

## APPENDIX 4. SUMMARY OF PRINCIPLES

**Table A-4.** Summary of general and author principles. When used below in connection with a number, the letter "P" refers to general principles explained in the text. 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 principle in that guidebook.

General principle	Author principles	Explanation and discussion of possible agreements and contradictions
P1: See the participation process as an opportunity for effective decision making, not as a constraining obligation.	<p>C1: Public participation is viewed as the way decisions makers get the mandate they need to act.</p> <p>C2: The public participation process is well integrated into the decision-making process.</p>	Decision makers should welcome the idea of participation when appropriate because a successful process will enable them to implement a decision. The principle also implies that any interaction with stakeholders during design or later during implementation should be clearly and transparently linked to specific decisions to be made. The other authors do not formulate anything that would contradict this principle. The principles B&C2, M7, and S&F5 develop this idea of effective decision making by urging the lead agency to learn from the stakeholders. To avoid a possible misunderstanding, this principle does not mean that participation should be used in all cases of decision making but only when the situation requires it. In this case, participation should be seen as an opportunity.
P2: Consider the input of the stakeholders during design and implementation.	<p>B&amp;C2: Recognize the legitimacy of public values.</p> <p>C7: Only undertake participation when the lead agency is committed to seriously considering the contribution of stakeholders.</p>	This principle follows from P1. It means that the lead agency must commit to taking the contribution of stakeholders into account. It does not mean doing exactly what the stakeholders want but considering their input for any decisions to be made. From this, it follows that the lead agency should transparently explain on what grounds it decided to take into account specific stakeholder inputs. The other authors formulate compatible principles such as M2 and S&F5.
P3: Encourage inclusive and appropriate stakeholder involvement.	<p>C3: The interested public is involved in every step of decision making.</p> <p>C4: Programs are targeted to ensure the involvement of all the stakeholders who perceive themselves to be affected.</p> <p>M5: The participation of the various actors in one participation process can take different forms.</p> <p>S&amp;F1: Design participation too broad rather than too narrow.</p> <p>S&amp;F2: Do not consider if but how to involve stakeholders at every step of the process.</p>	This principle means that a balance needs to be found between involving all affected and interested parties early on, i.e., erring on the side of too much participation, and remaining efficient in the use of resources used for participation, i.e., refraining from involving everybody into everything. Beierle and Cayford also discuss this challenge even if they do not formulate it in their principles (see, for example, Beierle and Cayford's steps in stakeholder analysis).
P4: Clearly define the	S&F3: From early on, inform	From the beginning, the lead agency should be

<p>roles and responsibilities of the lead agency and those of the participants.</p>	<p>participants about any constraints on the process as well as their influence as participants.</p> <p>S&amp;F7: As the responsible agency, be clear about your potentially multiple roles of convener, party, process supervisor, etc., and distinguish between them as necessary.</p>	<p>transparent about the influence participants may have on the decision as well as about the roles it is itself to play in the design and implementation processes, e.g., neutral or partisan. Even though this principle should arguably be applied at the beginning of process implementation rather than during the design process, a corresponding attitude of the lead agency may already be required during design, e.g., when stakeholders are first encountered. Beierle and Cayford have integrated these principles in their steps (see SA 9). Without explicitly formulating this principle, Creighton and Mazri nevertheless enable stakeholders to inform themselves about constraints, roles, and responsibilities (C3, C4, M6, and M7).</p>
<p>P5: Respect political realities.</p>	<p>C9: Agencies retain decision-making authority throughout the participation process.</p> <p>M8: The decision maker retains the last say over any important decision in the design process.</p>	<p>This principle establishes that the main decision makers, not necessarily the lead agency, need to be identified and that they remain responsible for the final decision even if they choose to delegate this responsibility. Decision makers may also be responsible for many decisions during the design process, such as deciding who will be involved in the participation process and on what issues. This principle has to be balanced with P 2. Like Creighton, who puts forward both principles, we do not see this as a contradiction but as the reality in which the design and implementation of participation take place.</p>
<p>P6: Participation processes are to meet the needs of the stakeholders and context.</p>	<p>B&amp;C1: Be open to potentially altering the framing of the problem according to the needs of the stakeholders.</p> <p>C5: Multiple techniques are used, aimed at different audiences.</p> <p>C6: Only undertake participation when there is enough interest on the part of the public/stakeholders in the policy decision to be made.</p> <p>C8: Only undertake participation when there are enough resources to finance a participation process.</p> <p>C10: The participation process should never be designed more ambitiously, in terms of the numbers of stakeholders invited and their influence on policy making, than the context, i.e., not only the decision makers but also other constraints such as schedule and budget, allows.</p> <p>M2: The design approach itself should be participatory.</p> <p>M3: The main problem to be addressed should be formulated by</p>	<p>This principle integrates a number of ideas, including that: stakeholders should be involved in framing or formulating the problem to be addressed in the participation process (B&amp;C1, M2, M3); participation mechanisms are chosen according to the needs of the public, e.g., interest, knowledge (C5, S&amp;F6), and the realities of the context, e.g., resources, environment, political situation, and objectives (C10); and participants are provided with the means, e.g., knowledge, opportunities, to participate in a meaningful way (M4, S&amp;F4). There appears to be no contradiction among the authors here because they all specify steps that correspond to these principles (see, for example, DA4 and DA5).</p>

	<p>relying on the input of the concerned parties.</p> <p>M4: The approach should consider the requirements of fairness, competence, and efficiency.</p> <p>S&amp;F4 Strive for fairness in the process</p> <p>S&amp;F6: Remain open to using novel and appropriate participation mechanisms.</p>	
<p>P7: Always remain open to adjusting the process design.</p>	<p>M6: The design of the participation process is subject to collective learning.</p> <p>M7: Process design is iterative, i.e., it evolves as the result of a dialogue with the stakeholders.</p> <p>S&amp;F5: Plan for flexibility and iteration.</p> <p>S&amp;F8: Combine analysis of the situation with deliberation.</p>	<p>This principle highlights the fact that designers should be prepared to adjust the planned participation process and the subject matter to be treated in the process as information or additional constraints arise through the design and implementation of the participation process. It considers that critical or positive stakeholder feedback can incite adjustment of the process in areas such as the topic chosen as already pointed out by P6, the focus of the problem analysis, the experts selected to address a specific question, the stakeholders to be involved, and the participation mechanisms foreseen. However, care must be taken to also avoid stakeholder disappointment if original design plans are preferred by some stakeholders (see Barreteau et al. 2010).</p>