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Do we take time to get to know who we are? A fundamental step in every trust-building relationship!

Who we are

1. To get to know and understand the other (who I am)
2. Conversations about roles (what I do)
3. Requests, promises: most conversations here (what we do together)
A brief exercise to get to know one another

It does not hurt to start our gatherings with some kind of playful conversation/interaction. We relax and feel we can take part and a sense of group might start building up.
This Session

- Introduction and your objectives/expectations
- Why stakeholder engagement - the case of MAPS Programme
- How - main steps in designing and implementing a participatory process
- Q&A
- Evaluation

It is crucial that we know what is it that we want to do together (expectations) and that we are flexible to accommodate other contents / emphasis.
Your objectives / expectations (for this session)

This is a central issue in constructive participation, conflict prevention and management!

1. Why have stakeholder engagement in LEDS?
2. What would you like to achieve today? Themes you would like to cover?
Rules of the game?

- We learn by doing, by experiencing
- We as facilitators (more than lecturers); your experience is central

- Mobiles, computers… screens!
- Participation - order in interventions
- Notes, minutes…
- Confidentiality?
- Hierarchies
- ¿Others?

Do we identify and AGREE on rules of the game at the very beginning of our processes?
Before continuing – what are our relevant beliefs (paradigms)?

Are we aware and respectful of our beliefs (principles, values) – mine and the others’?
A BIT OF CONTEXT
The case of MAPS Programme

WHY AND WHAT STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT
Stakeholder engagement in knowledge creation: MAPS experience
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Mitigation Action Plans and Scenarios
MAPS Programme

- Collaborative Programme Global South
- Generate & share knowledge, ways of working and ideas
- Strong focus on country leadership and sovereignty
- Local circumstance and needs paramount
- A general approach versus imposing a strict methodology:
  - different ways of approaching stakeholder engagement and structure of process between the countries according to the government needs, goals, way country is structured
  - collaboration and cross pollination between countries = evolving way of doing things
Generation of knowledge

The generation of relevant knowledge is useful and needed to inform policy decisions.

So how to produce this in the best way:

- **Co-creation** of knowledge: buy-in, ownership, rigour
- Having the right people in the room
- Rules of the game: structure and trust
- **Conflict**: the real conversations
- Impartial **facilitator** to lead the discussions
- **The Journey is the Destination**

Credible and Relevant evidence and options to policy makers
MAPS Process

Governmental Steering Committee (mandate)

Report

High-Level Stakeholders

Final Report

Government

Process design differs from country to country to accommodate national circumstances & culture.
Form of Stakeholder engagement

- Steering committees (government)
- Executive committees
- Scenario building teams (industry, government, civil society)
- Technical working groups (industry, government, civil society)
- Consultants

Mitigation actions
- MAC curves
- Co-benefits / co-impacts
- Baseline scenarios
- Mitigation scenarios
- Required by science scenario
- Required by equity scenario
- Macroeconomic modelling
- Knowledge management platforms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAPS Approach</th>
<th>Country specific, responsive not prescriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPROACH NOT METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>Multi-ministerial mandate, legitimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY LED</td>
<td>Country: stakeholders, researchers. Collaboration: input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>Consultative, multiple viewpoints, relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITATED PROCESS</td>
<td>Local researchers, development focus, credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN COMMUNITY</td>
<td>Capacity building within country and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLABORATION &amp; SUPPORT</td>
<td>Informed targets and decisions. More viable implementation, achievable targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVIDENCE</td>
<td>Evolving best practice, learning by doing, out the box</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank You

www.mapsprogramme.org

Who Supports MAPS

[Logos of supporting organizations]
STEPS IN A STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PROCESS
Main Steps

1. Getting a mandate
2. Building up a team
3. Defining and implementing governance structure
4. Identifying and gathering stakeholders
5. Rules of the game
6. Designing a process
7. Preventing and managing conflicts
8. Evaluating
Mandate

• Why? What for?
• How?
• Who?

There must be a high-level demand – sense of ownership – of what we are doing and of the eventual results.
Building up a team

• We cannot give what we don’t have…
• There is an undeniable relationship between the “micro” and the “macro”.

It is fundamental to have a good “team spirit” with a reasonable capacity to prevent and manage internal conflicts.
GOD BLESS OUR ORGANIZATION!

HOW WE LOOK...

HOW WE WORK...
Governance

- Many actors
- Most of the time poor inter-institutional coordination/communication
- Competition; not good history of cross-ministerial collaboration
- Anticipate issues; eg change in Administration…

Governance must be agreed upon as early as possible with all main actors. Roles have to be as explicit as possible.
Final decisions

Inter-ministerial steering committee

14 people from 7 Ministries

Suggestions and inputs for decisions

Scenario building team

60 people from public, private, academic, NGOs and consultants.

SC and professional team also part of the SBT.

Information, data inputs and sectoral experience

Technical working groups

40 people from each sector invited to technical meetings: electricity, transportation, industry and mining, CPR, wastes, forest, agriculture and livestock

Sectoral modelling

Sectoral consultants

6 consultant teams, over 50 people altogether

Design, analysis, review, coordination

Professional team MAPS Chile

14 professionals from different backgrounds

Multiple iterations
Stakeholders

• Who in the room – selection
  – Who decides
  – Criteria; various ways
  – Who invites
• What “format”: advisory group, expert group, technical groups, steering committee…
• Many challenges: people not in the room; trust; competing interests, costs / payments?, etc.
• Civil society participation

Personal contact with each participant is important right from the beginning; each of them need to have a perception that there are concrete benefits of participating.
Exercise

• For the selected LEDS initiatives, in your table:
  – Identify a list of **key stakeholder groups**
  – Think of possible **risks** of involving each group in the context of the LEDS initiative under analysis
  – List this in a table

• 15 min
Rules of the game

- To define roles, rights and duties
- To anticipate complicated issues and ways forward
- Examples: membership, decision-making, the media, confidentiality, publications, etc.
- In MAPS Chile we had rules of the game defined and agreed for:
  - Steering committee
  - Scenario building team
  - Technical working groups

Important that all actors know the rules of the game, and ideally approve them.
Designing a process...

- A good blend of information/data (thinking), interactions (feeling) and procedures (will).
- A sense of rhythm (frequency)
- Process must be designed collectively by research and process teams: process has to be at the service of the research and vice versa.

We need to combine an important effort to have a comprehensive plan/design with a flexible attitude to modify it as required. In this sense, the design has to be “organic”.
### Preventing and managing conflicts

- **Differences and conflicts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Excess</th>
<th>Lack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ideas and information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to cooperate and listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordered, chaotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**thinking**

**feeling**

**willing**
Preventing and managing conflicts

• Differences and conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Excess</th>
<th>Lack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Trees don’t let us see the forest</td>
<td>Speculation, arbitrariness, lack of credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ideas and information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Emociones desbordadas, excesiva polaridad, ineficiencia</td>
<td>Not alive, poor creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to cooperate and listen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Rígido, hiper sistemático, inflexible, burocrático</td>
<td>Without direction; going in circles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordered, chaotic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers to constructive participation and conflict prevention/management - our distorted perceptions
# Quick exercise

A stakeholder says the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Data</th>
<th>B. Value</th>
<th>C. Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My trucking business will suffer if you impose a carbon constraint on the sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I don't believe in climate change and oppose your attempt to constrain my business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The cost of solar isn’t that low, it’s far more expensive and not practical for this industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nuclear energy stinks and should not under any circumstances be part of the energy mix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think the oil price will go back to $100pb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. At a price of $0.60 for a unit of fuel, we go out of business, so a carbon tax that increases the cost to that level will be lethal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating

• How was the information/data, the contents
• How was the interaction, the relationships
• How were the procedures, methods and tools used

Evaluation should be done at all levels and right from the beginning (no need to wait until the end!).
In essence what is it that we are doing...

A Process of Change

- Gradual
- Organized
- Transparent
- Informed
- Creative
- Respectful
- Inclusive

How do we change? What are our essential human faculties crucial in processes of change?

- Our thinking: contents, data (information)
- Our feeling: interaction, relationships (values)
- Our will: procedures (interests)

A perception must exist that we give AND receive something valuable... a trust-building relationship