

METHODOLOGY FOR THE STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVEMENT

WP5

D.5.1.1 ICARUS Methodology for the stakeholder involvement

A.5.1 Participatory process to enhance the intermodal connections

AUTHOR: LP ITL
Status: FINAL VERSION
Date: 5/11/2019

DISCLAIMER

This document reflects the author's views; the Programme authorities are not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	3
2	Scope of this document.....	3
3	Strategy design of the stakeholders' engagement	4
4	Identifying stakeholders.....	6
5	Levels of engagement	7
6	Defining the engagement process	10
7	Setting up the Quality Partnership for a seamless Mobility governance (QPM).....	11
8	Handling the QPM meetings	14
9	References.....	17
10	Annex.....	17

1 Introduction

The project ICARUS aims at improving the passenger intermodal connections in order to ease the access to the coast for the hinterland population by activating behavioural change in mobility. In particular, ICARUS aims at creating new intermodal solutions taking into consideration passengers' mobility needs while allowing the maximum flexibility for users. More specifically, 8 pilot projects and a case study will be implemented focusing on timetable harmonisation, car/bike sharing within transport nodes, ICT solutions for seamless flow of information, integrated intelligent multimodal payment systems, dynamic travel planning and cross-border intermodal services. The planned activities will be tested in the regions of Emilia-Romagna, Abruzzo, Veneto, Friuli Venezia Giulia, Primorsko-Goranska, Istrian Region and throughout the Croatian railway area.

The involvement of stakeholders is a fundamental step for realizing new intermodal solutions; indeed, passengers' habits and opinions are at the basis of the development of common solutions shaped on passengers' needs.

2 Scope of this document

The first objective of ICARUS is to activate a transnational policy learning dialogue and to improve the awareness of private transport operators and users in order to foster a behavioural change and create the condition for a mobility concept change. We must therefore create people's awareness in order to stimulate the dialogue and eventually make this behavioural change happen.

The second objective of ICARUS is to change mobility behaviours by educating people about sustainability related issues and enhancing the sense of community as a consequence of the use of intermodal transport solutions and sharing mobility. Once again, we must educate people about sustainability if we wish to create this sense of community and in the same time bringing them to change their mobility habits by switching to intermodal transport solutions and sharing mobility.

The involvement of stakeholders is clearly at the core of ICARUS and this document drafts a methodology of engagement with a common approach. Indeed, a strategic and shared approach to stakeholder involvement ensures that organisations are able to comprehend and respond to the full range of issues and challenges, avoiding many potential problems.

3 Strategy design of the stakeholders' engagement

The term “involvement” refers to the process of identifying and incorporating stakeholder concerns, needs and values in the transport decision-making process. It is a two-way communication process that provides a mechanism for exchanging information and promoting stakeholder interaction with the project team [Barta et al, 2004]. Stakeholders involvement is a continuous and systematic process by which an organization establishes a *constructive dialogue* and a *fruitful communication* with its key stakeholders. The purpose of involvement is to convey to decision makers' expectations and interests of stakeholders, so that they can take them into account in decision making. The involvement, providing input to power management processes and to assess the impact of operations on those who are affected, becomes a guiding element for learning and change across the organization. Its added value lies in the creative search for solutions that best fit the specific social and environmental context, the possibility of a confrontation on the field and in the monitoring of the transformations of social relations among all the players involved.

The following schemes represent the different phases of the process of involvement:



Figure 1 Involvement process (SULPITER, deliverable DT2.1.3) (2017)

More in detail:



Figure 2 Effective stakeholder engagement (SULPITER, DT2.1.1) (2016)

For an effective stakeholders engagement it is indeed important to manage the involvement with a circular process, with a view to continuous improvement:

1. Defining the engagement objectives consistent and integrated with the strategic project objectives (strategic vision/think strategically)
2. Including features and expectations of its stakeholders (planning and organisation/analyse and plan)
3. Increasing the ability to respond to the problems (strengthen engagement capacities)
4. Choosing the most appropriate mode/approach for involvement (action plan/design the process and engage)
5. Giving effective action in response to the findings from involvement in a responsible way towards stakeholders (feedback and reviews/act, review and report).

First thing is selecting the stakeholders and organize the whole process of engagement, which is divided in the following steps:

Table 1 Steps for stakeholder involvement, adapted from Sulpiter, deliverable DT2.1.3 (2017)

STEP		GOAL
Step 1	Strategy design	Strategic priorities for stakeholder involvement
Step 2	Mapping the stakeholders	To ensure that, as far as possible, all relevant stakeholders are identified
Step 3	Prioritizing the stakeholders	To select a cluster of stakeholders to involve in ICARUS activities and pilot actions
Step 4	Involve the stakeholders	Concreting involving stakeholders with face to face meetings

Depending on different situations, it is possible that the procedure is not applied in this strict sequence, indeed some activities may be carried out at the same time, while others require to return to the previous step in order to clarify or reconsider.

4 Identifying stakeholders

Relevant stakeholders are those individuals, groups of individuals or organisations that affect and/or could be affected by an organisation’s activities, products or services and by the associated performance with regard to the issues addressed by the engagement. An organisation may have many stakeholders, each with distinct attributes and often with diverse and conflicting interests and concerns. Establishing a methodology for systematically identifying stakeholder groups that can contribute to achieving the purpose of the engagement and/or could be affected by its outcome is fundamental to the engagement process.

Organizations should profile stakeholder groups as well as individual stakeholder representatives according to the following features:

Table 2 Stakeholder identification (SULPITER, DT2.1.1) (2016)

Knowledge of the issues associated with the purpose and scope of the engagement	Expectations of the engagement	Existing relationship with the organization (close or distant, formal or informal, positive or negative)
Dependence on the organization	Willingness to engage	Level of influence
Type (civil society, government, consumer, etc.)	Cultural context	Geographical scale of operation
Capacity to engage (e.g. language barriers, IT literacy, disability)	Legitimacy and representation	Relationships with other stakeholders

5 Levels of engagement

The purpose of this activity is to understand if and how to develop the relationships with the various actors, indeed, the degree of involvement may widely vary from a stakeholder to another. In general, a low level such as monitoring or informing may be suitable for solving minor issues, while a higher level is adequate to address more important and difficult challenges.

In the following table, the different levels of engagement are reported from the more passive to the more active. To be precise, the first three levels (passive, monitor and inform) are not really engagements as such, but they represent the basis for the successive ones.

Table 3 Different level of engagement, Adapted from Forstater et al (2015)

LEVEL	GOAL	COMMUNICATION	NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP	ENGAGEMENT TOOLS
Remain passive	No goal. No engagement	No active communication	No relationship	Stakeholder concern expressed through protest, letters, media, websites, etc., or pressure on regulatory bodies and

LEVEL	GOAL	COMMUNICATION	NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP	ENGAGEMENT TOOLS
				other advocacy efforts.
Monitor	Monitor stakeholders' view	One-way. Stakeholder to team project	No relationship	Media and internet tracking. Second-hand reports from other stakeholders possibly via targeted interviews.
Inform	Inform and educate stakeholders	One-way: team project to stakeholder, there is no invitation to reply	Short or long term relationship with stakeholders	Bulletins and letters. Brochures, reports and websites. Speeches, conferences and public meeting. Press releases, press conference and media advertising.
Transact	Work together in a contractual relationship where one partner directs the objectives and provides funding	Limited two-way: setting and monitoring performance according to terms of contract	Relationship terms set by contractual agreement	Public Private partnerships and Private Finance Initiatives, Grant-making, cause related marketing
Consult	Gain information and feedback from stakeholders to inform decisions made internally	Limited two-way: team project asks questions and the stakeholders answer	Short or long-term involvement	Surveys. Public meetings and workshops. Stakeholder advisory panels. On-line feedback and discussion.

LEVEL	GOAL	COMMUNICATION	NATURE OF RELATIONSHIP	ENGAGEMENT TOOLS
Involve	Work directly with stakeholders to ensure that their concerns are fully understood and considered in decision-making	Two-way between team project and stakeholders. Learning takes place on both sides. Stakeholders and team take action individually	May be one-off or longer-term engagement	Round tables and stakeholder advisory panels. Consensus building processes. Participatory decision making-processes.
Collaborate	Partner with or convene a network of stakeholders to develop mutually agreed solutions and joint plan of action	Two-way between team project and stakeholders. Learning, negotiation, and decision making on both sides. Stakeholders work together to take action.	Long term	Joint projects, multi-stakeholder Initiatives, Partnerships
Empower	Delegate decision-making on a particular issue to stakeholders.	New organisational forms of accountability: stakeholders have formal role in governance of an organisation or decisions are delegated out to stakeholders.	Long term	Integration of Stakeholders into Governance Structure

Effective engagements are usually a combination of approaches from different levels, and informing is an essential part of most higher level engagements like consultation or collaboration. A key difference between the low levels and the high levels of engagement is the amount of the available resources (knowledge, human resources, operation capacities, finances or influence on others) for the achievement of a shared objective [Forstater et al, 2015]. Therefore, the approach depends on the strategic aims that are defined during the initial phase of the project and the maturity of the issue. For example, if a matter is still “latent”, a monitoring action may be sufficient but if it is consolidated or even institutionalised, it is

necessary to involve and collaborate with a wide range of stakeholders. It is important to highlight that this is not a final distinction, since it can be reviewed during the process, but it is helpful in order to choose the best type of tools and technique for the engagement.

6 Defining the engagement process

The level of engagement that we are looking for in ICARUS is a combination of involvement, collaboration and consultation, for we want to work directly with stakeholders as their concerns and their needs must be fully understood and considered.

The following checklist will help us control that all the actions of the engagement process are accomplished.

- **Overview:** it explains the reason and the scope of the engagement process, the aims, the involvement methods to be used for each stakeholder group. Moreover, this section reports the desired outcome and how they are related to the strategic objectives.
- **Preparation:** the communication strategy should use networks, relevant medias and mailing lists in order to invite the stakeholders, being careful of cultural differences, customs and languages. The pre-information should be provided in good time and included substantive issues and practical information; the time dedicated to this activity should not be underestimated.
- **Ground rules:** procedural and behavioural rules and terms of reference should be established at the outset to ensure a good engagement process, with possible subsequent changes. Some examples: avoid assigning, beliefs or motives to others; honour each person's right to "pass" if he is not ready or willing to speak; allow others to state their viewpoint completely; respect all confidentiality or anonymity requests; stay focused on the topic that is the subject of the agreement.
- **Logistics:** where and when will the engagement take place? Is the location convenient and accessible by public and private transportation? Does the timing fit in with stakeholders' other commitments?
- **Record keeping and assurance:** the attendees, the proceedings, the outcomes and any commitments have to be recorded because they may come in handy during the follow-up phase.
- **Signals of success:** engagement course, participant numbers, participant feedback, media coverage and consensus reached are some indicators used to evaluate if the process has been successful.

- Risk anticipation: the project team should imagine what might happen if stakeholder expectations are not met, or if something else goes off course, and it should invent some contingency plan.

7 Setting up the Quality Partnership for a seamless Mobility governance (QPM)

Identifying ICARUS stakeholders and understanding their potential role and position in the process is important to achieve the overall goals of sustainable mobility planning.

ICARUS foresees the establishment of a Quality Partnership for a seamless Mobility governance (QPM) in each region, i.e. a group of regional stakeholders made of key players with different profiles (public, transport operators, etc.) to discuss problems with and propose solutions. These types of meetings are very different from the “Behavioural change events” and “Dissemination events” (see Annex for more explanation on the differences). The setting up task is to identify all relevant stakeholders as well as their objectives, their power and capacities contributing to seamless mobility solutions’ proposals that need to be included into the process of development of passengers’ intermodal connections.

Participation of stakeholders is needed for:

- Knowing the stakeholders,
- Knowing and understanding their habits and needs,
- Options and their feasibility,
- Acceptance of results and measures.

The participative process must involve private operators, public authorities, trade associations and users.

Typical stakeholder groups involved in transport projects

Public sector	Local authorities Local transport authorities Regional authority
---------------	--

	Traffic police Other local/regional transport bodies
Private sector	Transport operators/providers Sectoral agencies Logistic and goods transport associations Trade associations Industry associations

For the Public sector, it is important to identify:

- Town/regional planners, transport specialists
- Infrastructure and (public) service providers
- Regional development agencies
- Regional innovation agencies
- Education and training associations/universities/research institutes

When analyzing potential stakeholders, there is the need to identify which relevant responsibility is in which authority.

Local administrations have an institutional role in the organization and development of passenger transport and must therefore be involved, given that there may be a political will to deliver more sustainable and efficient mobility solutions. In particular, we need to work with those who have a responsibility in:

- Traffic management
- Transport policies
- Environmental care and emission control.

These responsibilities may be spread across several divisions of the administration and may also be found in departments of economic development and promotion. However, key questions to any local administration will be:

- *Does a mobility plan exist?*

- *Does it explicitly cover passengers transport?*
- *Does it suggest/set environmental and sustainable measures? If yes, which ones?*

The department of the administration that has set up such a plan is of course a key stakeholder.

Together with local administrations, municipalities and neighbouring local municipalities shall also be considered and involved, and of course, the regional administrations, as they represent the wider territorial scale in which passengers' mobility happen every day.

Given the aim of shaping new mobility solutions, education and innovation are also at the core of ICARUS and thus regional innovation agencies, development agencies and education and training associations must be actively involved in the stakeholders groups.

Other local/regional transport bodies or associations may also be key stakeholders when searching for new mobility solutions, there actually could be more than the "obvious", therefore it is strongly recommended to search the whole range of organizations.

As for the private sector, we need stakeholders that represent the relevant regional mobility activities and that are eager or willing to debate them. Diversity is important; therefore, we should find a list of possible categories of stakeholders that may be relevant.

There are the transport operators and providers and the transport/trade/industry associations, the sharing mobility providers (bike sharing in particular) and the ICT developers, key stakeholders for the realization of ICT solutions for seamless flow of information, integrated intelligent multimodal payment systems and dynamic travel planning.

But most importantly, there are the private users. Common citizens, the general public, every-day-users of transports whose needs and habits must be heard, understood and discussed in order to tailor efficient solutions. It is a bottom up approach, from the people needs to the local/regional policies. However, users shall not only be heard but they shall also be educated, awareness must be raised among all different stakeholders in order to stimulate a constructive dialogue and create a sense of community.

Therefore, key stakeholders selected for the QPM should be:

- Practically minded
- Open to discussion
- Interested in improving their service (for transport providers/operators)
- Interested in listening to passengers needs (for policy makers/administrators)
- Willing to look into medium and long term issues

- Willing to deal openly with the topic of competition
- Willing to collaborate for testing new seamless solutions
- Have good communication skills

8 Handling the QPM meetings

Expectation

The QPM (Quality Partnership) should meet twice in each region, possibly when planning and developing the pilot actions. These meetings can:

- discuss any regional passengers' connections mobility related topic, adding new viewpoints or aspects,
- produce new ideas of seamless solutions or suggest improvements,
- show the interests of individual stakeholders or groups of stakeholders in a topic,
- make a decision to work towards a specific target,
- make weak points in the project work surface in time and help to improve them,
- decide about topics/mobility solutions which are finalized.

There are however limitations to what a single meeting can achieve: usually, during a single meeting, an assembly will not come up with an idea, define it in an operative way and then already decide about it. Thus, if a decision is needed, input must be provided to decide upon. This input may then be improved through debate, changed, or even discarded completely by the members of the Quality Partnership.

As for the discussion among stakeholders, participants can make suggestions about how to proceed and with whom to proceed, but they cannot make the decision to operate anything that needs the formal involvement of individual institutions. This must be negotiated between the meetings and will with all likelihood include other people as well as other institutions. It is important to keep records of these meetings, whatever informal they may be.

Knowledge

The more people learn about a topic they are interested in, the more it may appear to them that there still is quite a lot they do not know at all. This means that knowledgeable people may be rather modest in relation to their knowledge (for instance: policy makers or transport service providers), while people with

just some partial bits of knowledge may well be rather outspoken about their perceived insights (for instance, the general public/citizens/passengers). For this reason, education on sustainability topics and on ICARUS objectives shall always be considered so that all stakeholders are equally aware of the purpose of the meetings.

Passengers' mobility can be a complex field, with conflicting interests and with more aspects than one would expect at first. During the work of the Quality Partnership, it therefore may become obvious to some that the view of this or that stakeholder does not consider important aspects, simply because that person did not think about them. This is a perfectly normal situation and must be handled by the moderator, i.e. the organizer. Usually, it is enough not to pursue the issue further – most participants will understand the situation. The affected person may find it easier to adopt some of the other participants' wisdom if not publicly urged.

In this context it should be mentioned that there is a general tendency among people to take their own view of a topic for the whole thing, or at least for the heart of the matter. That means they believe to have an overview, just because they are knowledgeable about their own professional field. The risk is to completely blank out the problems that will arise, just because such problems may root in another field. Within a Quality Partnership, other professional views will be added, and thus the individual view may be enlarged. Therefore, there often is no need to correct such a standpoint explicitly. The sum of views and standpoints will broaden all viewpoints, of course including those of the organizers.

Active interest of participants

The members of the Quality Partnership will join for various reasons and motives. While active interest is what the QPM needs, it cannot always be taken for granted. Worse than that, a lack of active interest may not be openly stated. In practice, if a participant has no active interest for continuation, a typical action may be to send a deputy to the next meeting and an excuse to a follow up. The best answer is to check whether any other potential participants would be originally interested, and how to approach them. Also, it is a good idea to check the own agenda: are there topics ahead which are more interesting? Can we sharpen the agenda in their interest? Else, the lack of interest will usually mean that sooner or later there will not be a reasonably strong consortium to do anything reasonably. When dealing with the real interest of participants, a clear structuring of the agenda often helps. Summarizing and explicitly asking for solutions can also be useful.

Political support

The Quality Partnership needs active political support from at least some key public stakeholders. However, over time the political support may diminish or disappear. This may happen, for instance, for a change in policy (e.g., there may be a new local administration and new people may go for their own

agenda). It makes sense to check out whether the work of the Quality Partnership could actually be helpful also to new political stakeholders, and how to make them aware of it.

Documentation

A clear documentation of the meetings is a must and a key responsibility. It should therefore remain in the hands of the organizers. Of course, members of the QPM should have the chance to add aspects.

- Keep the documentation short enough to be read by decision makers.
- Name the results and the key arguments (pro and con) that lead to them, so that all participants find their main viewpoints and interests reflected.
- Meandering debates should be brought to the point and summarized.
- Include a list of next steps and responsibilities.

9 References

Barta F., Hossinger R., Jones P., Kelly J., Witte A and Wolf A. C. (2004), Successful transport decision-making - A project management and stakeholder engagement handbook, Volume 1-2, GUIDEMAPS consortium.

Forstater M., Krick T., Monaghan P. and Sillanpää M. (2015), *The stakeholder engagement manual – Volume 2: the practitioner’s handbook on the stakeholder engagement*, AccountAbility, United Nations Environment Programme and Stakeholder Research Associates.

SULPITER (“Sustainable Urban Logistics Planning To Enhance Regional freight transport” supported by the “Interreg Central Europe Program”) (2017): deliverable DT2.1.3 “*Strategy for stakeholders engagement in SULPS FUAs development*”

SULPITER (“Sustainable Urban Logistics Planning To Enhance Regional freight transport” supported by the “Interreg Central Europe Program”) (2016): deliverable DT2.1.1 “*Template for mapping of FUAs mobility stakeholders*”

10 Annex

ICARUS foresees many events and meetings, which have a direct impact on the project objectives and the achievement of the targets. The table below summarises the events, description, main target groups and overall target broken down for each partner.

Table 4 Explanation of meetings and events in ICARUS. Testing partners are FVG, VIU, HZPP, KIP, RER, IDA, CMVE, ARAP.

Deliverable nr & title	Description and expected outcome	Target groups	Target
D.4.3.3 Behavioral change events	To ease the behavioral change to an intermodal seamless mobility. Meetings, workshops and lectures/presentations for students towards the modal shift Expected outcome: Targeted to behavioural change. They do not necessarily depend on the pilot. Allocated budget can be used for experts or other catching format.	General Public Regional development agencies Enterprises, transport operators including operators of multimodal logistics hubs, infrastructure providers Transport associations Regional innovation agencies NGOs	Overall target: 24 (3 for each testing partners)

Deliverable nr & title	Description and expected outcome	Target groups	Target
	<i>The main targets are users and public.</i>	Education and training organizations as well as universities and research institutes	
D.5.1.3 QPM meetings	<p>Work groups at local level (identified in D.5.1.3). ICARUS will share the activities carried out and discuss how to achieve the project results</p> <p>Expected outcome: The QPM Meetings should give input for the activities of WP5 (policy action plans, position paper, policy recommendation to SUMP, local policies and Macro Regional Strategies). <i>Main targets are policy makers, municipalities, experts, etc.</i></p>	<p>Local, Regional and national public authorities</p> <p>Regional development agencies</p> <p>Enterprises, transport operators including operators of multimodal logistics hubs, infrastructure providers</p> <p>Transport associations</p> <p>Regional innovation agencies</p> <p>NGOs</p> <p>Education and training organizations as well as universities and research institutes</p>	Overall target: 16 (2 per testing partners)
D.2.3.8 Dissemination events in the ICARUS territories	<p>Local dissemination activities</p> <p>Expected outcome: Communication and promotional purposes</p>	All target groups	Overall target:8 (1 for each testing partner)