

## *Appendix I*

---

### Methodology of the Project

This book is the result of a UNED Forum project, undertaken between October 2000 and June 2001. Gathering some of the necessary building-blocks of a methodological framework for multi-stakeholder processes (Part I), we aimed to distil a step-by-step guide which allows for transparent, equitable, democratic and gender-balanced processes of stakeholder involvement and collaboration. The goal was to develop a framework that is agreeable to stakeholders and can be adapted to various situations and issues (Part II).

We produced a draft report on the project website ([www.earthsummit2002.org/msp](http://www.earthsummit2002.org/msp)) and asked for comments from a variety of stakeholder representatives, including UNED Forum's International Advisory Board, representatives of the processes studied, government representatives and researchers. Over 30 people provided us with comments, questions, amendments and literature, some of them in the form of general guidance, some in great detail. On the basis of these comments, we redrafted the text, developed a set of principles and send it to participants prior to a two-day workshop, held in New York on 28-29 April 2001. The presentations and discussions at the workshop were again incorporated into the work, which resulted in this book.

#### **METHODOLOGY OF THE REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE**

We conducted searches in social sciences libraries and via the PsycInfo database of psychological research, theoretical and empirical work on communication, consensus-building, conflict resolution, power relationships, and decision-making in groups; group composition, leadership, and so on. We also contacted experts in social and organizational

psychology to obtain their suggestions on relevant research material. They provided further pointers to relevant literature. Analysing the material, we focused particularly on review and applied literature. We received comments on a first draft from a number of experts and incorporated them into the final version of Chapter 6.

### **METHODOLOGY OF ANALYSING MSP EXAMPLES**

From the large number of existing examples, we picked a variety regarding their issues, objectives, scope, time lines, participants and linkage to official decision-making. We obtained information about the examples in print and via the internet. Much of the process design-related information which we were looking for was publicly available. We also interviewed people who are/were involved in the examples, either in person, by telephone or email. Almost every example presentation in this book is based on a combination of literature research and interviewing.

Studying the examples was not aimed at giving an assessment or evaluation via a representative group of people being interviewed. Of course, people do make judgements and that shines through in some cases (marked 'comment'). The goal was to obtain a descriptive analysis of the respective MSPs. All people who have contributed to obtaining that information are listed in Appendix II, along with other people who commented on drafts, gave guidance on the draft documents or parts thereof, and so on.

The following is the list of questions we used.

#### **General information**

Name:

Issues:

Objectives:

Participants:

Scope:

Time lines:

Contact details/URL:

## Procedural aspects

*Designing the MSP* How was the process designed? And by whom? Were there consultations with stakeholders on the design?

*Identifying the issues* Who identifies the issues? And how?

*Identifying relevant stakeholders* Who identifies relevant stakeholders? And how?

*Identifying participants* Who identifies the participants? And how? Possibly different for the various participating stakeholder groups.

*Setting the goals* Who sets the goals? And how? Can goals develop over the course of the MSP – eg from an informing process into a dialogue/consensus-building process; from mere exchange of views to implementation? Do participants have opportunities to check back with their constituencies when changes are being proposed?

*Setting the agenda* Who sets the agenda? And how? Do participants have opportunities to check back with their constituencies when changes are being proposed?

*Setting the timetable* Who sets the timetable? And how?

*Preparatory process* How is the dialogue prepared (consultations within constituencies; papers; initial positions; and so on)? Are the preparations within stakeholder groups being monitored somehow?

*Communication* How is the communication conducted (face-to-face/telephone/email, etc; chairing/facilitation; atmosphere; summarizing)?

*Dealing with power gaps* Are there power gaps between participating stakeholder groups? How are they addressed/dealt with?

Are there mechanisms of meta-communication during the process? What kind?

*Decision-making/procedures of agreement* Depending on the type of MSP, is agreement being sought? If so, how is that conducted? And by whom?

*Implementation* How is implementation decided/planned/conducted? By whom?

*Closure* How and when does the process conclude? Who makes the decision and how?

## Structural aspects

*Institutional back-up* Is there a secretariat, facilitating body, board, forum?

*Facilitation* Who facilitates the MSP? What is the exact role of a facilitating body? How does the facilitating organization work with stakeholders? Does that include secretariat services?

*Documentation* Rapporteurship from meetings; summarizing outcomes; publication of documentation – by whom, when and how?

*Relating to non-participating stakeholders* Do other stakeholders know about the process? Can they feed into the process? And how?

*Relating to the general public* What kind of information about the MSP is available to the public? Via which channels? Who provides that information? Can the public comment/ask questions/feed in? And how?

*Linkage into official decision-making* Is the MSP linked to an official decision-making process? Of governments, intergovernmental bodies, other stakeholders? Via which mechanisms? How transparent and predictable are these mechanisms? Can stakeholders impact the mechanisms? And how?

*Funding* Is the process being funded? By whom? Who fundraises? How much does it cost? What impact do funders have on process, structures and outcomes?