how and why should be captured by the criteria – many proposals don’t even provide this most basic information;
- Existing criteria are clear and easy to use and so should keep these, but with update or changes to (b), (c) and (d), or (c) could subsume (b) and (d);
- Some additional detail could be added to existing criteria as sub-points;
- A criterion on why stakeholder engagement and policy relevance is not appropriate could be added;
- Criteria should not be prescriptive, but provide a framework for applicants to respond to so that all proposals are not the same;
- The criteria should help the evaluation panel as well as the applicants, with specific information provided to evaluators;
- Once criteria developed then consider matching the guidelines or toolkit to the criteria;
- Whatever criteria are selected, the whole process needs transparency.

9.4.2 Scoring

- A third scored category shifts the emphasis of the criteria away from science excellence and so criteria for policy relevance and stakeholder engagement should be combined with a single scoring approach.

9.5 Key messages

It was agreed that the criteria could be simplified, but that overall they covered the key areas. Additionally, it was agreed that they could be used to help inform the guidelines or toolkit, once they are finally agreed. It was noted, however, that the scoring of a project would not be dependent on the use of the guidelines or toolkit – the guidelines would simply be there for those who wish to make use of them. It was noted that the scoring should be kept simple, and that the whole process needs transparency.

It was agreed that a simple system should be created, that encourages Stakeholder engagement in BiodivERsA research rather than being a barrier to it.

9 Overall conclusions

The primary aim of the workshop was to consider how the draft guidelines could be developed and revised, and to discuss policy relevance and the criteria for assessment. Over 30 people attended, representing at least 20 BiodivERsA-funded projects, as well as several BiodivERsA partners, and various other relevant research groups, including SPIRAL, BiodiversityKnowledge and LWEC.

The workshop was run through a series of presentations, discussions, and breakout groups. Overall the workshop was successful. It brought together a significant number of representatives from the European biodiversity research community and it encouraged some lively debate and challenged some preconceptions.

The overall conclusions regarding the guidance were:

- Make it a ‘toolkit’ rather than a guidance document.
- Draw attention to other tools, and where they can be found.
- Take care with the language being used – think about how different stakeholders will perceive the toolkit and provide a glossary of terms if necessary.
- Don’t make it too prescriptive – people want to pull out what is useful for them.
- Stakeholder engagement is a dynamic process and the toolkit should take that into account.
- Don’t forget to consider the challenges and difficulties of stakeholder engagement – it is not always easy and it can be expensive.
- Include examples and case studies to illustrate the approaches taken.
- Test the ideas with a range of stakeholders and not just the research community.
- Do we need a complete behavioural change in the way we approach research?

The organisers of the workshop at JNCC would like to thank all those who attended for their participation and useful contributions.

Appendix 1: List of participants

Workshop organisers (JNCC):
Helen Baker
Emma Durham
Richard Ferris
Elizabeth Moore

Name	BiodivERsA Project (or affiliation)
Richard Bradshaw	FIREMAN
Peter Bridgewater	JNCC
Joachim Claudet	BUFFER
Emilie Crouzat	CONNECT
Jurgen Dengler	SIGNAL
Nancy Dise	PEATBOG
Romina Drees	LIMNOTIP
Regan Early	EC21C
Anna Evely (24th only)	Project Maya
Bruno Fady	LinkTree & TipTree
Matthew Fisher	RACE
Claude Garcia	CoForTips
Sylvie Gourlet-Fleury	CoForChange
Allan Green	SCIN
Jennifer Hauck	EC21C
Ingeborg Palm Helland	FISHCON
Catherine Jolibert	University of Barcelona
Mark Koetse	CONNECT
Penelope Lamarque	VITAL & REGARDS
Henrik Lange	Formas
Pieter Lemmens	TIPPINGPOND
Xavier Le Roux	BiodivERsA (FRB)
Romain Pirard	INVALUABLE
Steve Redpath	Ecocycles
Mark Reed (23rd only)	Birmingham City University
Alicia Valdes	SmallFOREST
Marie Vanderwalle	BiodiversityKnowledge (Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research – UFZ)
Chantal van Ham	URBES
Carole Vuillot	FarmLand
Alexander Wezel	TIPPINGPOND
Georg Winkel	BeFoFu
Juliette Young	SPIRAL (CEH)

Appendix 2: Agenda

Day 1: 23 April 2013

Time	Activity	Format
09:00–09:30	**Arrival, registration**	
09:30–10:30 (1 hr)	**Welcome and scene setting** *Why are we talking about stakeholder engagement?* Helen Baker, JNCC, UK	Presentation (15 minutes)
	How do you make your research policy relevant? Peter Bridgewater, JNCC Chairman	Presentation (20 minutes)
	SPIRAL – methods for science-policy interfaces Juliette Young, CEH, UK	Presentation and brief discussion (20 minutes)
10:30–11:00	**Coffee break**	
11:00–12:30 (1 hr 30 min)	**Introduction to breakout 1** JNCC	5 minutes
	Breakout 1 (2 groups) Identifying policy issues and integrating consideration of policy in research	Breakout group discussion with flip chart (45 minutes)
	Feedback – conclusions/key issues	Groups report back to Plenary and discussion (20 minutes)
	Stakeholder engagement in biodiversity research – an overview Cathy Jolibert, University of Barcelona, Spain	Presentation and brief discussion (20 minutes)
12:30–13:15	**Lunch**	
13:15–14:45 (1 hr 30 min)	*Stakeholder engagement experiences from a BiodivERsA project* Penelope Lamarque (VITAL project), Université Joseph Fourier, France	Presentation and brief discussion (20 minutes)
	Introduction to the draft stakeholder engagement guidance Emma Durham, JNCC	Brief synopsis (10 minutes)
	Icebreaker Benefits and risks of stakeholder engagement	Activity (15 minutes)
	Introduction to breakout 2 JNCC	5 minutes
	Breakout 2 (2 groups) Step 1: The scoping phase – why engage with stakeholders	Breakout group discussion with flip chart (25 minutes)
	Feedback conclusions/key issues from Step 1	Groups report back to Plenary and discussion (15 minutes)
14:45–15:15	**Coffee break**	
15:15–17:00 (1 hr 45 min)	*Living With Environmental Change – Knowledge Exchange* Mark Reed, Birmingham City University, UK & Anna Evely, Project Maya, UK	Presentation and discussion (20 minutes)
	Introduction to breakout 3 JNCC	5 minutes

	Breakout 3 (2 groups) Step 2: Identification of stakeholders	Breakout group discussion with flip chart (55 minutes)
	Feedback conclusions/key issues from Step 2	Groups report back to Plenary and discussion (20 minutes)
	Summary of outputs of the day and how we proceed tomorrow JNCC	Plenary (5 minutes)

The evening meal will be held at the Great Northern Hotel at 19:30.

Day 2: 24 April 2013

Time	Activity	Format
09:00–09:30	**Arrival and coffee**	
09:30–11:00 (1 hr 30 min)	**Recap from Day 1** JNCC	Discussion, clarification (10 minutes)
	Introduction to breakout 4 JNCC	5 minutes
	Breakout 4 (2 groups) Step 3: How to engage with stakeholders	Breakout group discussion with flip chart (60 minutes)
	Feedback conclusions/key issues from Step 3	Groups report back to Plenary and discussion (15 minutes)
11:00–11:30	**Coffee break**	
11:30–12:30 (1 hr)	**Introduction to breakout 5** JNCC	5 minutes
	Breakout 5 (2 groups) Step 4: The Engagement Plan	Breakout group discussion with flip chart (40 minutes)
	Feedback conclusions/key issues from Step 4	Groups report back to Plenary and discussion (15 minutes)
12:30–13:15	**Lunch**	
13:15–15:05 (1 hr 50 min)	*Stakeholder engagement within BiodiversityKnowledge* Marie Vanderwalle, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research – UFZ, Germany	Presentation and discussion (20 minutes)
	Introduction to breakout 6 JNCC	5 minutes
	Breakout 6 (2 groups) Step 5: Assessing the outcomes of engagement	Breakout group discussion with flip chart (40 minutes)
	Feedback conclusions/key issues from Step 5	Groups report back to Plenary and discussion (15 minutes)
	Overall evaluation of the whole guidance JNCC	Plenary discussion (30 minutes)
15:05–15:20	**Comfort break** (refreshments will be available to collect and take into the meeting room for the last session)	
15:20–16:30 (1 hr 10 min)	*Stakeholder engagement as part of the BiodivERsA call process, and criteria for evaluation* JNCC	Presentation (10 minutes)

	Breakout 7 (1 group in plenary)	Discussion in plenary (40 minutes)
	Feedback and forward look Summary of outputs from the workshop, and what happens next Helen Baker, JNCC	Presentation and discussion (20 minutes)
16:30	**Meeting ends**	

Appendix 3: Breakout group questions

Objectives
Our aim is to test the guidance document and to ascertain whether the guidance would work in practice. In order to do this we will run a number of parallel breakout group sessions to focus on the 5 steps within the guidance. In addition there will be a breakout group session on policy relevance and one on the criteria for evaluating stakeholder engagement in the BiodivERsA call process.

As we work through the 5 breakout group sessions on the guidance steps we encourage you to feedback comments on each step, in terms of what works/doesn't work, what could be omitted or additional factors to include in the guidance.

Please use examples from your own research and experience and where possible, share information on stakeholder engagement that has been successful and unsuccessful. The goal is to ensure the best procedures are taken forward as examples of best practice in order to enhance the process of stakeholder engagement for all those involved and to enrich the research and its outcomes.

Breakout 1: Policy relevance (45 minutes)

How is the relevance of policy considered within your research? (30 mins)
Brainstorm ways in which policy relevance is considered and record the information on a chart (below). List type of research, how considered (provide examples) and when (what stage in research process). Also record when not considered.

Type of research (e.g. academic, scientific, socio-economic, blue-skies etc or just list the project name)	How policy relevance considered e.g. (include 'not considered)	When (what stage in the research process)

What are the benefits and risks of undertaking policy relevant research? (15 mins)
Highlight views and opinions on the value of integrating policy in research, and how it can affect the research or outcomes. Encourage participants to use egs from their own experience to illustrate positive and/or negative factors

Benefits	Risks (not related)

Breakout group 2: Step 1: The scoping phase – why engage with stakeholders? (25 mins)

Objectives: Define why you wish to undertake stakeholder engagement, why is it important? What outputs or outcomes do you want to achieve? Begin to outline the scope of the engagement and provide it with some context.

Activity 1: Reasons for engagement and desired outcomes (10 mins)
Can you provide some examples based on your research projects, to insert in the table? Record ideas in table (already on flip chart) – include projects that would not engage stakeholders and the reasons why not

Objective of the project	Why engage (or not)	Desired outputs	Desired outcomes
Main aim	e.g. to obtain information; to ensure stakeholders contribute to...	e.g. report, website, a tool for people to use, data	e.g. a better quality product, with more information and endorsement and support from the stakeholders

Activity 2: Scope and context of engagement (15 mins)
Remind participants of some of the reasons for including scope from the guidance (e.g. clarifies boundary for engagement, purpose and outcomes etc).
Ask participants to brainstorm questions about the scope that are important to consider and that could be included in the guidance. To get them started provide some examples (already on flip chart) e.g.

- how are stakeholders to be involved
- what can stakeholder engagement realistically achieve
- what are the costs of engaging...

Record the outputs on flip chart

Reiterate the reasons for including context considerations and ask participants to brainstorm questions on scope that could be used in the guidance. Provide examples to get them started (already on flip chart), for example:

- what existing networks exist – can they be used
- what wider decision-making processes need to be considered..

Record the outputs on flip chart

Breakout group 3: Step 2: Identification of stakeholders (55 minutes)

Objectives: identify, categorise and understand relevant stakeholders

Activity 1 - Share information on how you identify your stakeholders (20 mins)

- Do you use key questions e.g. p11 – if so what information is of most importance
- Do you consider different sectors or groups of relevance, or roles/functions
- Do you include reasons for engagement?
- Do you use another process – if so what?

Record responses (e.g):

Key questions	Different sectors/groups/roles	Reasons for engagement	Another process
Give e.g of what used/most important	e.g. of typology	Give e.gs or state if not included	Outline the details

Activity 2 - Mapping (20 mins)
Display the table on mapping importance against interest and clarify the 4 levels of engagement: inform; consult; dialogue; full participation.

Table on mapping importance against interest

IMPORTANCE		Low	High
	High	**DIALOGUE (3)** Keep these stakeholders adequately informed, and maintain regular contact to ensure no major issues are arising	**FULL PARTICIPATION (4)** These stakeholders are essential and must be fully engaged with, managed. Enlist their help and support, and make the greatest effort to keep them satisfied.
	Low	**INFORM (1)** Monitor these stakeholders and keep them adequately updated as and when required.	**CONSULT (2)** Provide these stakeholders with enough information and interaction to keep them updated, and to address their concerns, but don't bombard them with too much information.
			INTEREST

What is good about this approach and what doesn't work or is missing that could improve it?

- Should importance always be considered?
- What other factors could be mapped against importance?
- What questions could be asked to help complete the grid?
- Are the levels of engagement appropriate/assigned correctly to the boxes
- Are the levels of engagement adequately defined?

Record feedback in table (already on flip chart)

Positive aspects of table	What is missing/could be improved

Activity 3 - Understanding (15 mins)
Display the table (2.4) on understanding your stakeholders and possible overall levels of engagement. Work through a couple of examples to demonstrate/clarify.

What is good about this approach and what doesn’t work or is missing that could improve it?

- Is it helpful and clear to tabulate the information or too confusing?
- How easy would it be to complete this sort of process?
- How useful would this process be e.g. would it help to see links, share information with others?

Record feedback in table (already on flip chart)

Positive aspects of table	What is missing/could be improved

Breakout group 4: step 3: When and how to engage with stakeholders (60 mins)

Objectives: Start to consider when and how to engage. Engagement doesn't need to involve all of the stakeholders all of the time, and different methods can be employed to engage different stakeholders.

Building on the set of stakeholder groups/categories from the previous breakout group session, use these to test how well the next stages work. May need to refine the list of stakeholder groups and get them onto a separate flip chart before the start of this session (feasible at the end of day 1).

Activity 1 - Role and timescale (15 mins)
Within the guidance we have specified the following continuum on the project timescale
Before – before/during - during – during/after – after

Can the role or task that stakeholders can take (e.g. data provider), and stage be readily identified?
NB: stakeholders can play multiple roles

Brainstorm a variety of different roles/tasks and timescales. Record feedback on a table (already on flip chart)

Stakeholder group	role	Project timescale
Government policy makers		
Scientists from the same discipline		
Scientists from other disciplines		
etc		

Activity 2 – Methods

Part A – List methods used for stakeholder engagement (10 minutes)
Record as list on flip chart

Part B – What methods would participants use to engage stakeholders at different project timescales (15 mins)
Using the table from activity 1 on role and timescale and the list of methods, record feedback on a table (as below)

Inform	Consult	Dialogue	full participation
e.g newsletter, website	e.g. survey	e.g. focus groups	e.g. 1-2-1 meetings, workshops

Breakout group 5: Step 4: the engagement plan (40 minutes)

Objectives – create, implement and monitor the engagement plan

Activity 1 – engagement plan (30 mins)
Participants will be given a scenario of a BiodivERsA research project and asked to brainstorm ideas to form the basis of an engagement plan. (30 mins)

Record the feedback by filling in the table (already on flipchart)

What are the objectives of the engagement?	
What are the opportunities of (benefits from) engaging?	
What are the risks of engaging? Etc.	

Activity 2 - Consider how the engagement plan can be impartial (10 mins)
Would it be useful to include the following general rules:

- Avoid making assumptions about other's intentions or motivations
- Make sure that there are opportunities for everyone to be involved and have an input
- Stay focussed on the subject that is the topic of the engagement
- Respect any requests for confidentiality that have been agreed

Are there any other general rules that could be useful?

Record feedback on flip chart

Breakout group 6: Step 5: Assessing the outcomes of engagement (40 minutes)

Objectives: evaluate the outcomes of stakeholder engagement to consider whether or not the process has been successful.

Activity 1 – Assessing outcomes of engagement (20 mins)
Building on step 4, revisit the objectives of engagement from the scenario discussed in the previous breakout group session.
Brainstorm ideas about *how* to determine whether the process was a success against the success criteria. (The success criteria are based on the original objectives of the process.)

Consider how you could determine (i.e. what process, tools, methods, questions could be used) the success of the engagement:

- Whether the engagement process met its own aims
- Whether the process met the explicit and implicit demands of stakeholders
- Whether the levels of participation were considered appropriate for the stakeholders
- Whether the methods of engagement where appropriate and successful
- Whether the costs were reasonable

Are there any other significant factors that should be assessed?

Record feedback on flip chart

Activity 2 - Overall evaluation of the whole guidance (to take into plenary discussion) (20 mins)

Aim – to brainstorm and identify key comments on the guidance as a whole

- Do the five steps work?
- Are they in the correct order?
- Do we need to break any of them into smaller components?
- Do we need to merge any of them?
- What else should we consider? Have we missed anything?
- How useful is each step?

Record feedback on flip chart

Breakout group 7: Stakeholder engagement as part of the BiodivERsA call process and criteria for evaluation (40 minutes – one group in plenary)

Objective – to gather feedback on the process of developing criteria for evaluating stakeholder engagement as part of the BiodivERsA call process.

Activity 1 – brainstorm list of what the criteria should cover, identifying factors that are essential and desirable (5 mins)

Record feedback on flip chart

Activity 2 – brainstorm ideas on how to evaluate and score projects that have identified very little of no stakeholder engagement (5 mins)

Record feedback on flip chart

Activity 3 – on scoring (three parts) (30 mins)

Part A - What information would be useful in creating an appropriate scoring system? Brainstorm a list to include examples that might obtain a high or low score. (10 mins)

Record feedback on flip chart

Part B - Should stakeholder engagement be measured on the same scale (1-5), if not what scale could be used? (10 mins)

Record feedback on table (already on flip chart)

1-5 scale	Other scale	Strength/weakness for separate scores	Strength/weakness for combining scores
Yes/no reasons	describe		

Part C - If the scores were to be combined, how could this be realistically achieved? Brainstorm ideas (10 mins)

Record feedback on flip chart