# **Epilogue**

Tim O'Riordan

University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

## **Spreading the Ripples**

Providing opportunities for a wide array of interested parties to be satisfied by an integrated management decision is the stone that causes the ripples. Where the ripples move depends on the depth and obstructiveness of the water body, in this case the powers that shape how decisions are made. Just because there are ripples does not mean that they reach the shore. Offering participation can mean surprisingly little: those who must be involved are there already. Those who shout loudest make it their business to be there, however inconvenient. Those who may not realise their ultimate interests could well be affected by a decision outcome may only enter when advised or encouraged or enabled to do so. And there will always be many who simply do not want to be part, who cannot know in any reasonable way that their interests are relevant to the decision outcome, yet who may experience costs or suffering by being absent.

In short, stakeholder dialogue is usually a discussion amongst known and informed people to the party. The ones who also count may not be there either because they have sufficient power and influence to bend this outcome in their direction, so can be absent simply because of their virtual presence in the decision setting. They still command power even when not present. Others who are absent are those who are often included by a combination of ignorance, alienation or distraction by other demands on their distracted lives. Stakeholder dialogue may be mirror on social power relations and on the institutional design of decision-making.

Before exploring the scope for reinterpreting stakeholder dialogue, it is necessary to set the context in terms of fresh approaches to national resources management and integrated assessments. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment set the scene for interpreting national resources in the context of ecosystem services. No normal resource resides outside its placenta of ecosystem functioning that makes up the web of life. There is growing realisation that these functions are hugely valuable for human existence and economy, but that they are also seriously endangered by inappropriate and incomplete integrated assessments of reduced natural

resource management. Hence, not only are there potentials for combinations of ecosystems functioning failure, with unknown implications for human livelihood and well-being, let alone ecological viability. There is also no sound scientific basis for conducting the kind of genuinely integrated, integrated assessments that should be able to grapple with such outcomes.

This valuable collection of essays provides a basis for reflecting further on the theory and role of stakeholder dialogue. To begin with the notion of stakeholder may be misleading since key individuals or groups who may be absent do not declare their "stake". We may need to reflect on another set of names for participants. Power participants influence outcomes by virtue of their political bargaining strength or their economic ascendancy. Owners of resources and land have legal property rights that give them a variant of power. They do not need to be present to exert their stake. So they may not enter "dialogue". Illegal and corrupt interests may have huge bargaining power over regulators, non-governmental organisations and politicians. Again, they are neither present nor talking (and certainly not listening), yet they influence the "stake". Politicians influenced by the demands of established lobbies, or specialised entrants, may also not enter any dialogue, for they will have their own agendas. Citizens whose wellbeing may be influenced by a natural resources decision in say 20 years time, because of associated failure of ecosystem services, will fail to declare or even know of their interests, and hence not declare a "stake" or participate.

So the very notion of stakeholder needs careful attention in both theory and practice. Those who control the agenda need not be present: they are "second dimension" political interests. They are insidious because they infiltrate coalitions, enter into behind the scenes deals and adjust the biases in regulation, patterns of environmental quality or of natural resources sustainability.

The "third dimension" interests may simply not know what their long-term well-being might be, and how it might be affected by a set of natural resources decisions that could well affect their livelihoods and happiness. This is because we are only beginning to realise the wide range of arguments relating to alteration of ecosystem functioning that could result for a change in land use or climate change related factors. For example, the steady toxification of soil due to prolonged intensive agriculture, or because of "rained out" nutrients landing on catchments from air pollution would result in prolonged and indeterminate human health effects in two generations time. We do not know, but there is evidence for soil toxicologists that prolonged deterioration to ecosystems corrupted by toxic

additions, may result in food and water contamination that, as yet, has not been removed.

Meddling with ecosystem services can result in prolonged and pervasive long-term consequences for which communities involved are fully prepared. It is almost impossible to incorporate them in any stakeholder dialogue. They are wrapped in ignorance, and distracted by other demands on their attention to make room for dialogue. Even the heady application of the precautionary principle may not bring them in. Much as the precautionary principle has to recommend it for alerting future consequences via uncertain pathways, when the uncertainty is two generations away at least and the pathways worthy of a braided river, there is no feasible way of alerting their attention and encouraging effective involvement.

All this is telling us that the theory of stakeholder dialogues is skewed in two contrasting directions. On the one hand are the second dimension power absentees who manage the short term in their interests and set in train a huge array of possible damages to critical ecosystem functions. On the other there are the third dimension absentees whose "real future" interests are possibly affected by the steady breakdown of ecosystem services, yet who cannot sensibly get involved at a suitable point on the decision channelling.

The result is a heavily distorted picture of stakeholder dialogue that by no means guarantees either long-term sustainable outcomes or overall human well-being in resistant natural processes. Yet surely such an eminently desirable outcome is at least part of the purpose of stakeholder dialogues.

Hence it will be necessary to rechart the character of "interests inclusion" for future natural resource management and integrated assessments. There is no ready answer to how this can be addressed, but here are some thoughts on possible ways forward.

 Establish mechanisms for exploring long term consequences for ecosystem functioning arising out of all national resource decision making.

This could be done by a series of community-scientist-planner meeting arrangements designed to explore the likelihood of certain clusters of outcomes arising from particular natural resources, such as water use, coastal redesign in the face of sea level rise, soil care, and whole landscape sustainable stewardship. In essence, the aim would be to establish a setting for exploring a range of outcomes, and set these against the highest standards of sustaining nature and all identifiable social interests.

#### - Imaging scenarios with break points.

These scenarios of possible ecosystem functioning futures need to be shaped by a range of citizen's groups and science-regulatory interests operating a very free flowing manner. Such "floating" groups would deliberately target schools, young people (future residents) and those who may not immediately perceive their interests. The future images need to be realistic, challenging, fully supported by hypothesis and other conditions, and presented in such a way that the various future states are shared by the participant clusters acting in real "dialogue" of open ended creative learning.

#### - Exposing the power relations.

The scenario groups need to be enabled to become award of the layers of power that surround all natural resources decisions. This can be achieved by an equivalent set of "stories" of how power and interest coexist in natural resources management, who wields it and why, and what mechanisms are possible to incorporate new power relations into the setting. Such a precedent will rely on direct engagement by politicians and by knowledgeable insiders. Here is where the regulators and donors may play a role. It may be necessary to require the decision pathway to reduce such "power scenarios" as part of the political possibly legal framing of the ultimate decisions. In addition, such "power scenarios" may need to be talked through by special training and awareness raising sessions.

All of this may appear heavy handed. But in the context of possible long term damage to critical ecosystem functions, such a procedure may become a vital compliment of integrated assessment.

### - Sequential monitoring.

If the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment has any meaning, it is that biodiversity is losing out and that ecosystem nurturing of species, habitats and ultimately, humans, is diminishing. These important additions of stakeholder interest and dialogue are necessary if there is to be any serious assurance of functioning national processes in two generations' time. Hence regular monitoring, regular correction of initial decisions, regular dialogue amongst the two sets of scenario groups will be necessary if natural resources management is to be truly sustainable. Frankly there is far too much at stake now to shift the ripples so they actually reach a shore that is recreated by their energies.

### Index

```
Aarhus convention 263, 273
acceptance 71, 107, 117, 120, 124, 131, 141, 267f, 270, 273f, 283f, 306,
      317, 337, 354, 357
actors 17, 18, 25, 27, 29, 33, 54-56, 65-67, 72, 153, 159f, 188, 202, 213,
      235, 243ff, 248-251, 285-287, 307ff, 348ff
   churches 81, 310, 313
   communities 29, 86ff, 266ff, 280, 285, 304ff, 327ff, 353ff
   corporations 24f, 157, 220, 269, 368
   government agencies 142, 261f, 268
   non-governmental organisations (NGOs) 25, 43, 84f, 101, 103, 214ff,
      220f, 272, 287, 295, 307ff
   scientists 25, 32, 119, 176, 213ff, 241ff, 352, 360-362
adaptation 25, 177, 215f, 348f
alternative income 287, 294
arguments 4, 8, 24, 43, 69f, 213ff
Argyris and Schön 192
assessment
   Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) 201f, 256
   Integrated Assessment 17-19, 26, 153f, 173-177, 215f, 373-376
   stakeholder assessment 154, 162, 179
   Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) 241
   vulnerability assessment 221-223
ATEAM 221, 227, 231f
attitudes 6, 28, 45-49, 72, 121f, 164, 261, 331, 339
Bavaria 261ff, 349ff
Bayes
   Bayes' Theorem 56f
   Bayesian belief network 57-60, 225
   Bayesian learning 56f, 62
beliefs 31, 45, 48, 57f, 61, 69f, 110, 169, 176, 350
benefits
   benefit-cost analysis 159
biodiversity 29, 144, 224, 241ff, 261ff, 279, 304, 307, 326, 358, 376
   biodiversity conservation 40, 80, 323
bounded rationality 55, 159
capacity building 126, 132, 137, 139f, 274, 311, 317, 328
Chambers, Robert 86-88, 96, 104ff, 325, 340
change agents 84, 104
```

```
changing paradigms 51, 81, 109
CLEAR 26, 64, 176
climate change 25, 32, 69, 174f, 177, 201, 214ff, 348, 358, 367
coalition 63, 153, 159, 166, 168f, 178, 318, 374
cognitive science 188f
collective action 19, 65, 118, 153, 158
communication 50ff
   forums 21, 24, 213, 220ff, 231, 313, 318, 352
   intercultural communication 329, 365
community-based wildlife conservation 329
complexity 27, 30, 52, 68, 85, 104, 157, 165, 174, 188ff, 368
   complex problems 65, 71, 154, 214
compromise 9, 46, 65, 97, 163f
computer simulation 52, 158ff, 366
   Stella 171
   Vensim 171, 367
Conditional Probability Tables (CPT) 57, 60
   conflict management 71, 105, 247, 311, 359f, 368f
   conflict resolution 27, 153ff, 311, 366
   dispute resolution 163, 168
   environmental conflict 162f, 309, 366
   land-use conflict 327
conformity 49
consensus 3ff, 26, 52f, 69-71, 86ff, 118ff, 163ff, 226ff, 255, 305, 355
cooperation 156, 159f, 229
coordination 85, 305ff, 313
criteria 33, 43, 47, 62ff, 85, 117ff, 156ff, 229-231, 247, 251-253, 256, 269,
      273
cultures
   cultures of communication 3, 8, 357
   cultural studies 51
   professional cultures 31, 72
danger of localism 30, 96, 364f
decentralisation 80, 308, 386f,
decision
   decision analysis 62, 70, 158, 165, 176, 366
   decision making 3ff, 17, 21ff, 43ff, 64, 103, 118ff, 153ff, 196, 215,
      229, 245ff, 261ff, 306ff, 373, 375
   decision support systems (DSS) 20, 166, 177, 200, 366
   decision theory 179f
   group decision support 166
```

```
interactive decision-making 154ff
   multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) 62f, 70
   representative decision-making 17, 64
democracy
   deliberative democracy 7, 106
   democratic legitimisation 105
development
   development aid 83ff
   development cooperation 19, 279ff, 340, 364
   development discourse 79, 108
   participatory development 88ff
   sustainable development 24, 50, 142, 153f, 189, 215, 251ff, 313
dialogue
   corporate dialogues 24, 69
   Integrative Theory of Reflexive Dialogues 18ff, 43ff, 68, 234ff, 347ff
   multi-stakeholder dialogues for governance 24
   policy dialogues 24, 69, 355
   science-based stakeholder dialogues 24, 66, 155, 213ff, 351f, 355, 358,
      360
discussion 6, 26, 53ff, 129ff
economics 55, 159, 167ff
Ecuador 279ff
effectiveness 17, 83, 122, 138, 156, 230f, 283, 305, 368
efficiency 80ff, 107, 130f, 145, 156f, 165, 171, 230, 364
empowerment 28, 80ff, 107-109, 127, 143, 364f, 368
environmental
   environmental conflict 162f, 309, 366
   environmental education 273ff, 307, 328, 361f
   Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) 201f, 256
   Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) 241
equity 62, 89, 176
European Climate Forum (ECF) 220f, 231
European Union 262-264, 268, 275
evaluation
   goal-free evaluation 125
   outsider evaluation 126ff
   participatory evaluation 126ff, 230
   self-evaluation 127, 168, 366
   theory-based evaluation 124, 137f, 145
   user-based evaluation 125, 146
```

```
experts
   expert belief system 61
   expert knowledge 68, 347
facilitator 53, 66, 71, 87, 102, 104-106, 127ff, 256, 310ff, 338, 358ff, 366-
      368
Finland 241ff
fishery 153, 158, 162, 294
forestry 136, 224ff, 243ff, 261, 304ff, 350
Freire, Paulo 83, 103
gender 99, 305, 351
Germany 20, 137, 163, 200, 215ff, 244, 261ff, 338
groups
   focus groups 21, 64, 70, 135-137, 176-177, 331
   focus group interviews 331, 333, 338, 354
   group decision support 166
   group identity 46f
   group processes 44f, 104, 236, 355
   in-group 46f, 53, 68, 355
   local advisory group 202
   out-group 46-48, 53, 68f, 355
   target groups 66, 95, 104, 282ff, 329, 331, 348, 356, 359
Gunderson, Adolf 64, 74, 187, 189, 209
Habermas, Jürgen 6, 12f, 53, 64, 67, 105f, 113, 128f, 131, 138, 145, 351
Hardin, Garett 19, 35, 65, 97, 100, 153, 187
human cognitive capacity 196
human memory 196
ideal speech situation 53, 105, 128-131, 145
identity 44-48, 268, 312
ideology of oppression 84
illegal land clearance 282
information
   availability of information 306, 310, 365
   credibility of information 248, 361
   ecological information 245, 360
   Geographical Information Systems (GIS) 20, 194ff, 366f
   information processing 50, 196
   information production 47, 356
   scientific information 222, 245f, 258, 352
institutions 22, 30f, 43, 67, 93ff, 121ff, 156, 174-177, 192, 209, 214ff,
      283ff
Integrative Theory of Reflexive Dialogues 18ff, 43ff, 68, 234ff, 347ff
knowledge
```

```
indigenous knowledge 89
   knowledge bases 18, 25, 67f, 71, 347-349, 357, 367
   non-scientific knowledge 213f, 352
   lay knowledge 68, 347
   scientific knowledge 6f, 64, 68, 176, 213f, 241, 246, 256f, 347, 352
   web-based knowledge systems 64
land tenure 98, 306, 327
learning
   Bayesian learning 56ff, 162, 178, 358, 367
   collective learning 21, 189, 207
   e-learning 167ff
   inter-organisational learning 51
   joint learning 7, 133, 145, 196f
   Kolb's learning cycle 54, 190, 193, 355
   learning cycle 54, 189, 190-193, 207, 339, 355
   learning by doing 168, 339
   learning loops: single, double, and triple loop learning 54, 192
   mutual learning 84, 214
   organisational learning 44, 51, 54, 66, 72, 189, 314f, 355
   planning as learning 189, 206
   social learning 20, 69, 89, 121f, 173, 363f
legends 332, 350
liberation pedagogy 83
management
   adaptive management 17, 86, 122, 174, 224, 241, 340
   community forest management 279, 304ff
   conflict management 22, 71, 105, 246, 311, 314, 359f, 368f
   forest management 143, 217ff, 242ff, 304ff, 354, 359, 364-367
   natural resources management 17ff, 45ff, 121, 279, 307, 347ff, 376
mediation 105, 143, 154, 162ff, 366
   BATNA 64
mental models 25, 50, 52ff, 170ff, 193, 195, 225, 358, 367
methods 127, 165, 225, 358
models
   agent-based models 61, 154, 160, 169ff, 366f
   CIAM 174
   DICE 174
   FIRMA 176
   IMAGE 176
   mathematical models 54, 154
   mental models 25, 50, 52ff, 170ff, 193, 195, 225, 358, 367
   modelling 54, 61, 70, 86, 154, 157ff, 169ff, 218ff, 363ff
```

```
scale model 194f
   spatial model 162, 178
multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) 56, 62f, 70, 176
   NAIADE 63, 176
NATURA 2000 20, 243, 261ff, 349ff
natural resources management 17ff, 45ff, 121, 279, 307, 347ff, 376
   ecology 29, 68, 97, 245, 247, 341, 349
   flood management 196, 200, 207
   forest management 143, 217ff, 242ff, 304ff, 354, 359, 364-367
   forest protection 242ff
   GIS-based watershed management 199
   land and water management 187ff
   nature conservation 31, 71, 201, 234, 242, 247, 249, 254, 261ff, 340,
      349ff
   watershed monitoring 199
   wildlife management 143, 328f, 338, 350, 359, 363f
natural systems 55
negotiation 21, 55, 61, 89, 94, 98, 105, 107, 153ff, 207, 243, 252, 310,
      314, 320, 366
Netherlands, The 41, 188ff, 244
norms 7f, 45, 89, 97f, 110f, 156, 174
objectives 18, 310
Organisational Learning 44, 51, 54, 66, 72, 189, 314f, 355
opposition 31, 49, 94, 96, 108, 265ff, 349, 352
optimisation 85, 159, 165, 174
Ostrom, Elinor 19, 37, 58, 153, 184, 187, 210
outcomes
   outcome analysis 317
participation
   citizen participation 3, 21f, 140f, 143
   critiques of participation 96
   definitions of participation 88
   Future Search Conference 134ff
   institutions for participation 102
   participatory governance 155
   participatory planning 17, 208, 243, 302, 312, 359
   Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) 81, 86ff, 101ff, 312, 339, 359
   political participation 83, 92ff
   public consultation 269, 352
   stakeholder participation 23, 155, 187, 203, 231, 267
   typology of participation 79
perception
```

```
bias 125ff, 193, 235
   perception barriers 44
Philippines, The 188, 196f, 367
planning
   collaborative planning theories 63f, 138
   interactive planning process 194
   open planning process 205
   participatory planning workshops 312, 359
   planning as learning 189, 206
   planning cycle 191, 196, 202
   rational comprehensive planning 63
   spatial planning 124, 189, 194f, 204, 363
   sustainable land and water management planning 188, 192, 206f
poaching 283, 329, 337, 364
policy 3, 18, 64, 109, 117ff, 154ff, 174, 189, 214, 216, 241ff, 328, 347ff
   policy analysis 178, 189
   policy dialogues 24, 68, 142, 355, 358
   policy-making 17, 20, 58, 118ff, 176, 216, 221, 241, 361ff
   policy processes 20, 68, 118ff, 241, 352
post-normal science 12, 14, 213, 237
power 23, 27, 31, 63ff, 79, 107ff, 119ff, 145, 155ff, 264, 282, 297, 302,
      315, 318f, 351, 373
   empowerment 28, 80, 84, 89, 96ff, 107ff, 127ff, 135, 143, 364ff
   theories of power 65
   unequal power relationships 105, 108
preferences 3, 6f, 10, 31, 54f, 67, 120, 132, 139, 158f, 163ff, 219ff, 249,
      266
prejudices 48ff, 137, 155, 235, 355
prisoners' dilemma 159, 167, 187
procedural justice 100, 104, 365
processes
   group processes 44f, 76, 104, 149, 235, 355
   policy processes 20, 68, 118ff, 241ff, 352
project
   project cycle 90, 98
   project frame 100f, 305
property rights 23, 29, 31, 267, 273f
protected areas 29, 80, 121f, 202, 242ff, 253ff, 286f, 327, 336, 341, 361f
   national parks 173, 242, 248, 279ff, 325ff, 353ff
   strict nature reserves 242
   nature conservation areas 242, 254
psychology 46, 51, 124, 165, 168, 312
```

```
public-private partnership 305, 310
rationality
   rational actor 54f, 153, 159, 162
   Rational Actor Paradigm (RAP) 19, 55, 72, 159
   Rational Choice Theory 55, 67
reactance 50
reciprocity 65, 342
rural livelihoods 86, 273
science
   political utilization of science 248, 257f, 352
   public understanding of science 68, 351ff
   scientific community 231, 241, 245, 256ff, 349
   scientific information 222, 245, 258, 352
   scientific knowledge 6f, 64, 68, 176, 213, 241, 246, 256f, 347, 352
selection of participants 118, 221
self-organisation 69
Senge, Peter 18, 37, 51ff, 72, 76, 189, 210, 355, 370
social
   social audit 133ff, 151
   social capital 28, 65, 121f, 126, 150, 156, 184
   social categorisation 46
   social dilemma 47ff, 153, 187f
   social identity 44ff, 312
   social influence 49
   social interaction 120, 153, 162, 170f, 366
   social learning 20, 44, 69, 72, 89, 120ff, 173, 189, 363f
   social networks 126, 153, 156, 162
   social psychological theories 19, 44f, 66, 235, 355
socio-economic systems 55, 177
sociology 51, 55, 124
stakeholders
   stakeholder assessment 66, 153f, 162, 177, 179f, 367, 370
   stakeholder dialogues 17ff, 43ff, 79ff, 117ff, 154ff, 187ff, 213ff, 279,
      306, 310, 328f, 337, 347ff, 373ff
   stakeholder participation 23, 36, 155, 187, 203, 230, 267
stereotypes/stereotyping 47ff, 53, 69, 137, 313
structures 66ff, 347ff, 351
success
   success criteria 33f
   success factors 357, 369 (for stakeholder dialogues)
sustainability transition 21, 25, 153, 178, 215
sustainable
```

```
sustainable development 24, 50, 136, 142, 153f, 189, 215, 220, 251,
      255, 262, 274, 313
systems
   expert belief system 61
   natural systems 55
   socio-economic systems 55, 177
   systems theory 157f, 363, 366
   systems thinking 44, 51ff, 132, 139, 314
theories
   collaborative planning theories 63f, 138
   Control Theory 159
   Critical Theory 64, 124, 229
   Decision Theory 179f
   Dependency Theory 83
   Expected Utility Theory 55
   Game Theory 55f, 159f, 165ff, 179, 363, 366
   Integrative Theory of Reflexive Dialogues 18ff, 43ff, 68, 234ff, 347ff
   network theories 63, 65, 71
   Rational Choice Theory 55, 67
   Rational Comprehensive Planning 63
   Social Identity Theory 43, 46ff
   Stability Theory 158
   theories of democracy 64, 131
   theories of power 65
   theory-based evaluation 124, 137f, 145
   Theory of Communicative Action 6f, 64
   Theory of Psychological Reactance 50
   Viability Theory 161f, 179, 366
Third World countries 194
tools
   analytical tools 19, 33, 45, 70, 225ff, 235, 358, 366, 368
   communication tools 45, 64ff, 225ff, 235, 312, 347, 351, 358, 369
   geo-visualisation tools 188ff, 363
   Gossip Matrix Tool 314, 357
   internet tool 167
   tool development 33, 44, 363, 366, 369
top-down approach 87ff, 108, 121, 267f, 340
tourism 29, 92, 197, 218, 224, 233, 277, 282, 286ff
Tragedy of the Commons 19, 65, 97, 100, 187
training 18, 88, 274, 284ff, 305, 311, 319, 359ff, 376
transdisciplinarity 25, 213f, 222, 360
```

transparency 7, 88, 120, 127, 131, 145, 155, 174, 194, 203, 229ff, 273, 311, 329, 341, 353ff, 362

trust 24, 97, 235, 247ff, 271ff, 338, 347ff, 366

distrust 31f, 58, 103, 247f, 267f, 296, 329, 337, 340, 352ff, 361, 365, 369

trust building 19, 43, 51ff, 65f, 72, 132, 137ff, 235, 247, 355

Uganda 325ff, 350ff

ULYSSES 64, 174, 176, 234, 257, 339

uncertainty 4ff, 19, 32, 55ff, 161, 171ff, 233, 248, 352, 375

validation 157, 173ff

values 3ff, 22, 43ff, 58ff, 82, 106, 130, 134ff, 156, 159, 171ff, 192, 213, 242f, 247f, 268f, 320, 337, 348f, 362, 368

virtual 158, 170, 194

virtual landscape 166, 205ff

virtual reality 195

visualisation 18f, 187, 194, 203, 358

geo-visualisation tools 188, 350, 363

wildlife 31, 143, 201, 325ff, 350ff

World Bank 100, 287

Printing: Krips bv, Meppel Binding: Stürtz, Würzburg