

APPENDIX 2. RECONSTRUCTION TABLES

When used below in connection with a number, the following letters refer to a guidebook: A = d’Aquino (2008), B&C = Beierle and Cayford (2002), C = Creighton (2005), M = Mazri (2007), and S&F = Stern and Fineberg (1996). The numbers used with them refer to a step or substep in that guidebook. The other abbreviations refer to steps that have been reconstructed in the text of this article in the sections on decision analysis (DA), stakeholder analysis (SA), and public participation (PP).

Table A2-1. Decision analysis.

Reconstructed summary step	Deconstructed steps	Thoughts on differences and similarities in the summarized deconstructed steps	Application of reconstructed step to water management
DA 1: Assemble a team for decision analysis as part of the participation design.	C1: Decide who needs to be involved in decision analysis.	Only Creighton at this early point explicitly advises the creation of a design team that cuts across organizational sections. Stern and Fineberg also talk about this in their Step 6, noting that such a cross-sectorial task force should be built early in the process. D’Aquino and Beierle and Cayford do not seem opposed even though they do not mention the point. This, of course, does not mean that they would be in favor either; we address this problem in the discussion. Only Mazri seems to have difficulty imagining such a team, because his description is based on a situation in which one analyst or consultant cooperates closely with one decision maker. Nevertheless, Mazri recommends a little later in his Stage 2 that the lead agency “reflect on the resources of the decision maker ... and consider the possibility of increasing them by notably enlarging the composition of the work teams that he would like to involve.”	The team members should belong to the lead agency, e.g., the water board, but can also include stakeholders if this appears useful for the following steps. They may be needed for decision analysis as, e.g., modeling experts, technical implementers, and facilitators, and in general as supporters for the participation process to be designed.
DA 2: Fix objectives on various levels.	A1: Determine the minimum, short-, mid-, and long-term objectives of the intervention. B&C3: Identify the goals of the participation process that is to be designed. C3: Determine the decision being made or the question being answered. M1: The consultant understands the “resources” and	The substeps summarized here are of course not exactly the same, but they are all about determining objectives from the point of view of the lead agency. As d’Aquino’s point clarifies, objectives can be short, mid, and long term. This is possibly also reflected in the differing foci of the other authors: Stern and Fineberg as well as Beierle and Cayford advise planners to consider the problem that needs to be solved. However, the latter also point toward larger social goals that the participation process may want to address. Creighton urges planners to consider what decision needs to be made, although he does not really seem to distinguish much between “problem” and	This step consists in asking: From our point of view as lead agency, what are the problems, e.g., depleting aquifers or the need to take action on water quality issues, to be solved? What are the decisions, e.g., developing a water management plan, to be made? What are the possible purposes, e.g., gaining the support of the stakeholders for the measures to be taken, of the participation process? What is the possible purpose, e.g., to achieve a sustainable water management situation, of the decision?

	interests of the decision maker.	"decision." Mazri seems to go beyond determining objectives when he requests the analyst to understand the interests and resources of the decision maker.	
	S&F1: Understand what is posing the risk.		
DA 3: Determine which stakeholders are to be involved or affected by the decision.	A2: Identify the groups that need to be involved.	This is a first look by the decision analysis team at potential stakeholders to involve in the decision-making process. Later, during stakeholder analysis, this step will be carried out again in more depth. Some authors, e.g., Creighton, emphasize the importance of involving high-level decision makers; others do not, although they do not advise against it either. Stern and Fineberg appear to go further than the other authors by advising that nonhuman actors should be considered.	Ask: Who are the actors that are likely to be interested in or affected by the problems under consideration and the decision to be made? This can also be extended to nonhuman stakeholders such as ecological systems and future generations.
	B&C4: Identify the "public."		
	C2: Clarify who the decision maker will be.		
	C4: Consider who the potential stakeholders are.		
	M2: The analyst understands which stakeholders should be considered.		
	S&F2: Understand who or what is exposed.		
DA 4: Outline potential stakeholder views related to objectives.	B&C5: Identify the goals of the public/stakeholders.	In this step, the decision analysis team considers the points of view of potential stakeholders. As in the previous step, some authors, e.g., Beierle and Cayford, refer to this step only briefly, whereas others, such as Creighton, Stern and Fineberg, and Mazri, focus on it. D'Aquino does not mention this step at all, nor does he advise against it. Creighton and Stern and Fineberg emphasize the importance of this step for avoiding trouble with stakeholders later on in the process.	Consider what stakeholder views could be with regard to the proposed objectives and the issues that were evoked in DA 2. This is not yet to be a fully fledged stakeholder analysis, only a preliminary sketch. It should be also noted that, even though DA 3 and DA 4 have been separated here in practice, it is advisable to carry them out simultaneously, because specific issues may point toward specific stakeholders and vice versa. The questions to be asked here would be: What interests of the stakeholders are affected with regard to the perceived problems or the envisaged decisions? What goals are stakeholders likely to pursue when they become involved? From what perspectives would the different stakeholders see the problem/decision as it is framed now and what framing would they see as appropriate?
	C5: Find out ahead of time how stakeholders view the problem/question that needs to be addressed.		
	M3: The analyst understand the interests and resources of the stakeholders.		
	S&F3: Understand which harms characterization must address for it to be accepted as sufficiently thorough.		
DA 5: Integrate these stakeholder views into the initial formulation or framing of the problem.	C6: Build the stakeholders' views into problem formulation.	As in DA 2, in which objectives were first determined, not all authors talk about the same level of objectives, but they all seem to at least imply that potential stakeholder views should be considered at this point to either broaden the problem formulation (Creighton), adjust the goal of the participation process (Mazri, Stern and Fineberg), preliminarily determine its topics of debate (Mazri), or define the decision to be made and its purpose. Although Stern and Fineberg do not explicitly advise in S&F7 and S&F8 the lead agency to consider potential stakeholder	The stakeholder views that were previously considered are now built into the objectives, political and resource constraints permitting. The basic idea is to take into account assumed and already known stakeholder opinions so that stakeholders are not disappointed later. It is especially important to consider the views of high-level decision makers and other agencies that may have some shared decision-making authority. For a water authority, this could mean considering the views of provincial and ministerial officials, land-use planners, and other authorities such as park and wildlife
	M4: The decision maker determines the topics to be debated in the participation process.		
	M5: The decision maker determines the overall objectives of the		

	participation process.	opinions, these steps follow another one in which they look at who is exposed to a risk (S&F 2), so their consideration of potential stakeholder views can be assumed at this point. Beierle and Cayford, even though they do not explicitly recommend taking this step, can be assumed to support it through the opinion expressed in B&C2.	managers.
	S&F7: Describe the purpose of the risk decision.		
	S&F8: Describe the purpose of the risk characterization.		
DA 6: Identify potential barriers or preconditions to working with stakeholders.	A3: Determine the preconditions for each target group before work starts. B&C6: Identify barriers to goal achievement.	Only d'Aquino and Beierle and Cayford mention this step at this point in the process design; Creighton's step C9 is different because it is more about checking whether conditions inside the lead agency exist that make the participation process impossible. This step seems complementary to what Creighton, Mazri, and Stern and Fineberg propose because those authors in general advise considering stakeholder needs.	Analyze what competencies stakeholders need before the participation process starts in terms of their motivation, knowledge, and practical capacities so that they will be able to effectively participate.
Additional step: Determine the change objectives of the intervention for the different target groups.	A4: Determine the change objectives of the intervention regarding the different target groups.	Only d'Aquino mentions this step. It makes sense when the planned intervention includes the empowerment of the stakeholders or when there is some other change objective with regard to the involved parties.	In European water management, e.g., the drawing up of a management plan, this would be a rather unusual step because water authorities do not usually fix objectives of change for social groups. However, it may apply in specific cases, such as when a water authority wants to encourage certain stakeholder groups to become more involved in long-term water governance.
Additional step: Determine what capacities the target groups will still need to acquire after the intervention.	A5: Determine what capacities the target groups will still need to acquire after the intervention.	Only d'Aquino mentions this step. It would be useful when there is a series of interventions.	This could be a suitable question for a water manager if there is, for example, the intention to move toward a more stakeholder-driven administration of water bodies in the long term.
DA 7: Clarify the existing knowledge about the physical system.	S&F4: Understand the state of knowledge about the risk.	The other authors do not really mention this step explicitly in this early phase of decision analysis. However, it does not seem in contradiction with what they say, e.g., d'Aquino talks about the need to assess preconditions before working with the stakeholders and Creighton in C7 and C8 urges designers to check what additional knowledge they still need to acquire before dealing with the public.	Determine what studies, models, and action plans for the system already exist and create a preliminary synthesis of state-of-the-art knowledge on the system. In many water management processes, including the development of water basin management plans, careful consideration is required to account for the spatial and temporal diversity of hydrological and social systems over the basin's area. This knowledge may then be linked to questions of stakeholder selection, among others.
DA 8: Clarify the existing knowledge about the legal system.	M6: Know the existing relevant legal regulations and, if necessary, advise the decision maker on this.	This step is mentioned by Mazri as well as by Stern and Fineberg. As a step to gather additional knowledge, it does not appear to be in contradiction with what the other authors are saying.	This may include relevant high-level legal texts, e.g., the EU Water Framework Directive for water management in the EU States, as well as national and local regulations. Often, it is also necessary to consider

	S&F5: Specify any legally fixed elements of the decision-making process.		legal regulations that are not directly linked to water or natural resources management but are nonetheless relevant for a decision to be made in an area such as land planning or public participation.
DA 9: Plan the decision-making stages and timelines.	C7: Specify the stages in the decision-making process.	The other authors do not discuss decision planning in this phase. However, they consider this step later in participation planning.	Clarify to what extent and when the stages of a decision-making process such as problem and values formulation, the development of alternative solutions, the development of evaluation models, and final recommendations are to be carried out. It should also be seen if there is enough time to move through these stages.
	C8: Schedule these stages.		
DA 10: Consider attitudes toward participation and determine the reasons for undertaking participation.	B&C1: Find out if there are any qualifying reasons for taking the participation approach.	Of the five guides, only two (Beierle and Cayford, and Creighton) explicitly advise the lead agency to self-critically monitor the reasons why it wants to undertake participation and to refrain from it when there are constraints (Creighton) such as a lack of will to take into consideration the view of the stakeholders. Beierle and Cayford demand as a minimum commitment that the lead agency to be open to changing the problem formulation if this is desired by the participants. However, Stern and Fineberg also recommend adopting an open attitude by interpreting existing decision-making regulations broadly in favor of more participation. Mazri, more generally, advises the lead agency to take into consideration the views of the stakeholders to the extent possible and as required by the situation. D'Aquino does not express himself on these matters but nothing in his guide suggests that he would be opposed to these ideas.	Avoid high levels of participation when there seems to be a lack of willingness in the lead agency to consider the input of the stakeholders, because it may lead to the disappointment or disillusionment of stakeholders and the lead agency in the decision-making process. This could also mean to commit to openness in terms of taking into consideration stakeholder opinions with regard to the issues to be covered. Water managers should also find out about potential opposition toward the participation process in their own agency or other decision-making bodies and interpret existing regulations generously in favor of broad participation if this is warranted by the issues to be addressed.
	B&C2: Make a commitment to be flexible in terms of content and process.		
	C9: Identify institutional constraints.		
	C10: Decide whether public participation is needed.		
	S&F6: Consider how much discretion a responsible agency can exercise in involving the affected parties.		
Additional step: If you decide in favor of participation, start thinking about different levels.	C11: Decide what level of participation is required.	Creighton is the only author to talk about levels of involvement in decision analysis. All other authors do this during the stakeholder analysis phase. This is why it is considered additional for decision analysis.	Water managers, like other participation professionals, may want to consider levels at this point. The right level depends of the specific objectives of the participation program. For example, if the goal is to inform the public about something, the first level, i.e., informing the public, may be sufficient. If the goal is to solve a hot controversy, the fourth level, i.e., negotiation, may be required. In case of uncertainty about what level of involvement is appropriate, Creighton recommends discussing this with some key stakeholders.

Table A2-2. Stakeholder analysis.

Reconstructed summary step	Deconstructed steps	Thoughts on differences and similarities in the summarized deconstructed steps	Application of reconstructed step to water management
SA 1: Adjust the team as needed for stakeholder analysis.	C1: Adjust the planning team as needed.	This step corresponds to Stern and Fineberg's reflection on planning for organizational needs (S&F2 in participation planning). The other authors do not consider these organizational aspects. However, nothing suggests that they advise against this.	Check how the initial team from decision analysis may have to be adjusted according to new planning requirements in stakeholder analysis, e.g., bring in social scientists to conduct surveys, people who are familiar with some of the stakeholders, or stakeholders themselves.
SA 2: Identify the stakeholders and their interests.	A1: List the stakeholders and link them with their interests. B&C1: Ask: How far should the reach of participation extend? C2: Simultaneously, identify stakeholders and potential issues and concerns. M2: For the various issues/topics that were identified in the previous phase, identify the stakeholders and interests that are linked to the issues. M5: Study each stakeholder once again. S&F1: Determine "the identity and likely positions and perspectives of the interested and affected parties."	Beierle and Cayford's question is formulated differently from the four other guides, but essentially all questions aim at identifying the stakeholders and their concerns. One difference between authors is how they propose to go about stakeholder analysis. Mazri, for example, proposes highly systematic research and even recommends two rounds of stakeholder analysis during this phase, one without and one with questioning the concerned stakeholders. Creighton provides various sets of questions that could be used. However, the main point for the various authors seems to be to carry out sufficient research on stakeholders and their stakes to be able to say which ones to include and what issues to expect.	In water management as in other participation arenas, the stakeholders and their interests should be identified. Various techniques and sets of questions (see tools) can be used for this. Thus, it becomes possible to develop a more informed view on how far or to whom participation should be extended.
SA 3: Decide on stakeholder representation based on clear criteria or strategies.	B&C2: Ask: Should participation be based on socioeconomic characteristics or on interest group representation? S&F2: Determine whether direct participation is needed. S&F3: Select participants according to four key considerations. S&F4: Select participants according to three strategies.	This is an "umbrella step." The four substeps mostly differ in their content with the exception of B&C2 and S&F4; the former is contained in the latter. The other three authors do not explicitly address the thorny issue of representation. Creighton and Mazri do give a strategy for the selection of stakeholders based on their interest and influence; see SA 5. Nothing suggests, however, that they would object to Stern and Fineberg's or Beierle and Cayford's considerations.	Water managers should reflect on whether participants should be represented by the members of their own group or by surrogates such as attorneys or scientific advisors. Participants may be selected according to socioeconomic criteria, because of their expertise, or self recruited. Selection should be made according to the objectives of the process and according to a few key considerations (see especially Table A1-5). These criteria and strategies may need to be clearly documented for procedural transparency.
SA 4: Determine during which decision phases the affected parties should be	A3: Consider the stages in the decision-making process, e.g., data collection, data analysis, interest	D'Aquino and Stern and Fineberg ask here at which point of the participation process the stakeholders should be involved and why. The other authors seem	At this point, water managers can go over the plans made so far and consider at which points of the participation process stakeholders should be involved and with what

involved in the participation process.	definition, etc., and define which actor will be involved in which phase and with what objective.	to reflect on this later in the participation planning phase (Creighton, for example, in Step 1 of participation planning).	objectives. Given the specific expertise and interests of the various stakeholders, they should be involved in the participation process when their interests and expertise match with the requirements of the process, e.g., certain experts in the diagnostic phase, affected water users throughout the process.
SA 5: Determine the possible levels of stakeholder involvement in various stages and events of the participation process.	B&C3: Ask: What kind of engagement is appropriate?	Three authors urge designers to consider levels of involvement. B&C3 and B&C4 are almost identical, with the latter being more fine-grained than the former. One difference is that Beierle and Cayford seem to think about involvement for a one-event participation process, whereas Mazri is concerned with involvement for a series of meetings. The latter thus specifies that involvement should be determined for each issue or topic that is going to be discussed. Also, for Creighton, participation is often planned for a series of meetings. He urges designers to remain open to changing levels of participation throughout the process. D'Aquino talks about levels of involvement only at the end of his design process in Worksheet 5 and not at this point. Stern and Fineberg do not elaborate on levels of involvement, possibly because they focus in their guide on deliberation, which already requires a specific level of participation. Basically, the authors seem to agree that it is important to think about levels of involvement and that participation should be handled in a flexible way, meaning that the lead agency should also consider the preferences of the stakeholders, even if specific ways to determine levels of involvement may differ, as suggested by the tools that authors propose for determining levels (see tools).	Consider appropriate levels of influence, e.g., being informed, being consulted, or being involved in problem solving, for different stakeholders through the participation process. This reflection should be based on the stakeholders' levels of interest, their expertise and influence, and the objectives of the process.
B&C4: Ask: How much influence should the public have: limited, moderate, or high?			
C3 Determine the level of participation that stakeholders will want using the orbits of participation tool.			
M3: For each issue/topic determine on what level each stakeholder should participate.			
SA 6: Prepare for potential issues and concerns.	C4: Prepare for potential issues and concerns.	Creighton wants to ensure that the lead agency is sufficiently prepared, e.g., in terms of knowledge, before meeting the public on the various identified issues. Mazri has exactly the same concern. The other authors, rather unsurprisingly, do not advise against this.	Foresee any issues that may come up in the discussions with the stakeholders so that any preparatory work such as studies, policy decisions, and information materials can be done beforehand.
M1: For the various issues/topics that were identified in the previous phase (see M4 in decision analysis), specify the required resources.			

SA 7: Remove any obstacles to participation.	M4: If necessary, anticipate participant training.	Mazri and Stern and Fineberg want to ensure that the participants are able to participate in a meaningful manner. The point of Stern and Fineberg is wider, considering more potential problems than Mazri. There is nothing in what the other authors write that would contradict this step.	This could include participant training sessions or extra funding if a lack of knowledge or funds is perceived. It may also mean to address a lack of trust in the lead agency.
	S&F6: Determine any barriers that may hinder the effective involvement of stakeholders.		
SA 8: Assess conflict and trust levels.	A2: Determine possible reactions of other stakeholders.	The three authors agree that the level of conflict that exists around specific issues will likely have consequences for the chosen process. It may point toward more intensive and longer participation processes (Creighton) or require more research (Stern and Fineberg). D'Aquino does not discuss possible consequences of conflict but indicates the importance analyzing it. The remaining authors do not advise against assessing conflict and trust levels.	In water management, as elsewhere, conflict and trust between some stakeholders at various levels may already exist before the process starts. This can have implications for participation design, such as foreseeing longer and more intensive processes for high conflict situations or selecting appropriate tools to manage the situation.
	C5: Analyze the existing levels of conflict around the issues to be discussed.		
	S&F7: Consider the potential for controversy.		
SA 9: Consider designers' influence on the participation process.	B&C5: Ask: What role should the decision maker play in running and organizing the participation process?	Beierle and Cayford suggest that the decision-making authority should be wary of exerting too much control and should also leave the process more open to participant influence as the process matures. The other authors are likely to agree to this because they all subscribe to the principle of stakeholder feedback for process design (see the participation planning phase). Creighton also advises lead agency self-reflection in decision analysis.	When designing and running participation processes, decision makers should ask themselves how much influence they want to exert on the process. They will basically have to find the right mix between generating clarity and structure, and openness and trust by allowing participants to adapt the process.
Additional step: Adjust your vision of objectives, topics, stakeholders, etc. as new information arises.	M6: Adjust your vision of objectives, topics, stakeholders, etc. as new information arises.	Mazri clearly formulates the iterativeness principle as a substep at this point. The other authors also subscribe to this principle without necessarily formulating it as a specific step during the process; for them it is rather an ongoing operation.	This appears to be more of a principle than a step. Iterativeness should be an ongoing operation throughout the design process.

Table A2-3. Participation planning.

Reconstructed summary step	Deconstructed steps	Reflection on differences and similarities in the summarized deconstructed steps	Application of reconstructed step to water management
Additional step: Plan for organizational needs.	S&F2: Plan for organizational needs.	This step we consider only additional at this point in the design process, but it is otherwise highly important. It corresponds to Creighton's C1 substeps in both decision and stakeholder analysis.	In water management as elsewhere in participation, the lead agency should ask itself how it organizes and manages the internal team responsible for designing and accompanying the participation process.

PP 1: Define participation objectives for each major stage in the participation process.	C1: Define public participation objectives for the major stages in the decision process.	This step is specific to Creighton’s planning approach because he previously, in decision analysis, asked designers to determine the main decision-making stages of the participation process. It should be remembered that a stage, such as system diagnosis, can involve several participation events. In a way, this step is quite similar to SA 4, even if the focus is a bit different, and thus to the reflections of d’Aquino and Stern and Fineberg. Beierle and Cayford do not focus on this aspect because they gear their design process more to a one-off event participation process. Mazri, on the other hand, seems more to think in terms of an array of discussion topics that have to be brought into some kind of order (see below).	If designers have already defined the major stages of the decision-making process (see DA 9), it may make sense at this point to reconsider the objectives of each of these stages in the light of new information that may have surfaced during stakeholder analysis.
PP 2: Plan the various interaction events in logical manner.	M1: Begin to put the various topics to be discussed in the participation process into a logical order. M2 Match the various actor groups to the various discussion topics M3 Foresee and plan for the interconnection of the various topics that are going to be addressed	Instead of focusing on major stages, Mazri looks at the various participation events that should happen in the process and at how to bring them into a coherent relationship with each other. Also, Stern and Fineberg (S&F3) mention the planning of the sequence of events and their “expected iterations” as important. For Mazri it is a central focus in this last phase.	As well as thinking about the objectives of stages and stakeholder involvement in these, designers should also reflect specifically on how they plan to sequence the participation events to align with resource constraints, information, and participant needs.
<u>Additional Step:</u> Identify the required information exchange.	C2: Identify for each step what information needs to be prepared for the public and what information needs to be obtained from the public.	The other authors do not mention a similar step. There is, however, no reason to believe that they would be opposed to this kind of reflection, which can improve clarity of purpose and the preparedness of the lead agency.	It seems feasible to leave this step for a later stage when participation events are planned in detail.
PP 3: Identify special considerations that could affect the selection of participation mechanisms.	A1: Determine the various institutional and/or geographical levels that will be relevant for your interventions and the eventual decisions to be made. B&C3: Also consider cost when making your choice. C3: Identify special considerations that could affect the selection of techniques. S&F1: Estimate resource needs and timetable.	Creighton’s contribution is the most all-encompassing and, in fact, includes the three others plus additional special considerations mentioned by Creighton.	Systematically check how issues such as the technical complexity of the issue, facilitation team skills, or a hostile public could affect your participation planning.
Additional step: Define the people involved in each participation event and any change objectives	A2 Define the objective, the facilitator, and the decision maker for each of the interventions on each of the different scales, as well as the stakeholders to be involved.	Only D’Aquino urges designers at this point to begin thinking about the details of the workshops that they are planning. For Creighton, for example, this comes after the process design has been finished.	It seems feasible to leave this step for a later stage when participation events are planned in detail. Empowerment considerations may be relevant for water

set for them.	<p>A3: Reflect on change objectives for each stakeholder as a result of the interventions.</p> <p>A4: Consider any stakeholders who need to be mobilized for the interventions, usually to be found on the lower geo-institutional scales, those at a higher level who need to be lobbied, and those who need to be empowered.</p>	<p>Unique in d'Aquino's steps is also his reflection on change objectives, lobbying, and empowerment. Even though these three substeps are clearly distinct from each other, we summarize them into an additional step to simplify the overall structure of this summary table.</p>	management in Europe.
PP 4: Match participation mechanisms to planned participation events.	<p>A5: Use the worksheet for making the final plan by listing the actors, their level of influence on the decision, the objectives of the issues to be addressed at specific points in time, the methods and support materials to be selected for specific interventions, and the character of the intervention, e.g., presentation, facilitation, or mediation.</p> <p>B&C1: Match the answers to the design questions (see Step 3 of Beierle and Cayford in stakeholder analysis) to specific participation mechanisms.</p> <p>B&C2: Repeat the previous substeps as needed for other stages of the participation process.</p> <p>C4: Select from a set of mechanisms and schedule them into the different key decision points.</p>	<p>Here the authors describe various ways of matching the information that was gathered in the previous steps and phases to appropriate participation mechanisms such as citizen juries, advisory councils, etc. For Mazri, this seems to be implicitly included in his steps M1–M3. For Stern and Fineberg, it is included in their step S&F3 below. The different authors provide different tools to do this work. What they have in common, however, is the fact that this matching of the information gathered in the design process and the participation mechanism to be chosen occurs and that it usually occurs toward the end of the design process.</p>	<p>Translate the previously gathered information into a design that lists the key decision points, the participation events that will take place for these, the specific participation mechanisms used in these events, the participants and their level of involvement, and the issues to be addressed.</p>
PP 5: Write the participation plan.	<p>C5: Write the plan.</p> <p>M4: The decision maker and the consultant preliminarily finalize the plan.</p> <p>S&F3: Develop a preliminary process design.</p>	<p>The authors agree on the need to write a plan, although their opinions as to what it should contain differ. D'Aquino and Beierle and Cayford do not mention the necessity for a detailed plan, although step A5 corresponds to an overview of a plan, and it is hardly conceivable that Beierle and Cayford would argue against this basic tool of planning.</p>	<p>Convert the previous planning exercise into a coherent written plan explaining the political context, the participation activities that will take place, the sequence of the activities and their interrelationship, and the rationale for the planned decision-making process. How adaptations to the plan may occur should also be outlined.</p>
PP 6: Share the plan with the public.	<p>C6: Share the plan with the public.</p> <p>M5: Submit the plan to the stakeholders for approval or modification.</p>	<p>Here, one general idea, i.e., sharing the plan with the stakeholders, is common, although there are differences with regard to how this should be done. Creighton simply proposes to communicate the plan to the stakeholders in written form once it is finished. For Mazri this is more of a systematic exercise: He proposes to receive feedback</p>	<p>Lead agencies should be open to receiving feedback on their plan. They can do this in several different ways. Perhaps the most pragmatic method is Creighton's and Stern and Fineberg's approach of distributing the plan to stakeholders once it is finished and then receiving feedback on it at the first</p>

	S&F4: Be ready to share the plan with the public.	from every stakeholder before the participation process starts so that the plan can be adapted. Stern and Fineberg seem to rather go along with Creighton's idea of sharing the plan and seeing what stakeholders say when the process starts. With regard to the other authors, Beierle and Cayford seem to agree to this feedback loop with their step B&C2 in decision analysis, and d'Aquino gives at least no indication of being opposed to this principle.	stakeholder meeting.
PP 7: Learn from the design experience and use the learning.	M6: The decision maker and the analyst take into account the opinions expressed by the stakeholders and adapt the plan. S&F5 Summarize and discuss diagnosis within the organization.	Both Mazri and Stern and Fineberg see the finished plan as a learning opportunity even if the focus of the learning is somewhat different. For Stern and Fineberg the finished plan helps test reactions within the lead organization concerning the planned participation process. For Mazri the feedback received from the stakeholders is an opportunity to adapt the plan. It is inconceivable that the other authors would argue against seizing this learning opportunity.	Lead agencies and their water managers should use opportunities to learn from the design process. For example, they can receive and use feedback either from outside stakeholders or from within the organization concerning the content of the participation plan and the way in which it was designed.
PP 8: Plan for evaluation from the beginning of the participation process.	B&C4: Build evaluation mechanisms into the process, especially for determining if the process objectives were reached and if design choices were useful.	The other authors do not really mention evaluation as a part of their design steps but rather as something that is required through the participation implementation process. Creighton and Stern and Fineberg clearly recommend evaluation as an element that can improve any public participation effort. There is no reason to believe that any of the other authors would be against evaluation because it can serve as one contributing element to iteratively improving the process.	If managers want to continuously improve the process during its implementation and also learn something about the appropriateness of the process as a whole, they should consider what kind of system they can set up to monitor and finally evaluate the participation process.