STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT IN THE ALLOCATION PROCESS
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**Scope**

1. Why involve stakeholders?
2. How do we do it currently?
3. Is it successful?
4. How could we do it better?
5. What should we expect as an outcome?
Why involve stakeholders?

• Government commitment
  • Agenda 21 – public participation essential for ecological sustainable development.
  • Australian and State Government commitments.
• Community demand
  • Eg: 2002 Bureau of Rural Sciences national fishing survey – 79% respondents wanted management of fisheries to include better consultation with the community.
Why involve stakeholders?(cont)

- A. Is it fair? Do they care? (community)

Does the Department of Fisheries share fish resources fairly between the sectors

![Bar chart showing yes, no, and can't say responses for the years 1997 to 2005.]

- Year:
- Legend:
  - Red: Yes
  - Green: No
  - Blue: Can’t Say
Why involve stakeholders? (cont)

B. Is it fair? Do they care? (stakeholders)

Does the Department of Fisheries share fish resources fairly between the sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What happens if you don’t?

Eg: Logging in native forests

• CALM science showed karri harvesting regimes sustainable,

• Emotive response of mainly metro-based public,

• Result: 86-100% of old growth karri and two-tiered karri-tingle forest now reserved from logging.
What do we do currently?

Example: IFM allocations for rock lobster
(40,000 rec. fishers; 500 commercial fishers)

• IFAC develop paper,

• Public workshops around WA
  Attendances:
  • Geraldton – 1
  • Jurien – 8
  • Fremantle – 1
  • Bunbury – 18
  • Mandurah – 9
  • Hillarys – 35
What do we do currently?

- IFM allocations for rock lobster (cont)
- Why so few?
- Hypothesis: Inadequate awareness of workshops
  - So – increase communications through media, website, direct mail, presentations to fishing clubs, displays, etc.
- Results:
  - Jurien meeting2 - 35 people,
  - Fremantle meeting2 – 35 people
- Is it apathy?
  - Surveys say people interested, want to be involved;
- Awareness?
  - Not tested – unlikely?
- Is it the method of engagement? - maybe
How could we do it better?

1. Invite participants to become involved
2. Clarify objectives, scope, roles and responsibilities
3. Provide information (increase capacity)
4. Develop preferred methods of engagement with stakeholders
5. Draft proposal (together) for general comment
6. Evaluate, review, reward
1. INVITE PARTICIPANTS TO BECOME INVOLVED

NOT just ‘special interest groups’:

- Vicarious users (anyone interested), AND
- Management Advisory Committees, AND
- Peak groups, AND
- Regional communities, AND
- Conservation sector, AND
- Indigenous sector, AND
- Researchers (social, biological, economic), AND
- Fishery managers, AND
- Policy makers, AND
- Mass media, AND
2. Objectives, scope etc

- What do you want to achieve together?
- What is non-negotiable and why?
- What sorts of time frames?
- What feedback can they expect from the process
3. **Increasing capacity**

Provision of background information in various forms

- Online
- Hard copies
- Presentations
- Displays
4. Developing preferred engagement model

Consider together:

- Time frames
- Preferred methods— an integrated plan may include:
  - E-engagement (emails, bulletin boards, e-forms)
  - Citizens juries
  - Charrette
  - Public meetings
  - Focus groups
- Cost/benefit
5. Draft proposal

- Develop the proposal (together)
- Distribute widely for comments
6. Evaluate, review, reward

• How effective was the process?
• Did participants feel engaged?
• Any suggestions for modifications?
• Thanks and acknowledgment of input
What should we expect as a successful outcome?

1. Stakeholders accept legitimacy of decision making process
2. Understand each others concerns
3. Decisions improved
4. Stakeholders accept decisions
5. Stakeholders assist by becoming our ambassadors
6. Support of and compliance with decisions
Ensuring fish for the future

- One size does not fit all

- May need different methods for similar allocations decisions over time (because things change)

- Ultimately we want to be ensuring fish for the future and we can only do it by working together