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Stakeholder involvement in addressing problems related to natural resources management has been increasing both formally and through informal sources. In some countries, stakeholder and citizens involvement in addressing environmental and natural resource management problems has been made mandatory through legal provisions. Within EU there is now a growing tendency to promote stakeholder involvement in the WFD. In our project, though the response was moderate initially, we have seen an increased interest amongst stakeholders to take part in the discussions related to sediment issues within the Bergen Fjord. We have managed to establish a stakeholder panel within the project period, and currently they are being engaged by Bergen commune to discuss the various options/solutions to address the sediment problems.
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Summary

The importance of stakeholder involvement and using stakeholder experiences to address problems that they are directly concerned with or affected by, is becoming increasingly important in recent years. This report summarizes the activities initiated in the “Sediment and Society” research project to engage stakeholders in Bergen harbour who are mainly concerned with contamination of the sediments in Byfjorden and the various options available for remediation. A stakeholder analysis (SA) approach was used to map stakeholders in Bergen relevant for sediment remediation measures in the fjord, identify their interests establish a stakeholder panel. The 12 member stakeholder panel is well represented by stakeholders representing managers, users, researchers, non-governmental agencies and welfare organizations. A positive outcome of the stakeholder analysis process was the “transfer” of the stakeholder group from the Sediment and Society project to Bergen municipality. Overall, from our experience, engaging relevant stakeholders right from the beginning, keeping the process transparent and providing legitimacy to stakeholder group can be useful to address issues such as sediment contamination, develop more agreeable and practical solutions, and meaningful policies.
1. Introduction

The importance of stakeholder involvement and using stakeholder experiences to address problems that they are directly concerned with or affected by, is becoming increasingly important in recent years. In the EU region, there is an increasing focus on stakeholder involvement in management of natural resources, especially coastal ecosystems, lakes and rivers. At the EU level, efforts are being made to provide institutional and policy support for stakeholder involvement in water resources management. In Norway, the public are involved in taking decisions concerned with any major interventions such as changing the course of rivers, construction projects in natural areas. However, the stakeholders are not involved in the planning process, and in most cases their interests are not considered while planning such projects. Engaging stakeholders requires a good methodological approach that helps in bringing together the stakeholders, motivating them to actively participate and discuss the main concerns and ways to address them.

This report summarizes the activities initiated in the “Sediment and Society” research project to engage stakeholders in Bergen harbour who are mainly concerned with contamination of the sediments in Byfjorden and the various options available for remediation. A stakeholder analysis (SA) approach was used to identify or map relevant stakeholders in Bergen relevant for sediment remediation measures in the fjord, identify their interests establish a stakeholder panel.

“Stakeholder analysis can be defined as an approach for understanding a system by identifying the key actors or stakeholders in the system, and assessing their respective interest in that system” (Grimble et al. 1995, pp. 3–4). The importance of stakeholder analysis in understanding the complexity and compatibility problems between objectives and stakeholders was emphasized by Grimble and Wellard (1996). According to Pretty et.al. (1995) and Chambers (1997) stakeholder analysis is closely associated with participatory approaches and is often seen as a tool for effective management of natural resources through stakeholder participation. Stakeholder analysis is a useful tool in conflict management and has important roots in the social actor perspective in the sociology of development (Long, 1992). Stakeholders can be part of a management strategy if only they can agree on its
goals, boundaries, membership, and usefulness (Röling and Wagemakers 1998). The first step thus in any SA is to identify the relevant stakeholders who would be involved in managing the problem or a system. In the “Sediment and Society” project (WP2), one of the tasks is to identify relevant stakeholders in Bergen Harbour, establish a stakeholder panel and use the panel in stakeholder mobilization.

The question then is “Who is a stakeholder and in what situations is their role needed?”. Stakeholders are identified based on many factors. The most common methods include: the interest and influence of the stakeholder in the particular issue, or a resource. The knowledge about the system or resource and networks the stakeholder is involved within the system is valuable to the process.
2. Steps in Stakeholder Analysis

This report documents the various steps followed in the identification process, the selection of the stakeholder panel, the stakeholder workshops and main issues discussed and finally the institutionalization of the stakeholder panel constituted during the project.

Table 1 lists the various steps to be followed while selecting and analyzing stakeholder interests. In some cases, the analysis can be done without going through all the listed steps.

Table 1. Steps to be followed in Stakeholder Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>Stakeholder mapping/categorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>Establishing stakeholder panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td>Organizing stakeholder workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4:</td>
<td>Problem discussion and identifying solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Stakeholder mapping/categorization based on influence and interest

One of the project objectives is to evaluate/test different methods of identifying stakeholders. The following identification methods were considered including:

- Stakeholder identification based on the norms prescribed according to the “Plan- og bygningsloven” (The planning and building act)
- Identification and classification of stakeholders based on influence and interest
- A random list of stakeholders identified with the help of key actors in the harbor
- Stakeholders identified through interviews and questionnaires

The purpose of the stakeholder analysis should be articulated as clearly as possible in the beginning in order to make relevant stakeholders participate actively.
Deciding on who should be involved is a key strategic choice. In general, people who have information that cannot be gained otherwise should be involved, or if their participation is necessary to assure successful implementation of initiatives built on the analyses.

Stakeholders were mapped as follows:

1. A preliminary list of possible stakeholders who would probably be interested in sediment issues in the Bergen harbor was prepared. For convenience, it was useful to list the stakeholders according to their role (managers, end users, NGOs, scientists/consultants).

2. The list was circulated to selected key stakeholders who have knowledge and earlier experience with the sediment problem in the Bergen Harbor. The project team met some of the key stakeholders and discussed the preliminary list of stakeholders. After receiving feedback from the key stakeholders, the list was revised.

3. Care was taken to ensure that all relevant stakeholders were included for a meaningful and effective management of the sediment problem.

4. Invitations to participate in the stakeholder group were sent out to all of the stakeholders identified on the “revised” list.

2.2 Categorization of the stakeholders based on influence and interest

At a later stage, the stakeholders were identified based on their influence and interest (as per the matrix below) in the sediment issue. This is often difficult since it is based on qualitative information and subjective to the judgement of persons involved in classifying. However, the exercise in itself was of interest to the project, in order to understand the power relations and positions of various stakeholders in the process. The list was used for internal project use, but it could be useful to get a feedback on the classification process from some of the key stakeholders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High interest</th>
<th>Low influence</th>
<th>High Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forvalter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velforening</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beslutningstaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low interest</td>
<td>Rådgiver</td>
<td>Næringslivet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forsker</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forsker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Stakeholder panel selection process
The next step was to select the stakeholder panel (8-12) members who participate actively in the consultation process, give feedback, help in networking with other stakeholders whenever needed and influence in the decision making process.

The meeting with some key stakeholders in Bergen kommunen (on 25.11.08) set the stage for the stakeholder panel selection. The project team presented a probable panel as a starting point for stakeholder selection. Prior to the meeting, a complete list of stakeholders prepared by the project team was circulated to all the stakeholders seeking their feedback:

1. To check if the list included all relevant stakeholders interested in sediment issues in the Byfjorden region or not.
2. To assist in classifying the stakeholders based on their role (Managers, Policy Makers, NGO, Welfare organizations etc.).
3. To rate the stakeholders on a 1-4 scale based on their influence and interest (1 -Most influential and most interested in the Byfjorden resources and 4 - least influential and least interested).

Feedback from the stakeholders on the stakeholder list was mixed. The comprehensive list was based on input from FMHo and organizations that had been involved in the work with the feasibilities studies for Bergen harbor. In the initial and more abstract stages of establishing a stakeholder group, feedback was modest until we held a formal meeting with FMHo and Bergen commune in September.
2008, wherein the list of stakeholders was discussed and response was constructive. Bergen kommune had some thoughts about additional stakeholders and this information was used to update the list in addition to doing an Internet search for contact information for the different organizations based on what types of organizations had been involved in Oslo harbor. The comprehensive stakeholder list was updated and circulated prior to the meeting in November 2008. However, the feedback on the comprehensive list (which did not include the ranking when distributed) was limited. Specific inputs were received from Laksevåg Velforening and Naturvernforbundet Hordaland, but only regarding their own organizations (i.e. updated contact names). Bergen kommune felt it was rather a long list, which could have been one of the reasons for not getting proper feedback. But discussing the comprehensive list in plenum was very useful and the stakeholders that were present at the meeting in November were actively engaged.

The following assisted in the selection of stakeholder panel at the Bergen meeting.

1. Laksevåg Velforening (Welfare organization)
2. Naturvernforbundet Hordaland (NGO)
3. Bergen Kommune (Manager)
4. FMHo (Manager)

Those present at the meeting were also represented in the panel. This helped in easy discussion and identification of the stakeholder panel.

The group was asked to comment:

1. Whether the panel represented all relevant stakeholders?
2. Whether any stakeholder whom they considered important was missing?
3. Whether they felt if someone should be removed from the list?
4. And if the rating given to them based on influence and interest was correct or not?

At the meeting several concerns were expressed by the stakeholders present.

1. The need for adding more members into the panel if needed and not restrict the number. However the group agreed to a manageable size of 2-15 members. The concern was to keep it open for any stakeholder who is
interested to join the panel, and also to take suggestions or advice from others who are not included.

2. It was agreed to explore synergies between the stakeholder panel and the reference group that is likely to be established under the Kirkebuken project that Bergen Kommune will start in 2009. The interest to have a close dialogue between the two was expressed. The idea of using part or entire panel as the reference group was also discussed.

3. The main purpose for the establishment of the stakeholder panel and its role was discussed. The stakeholders present at the meeting were interested to know the project expectations. The group felt that there should be clarity on the role of the panel from the beginning and that the panel should establish some kind of legitimacy, without leaving out anyone relevant in the process. It was expressed that care should be taken not to mix the research objectives for which the stakeholder panel is being established with real management issues - especially not to contradict or conflict with political and local interests.

4. The stakeholders felt that it was ok, as long as the mandate of the panel was mainly to contribute to knowledge generation and add to the discussion. But beyond that, they felt it would be sensitive to come up with scenarios that can lead to controversies.

5. The case of Oslo Fjord was not seen as a good example and that they were not interested to end up in a similar situation.

6. There were suggestions to include representatives from small scale industries forum, NHO and Bergen Maritime Forum.

7. There was discussion about the classification of stakeholders based on their influence and interest and how these can change over time. The group agreed that it is a dynamic process that needs to be open to changes.
8. Challenge - people who have important management information/knowledge, but not much influence - how to include them.

After the initial round of discussions on the selection process of stakeholder panel with the selected group of stakeholders, an invitation letter was sent to 23 organizations and thereafter they were also contacted through telephone and e-mail. Based on the response and interest to be a member, 12 stakeholders were shortlisted (letter attached, together with the 23 list in Appendix II).

The selected stakeholder panel is as follows:

1. Gamle Laksevåg Velforening Vel (welfare)
2. Havforskningsinstitutt Forskning (Research)
3. Mattilsynet (nasjonalt) Forvalter (Manager)
4. Forsvarsbygg Forvalter
5. Bergens sportsfiskere Bruker
6. Norges Miljøvernforbud NGO
7. Universitet i Bergen, Institutt for geovitenskap Forskning
8. Bergens Sjøfartsmuseum Forvalter (Manager)
9. Bergen Group Laksevåg Bruker (User)
10. Dykkerklubb Bruker
11. NHO Hordaland Næringslivet
12. Kongelig Norsk Båtforbund, Region Vest Bruker

The panel is well represented by stakeholders representing managers, users, researchers, non-governmental agencies and welfare organizations. The objective is to seek active cooperation through a series of workshops and meetings. In 2009, three stakeholder panel meetings were conducted. The meetings were jointly
organized together with another ongoing project in the Bergen Fjord funded by Bergen Kommune.

2.4 Guidelines/steps and timeline followed

- June/July/August 2008: Prepared a list of relevant stakeholders. Categorized/grouped the stakeholders for practical purposes (resource persons, scientists, managers, end users, policy makers, welfare groups).

- September 2008: Circulated the list to key actors

- November 2008: Based on feedback from the key actors, added the missing members, and deleted others who were not relevant

- December 2008: Classified the stakeholders, based on influence and interest

- February 2009: Selected the critical stakeholders from the list and suggest a stakeholder panel

- March 2009: Evaluated the panel, through feedback from key actors,

- April 2009: Established contact with the panel members, explain the purpose, objectives and seek their commitment to participate when needed.

- 3 Stakeholder workshops during 2009/2010

- October 2009: Summarize all findings in a report
3. Organizing stakeholder workshops

Consultations with the selected group of stakeholders were held at three workshops (see proceedings below), within the limited project time and resource constraints. For practical purposes and more effective communication, a smaller group of stakeholders were constituted. It is important to know beforehand whether stakeholders are willing to participate in a stakeholder panel and under what conditions and with which expectations. The main idea behind establishing such a “stakeholder panel” was that they could be used later by management authorities if they are interested in using the panel for addressing the sediment problem in the Bergen Harbor.

The first stakeholder workshop focus was to inform the stakeholders about the “Sediment and Society” project, the process behind establishing the stakeholder group and stakeholders role in the process. The participants were briefed on the background of the municipality’s activities that are now ongoing in Byfjorden (“History, political decisions” presentation) and the status of the pollution situation in Byfjorden (“Bergen harbor- short” presentation”). A brainstorming activity was undertaken to list the topics relevance for planning of future discussions, which included: connecting risk assessment with nutritional advice and calibrating towards surveys; effects of environmental toxins on the ecosystem; short term effects of measures; documentation of long term measures; pollution during ”sediments and currents” model for Byfjorden; leakage from land; restraints on the industry and business (short and long term); locating whereabouts of undetonated bombs and cost sharing and importance of not punishing the industry for previously approved emissions.

The second stakeholder workshop started with a brief questionnaire survey as a preliminary step for Multicriteria Analysis (for further information, see the Technical brief). Participants expressed the need for a better introduction for such an exercise. Discussions at the workshop revolved around the need for proper information and an information strategy. At the workshop stakeholders expressed the need to be provided with more information/ through posters etc and display at places where everyone could see, and through public meetings on local
environment and problems. Stakeholders expressed interest in the contaminated sediments and its pollution impacts and wanted a more involvement in addressing the problem and identifying solutions.

At the third stakeholder workshop, participants were introduced to the Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA). None of the participants had knowledge of models. However, there was some enthusiasm to know more about them and what the models meant in the remediation issue. Stakeholders felt that it was necessary to provide more information to the public and increasing public awareness on the sediment problems and solutions in the fjord. Stakeholders responded positively to the idea to continue meeting, but were not sure about the identity of the panel and what role it would have in the future process.
4. Conclusions

A positive outcome of the stakeholder analysis process was the “transfer” of the stakeholder group from the Sediment and Society project to Bergen municipality. The panel members were quite interested to be involved in the discussions even after the Sediment project, as seen from their responses to attend a meeting in June 2010 to present the background information for remediation through another project in a specific area called Kirkebukten. Local knowledge and experience of the stakeholders in the group from this area (neighborhood organizations and boat marina) was considered useful. The stakeholder group members contributed to the discussions which generated overall interest, since the municipality would like to use this area to test capping methods and the marina also would like some dredging to be conducted. The Marina suggested 3 different local disposal alternatives for their dredged material (seashore disposal in extended jetty or new pier or upland disposal on the marina's own property). Some of these suggestions may not be realized since they also require technical design. Bergen municipality has the intention to involve the stakeholder group constituted under the “Sediment and society” in drafting a work plan for the remediation to be conducted in Kirkebukten. The group would be able to review this plan either before or in tandem with the open hearing process, scheduled for autumn 2010, and Bergen municipality will take the lead with this meeting.

The main lessons learnt from this process are that:

- Though time consuming, engaging stakeholders has been a positive experience for all partners involved

- Stakeholders, by and large, have genuine interest in addressing issues such as remediation measures for sediment problem in Bergen harbor, and their experience and local knowledge is essential for addressing such issues

- Engaging stakeholders from the beginning builds trust and credibility to solutions proposed to address the remediation problem.
Formalizing the role of the stakeholder group is a challenge in research projects, due to budget constraints and also their limited role in the actual management process. It is also difficult to motivate the stakeholders unless they see a direct benefit in the process for themselves.

The projects can use the stakeholder group to identify potential missing stakeholders.

The group can also assist the projects to identify the potential positive and negative consequences of involving - or not involving - of other stakeholders.

However, there is a lot of disconnected dynamics in the stakeholder process and the challenge lies in connecting the gaps, the plural views of the problem and solutions. There are always question raised about their involvement in a decision making process, their legitimacy and their role. Some of the stakeholders see spin offs from being a member, or identity. Overall, from our experience, engaging relevant stakeholders right from the beginning, keeping the process transparent and providing legitimacy to stakeholder group can be useful to address issues such as sediment contamination, develop more agreeable and practical solutions, and meaningful policies.
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The first half of the meeting was used to give information. Oddmund Soldal from COWI (project coordinator for Bergen municipality’s project in Bergen harbor) welcomed everyone to the meeting and showed the organization of the municipality project and placement of the “Sediment and society” project and informed briefly about the mandate of the Stakeholder group (“Sediment & Society- stakeholder group” presentation). Oddmund presented the mandate for the stakeholder group, which was important to define legitimacy and the possible impact of the groups work:

- Produce results that can give useful inputs to Bergen municipality
- The results presented are not binding for the municipality and the municipality will assess to which degree inputs will be included in the further work of the project
- The project is obligated to publish its results when it ends in 2010
- The meeting continued with Per Vikse from Bergen municipality informing about the background of the municipality’s activities that are now ongoing in Byfjorden (“History, political decisions” presentation). Oddmund also gave a presentation of the status of the pollution situation in Byfjorden (“Bergen harbor- short” presentation”).

- Amy Oen from NGI explained in short about the process behind establishing the Stakeholder group (“Sediment and society, choice of stakeholders” presentation). The figure that shows the categorization of stakeholders based on influence and interest was presented and many of the participants claimed that they recognized themselves in “their” role. The group did not identify any other participants as missing from the participant list.

- Magnus Sparrevik from NGI introduced the multi-criteria – analysis that will be undertaken during the next two discussions as a way of prioritizing between possible future scenarios for planned measures in the Bergen
harbor (“MCA stakeholders” presentation and “background document”). Four different measure alternatives were presented with the same selection criteria that were used in the process with the citizen panel.

A brainstorming activity was undertaken on which topics to discuss in the group. The list of topics will be used in the planning of future discussions:

- Connecting risk assessment with nutritional advice and calibrating towards surveys
- Effects of environmental toxins on the ecosystem
- Short term effects of measures
- Documentation of long term measures
- Pollution during "sediments and currents” model for Byfjorden
- Leakage from land
- Restraints on the industry and business (short and long term)
- Locating whereabouts of undetonated bombs
- Cost sharing and importance of not punishing the industry for previously approved emissions
- Questions regarding cultural heritage versus health and environment, what is more important?

A preliminary prioritization of topics for the next two meetings was made; please refer to the call sent by e-mail.

**Minutes from the second Stakeholder meeting #2, 22. oktober 2009**

Tusen takk for oppmøtet. Vedlagt følger en kort oppsummering av presentasjonene og diskusjonene som foregikk.

Møte begynte med en kort diskusjon om hensikten av spørreskjema. Interessegruppen hadde identifiserte behov for informasjon på det første møtet, men allikevel ble det delt ut et spørreskjema på slutten av møtet og dette tidspunktet ble oppfatet av noen som upasselig for å kunne gi begrunnet svar. David Barton fra NIVA brukte tid for å forklare bruk av spørreskjema som et verktøy i forskingsprosjektet.

Per Vikse og Anne Kringstad fra Bergen kommune, ble invitert på møte slik at Interessegruppen å kunne gi innspill til kommune om informasjon og formidling i
forbindelse med kommunes informasjonsstrategi for nåværende arbeid med håndtering av forurensede sedimenter i Bergen havn. Anne oppsummerte de hovedprinsippene med informasjonsstrategien. Informasjon skal:

- bidra til at prosjektet kan gjennomføres som planlagt.
- øke kunnskap om prosjektet inklusive forståelse for nødvendigheten av de ulike aktivitetene.
- illustrerer og synliggjøre problemstillingen og beskrive konsekvensene.
- vis det som skjer.

Kommune ønsker en åpen dialog med borgere som kan for eksempel aktualiseres ved å benytte ”Din Arena” for å gi innspill samt spørre hva man lurer på og hvilke problemstillinger man har tenkt. Selv om aktivitetene i kommunes nåværende prosjekt er vedtatt er ikke alle beslutningene tatt. Per Vikse presiserte at innspill fra Interessegruppen skal taes med videre på en eller annen måte. Ideer som var nevnt på møtet inkluderer:

- å sette opp en informasjonsplakat langs gangviere det man går forbi. Her kan det forklares hvilke aktivitetene som har vært tilstede og hva finnes i sjøen.
- å organisere folkemøter på lokale miljøet gjerne med TV journalist tilstede slik at andre som ikke bo i nærheten er også informert.

Amy Oen fra NGI presenterte ulike tiltaksalternativer for oppryding av forurensede sedimenter med fokus på konsekvenser og forurensningsspredning på kort og lang sikt. Her ble det en ivrig diskusjon med flere spørsmål.

David Barton fra NIVA styrte samtalen tilbake til formål med møte som var å gå gjennom kriteria i det multi-kriteria-analyse slik at Interessegruppen kunne svare på spørreskjema på nytt. Det ble ikke tid til dette og derfor gjenomføres på neste møte.

Kurt Oddekalv fra Norges Miljøvernforbund avsluttet møte med en kort presentasjon om sitt6 engasjement og sine aktiviteter.
Minutes from third stakeholder meeting 3, 29 oktober

In all 9 stakeholders were present at the meeting including Bergen Kommune, COWI, Mattilsynet, Hav forskning Institutt, UiB and others (see the list).

Mattilsynet gave a presentation of the tolerable limits of toxins in sea food, and their role in maintaining food quality. The presentation was oriented towards permissible limits and the control measures by Mattilsynet. COWI presented the Strøm modellering I Vågen on the sediment transport.

During the presentations it was observed that none of the participants had knowledge of models. However, there was some enthusiasm to know more about them and what the models meant in the remediation issue.

The participants were then introduced to the Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) and were asked to spend some time to fill in their responses.

Some of the stakeholders expressed difficulties in answering the questionnaire, for eg. Questions 8, 9 and 10 and also what the intentions were behind the questions. For some it was difficult to choose the options due to lack of adequate knowledge and background information, especially on the costs of remediation. The options would depend partly on the costs, and who could bear the costs.

One stakeholder mentioned that ideally for him the objective should be how to make the area clean and reduce PCBs, pollutions, etc to a level where we can use the nature well before this all happened.

Objectives (some questions):

- *Kostholdsråd oppheves* (for Municipality - this is something to be considered),
- The control of the drainage inlets in the fjord
  - More information to the public
  - Increase consciousness

The stakeholders were asked if it would be meaningful to further meet and discuss in 2010. The stakeholders responded positively to the idea, but were not sure about
the identity of the panel and what role it would have in the process. It was felt that the press should be involved and invited to the meetings next year - so that they can make a story in the paper, and listen to stakeholder perspectives. The idea was to bring the discussion out of the room and to the public.

It would be good to bring about more discussions amongst the stakeholders, and in the meetings in 2010, efforts should be made for smaller working groups, presenting scenarios to the working groups and mapping their priorities and suggestions.