



REGIONAL REPORTS ON THE CONTEXT FOR PARTICIPATION

www.newater.info

Title	D 3.1-2: Regional Reports on the Context for Participation
Purpose	Evaluating the conditions for participation in the test basins
Filename	
Authors	Yorck von Korff, Olivier Barreateau
Document history	
Current version.	V5
Changes to previous version.	
Date	13 June 2006
Status	Final
Target readership	Project
General readership	
Correct reference	

Yorck von Korff, Olivier Barreateau
Cemagref

June 2006

Prepared under contract from the European Commission



Contract no 511179 (GOCE)
Integrated Project in
PRIORITY 6.3 Global Change and Ecosystems
in the 6th EU framework programme

Deliverable title: Report - Regional Reports on the Context for Participation
Deliverable no. : D 3.1.2
Due date of deliverable: Month
Actual submission date: 13.06.2006
Start of the project: 01.01.2005
Duration: 4 years

Preamble

The project has assembled a group of enthusiastic people with different scientific and practical background. In and of itself, the project presents a major challenge and a practical lesson in social learning in order to promote and guide the research process to profit from the diversity of knowledge and experiences. We welcome feedback and suggestions from anyone reading this report since it defines the basic structure of what we intend to do in the project. All teams involved are grateful for the support of the European Commission in providing funds for this research and to the national organisations contributing to the project.

Claudia Pahl-Wostl

Coordinator of WB1
NeWater project
August 2005

Executive Summary

This report is the report of the NeWater project on the context for the participation of local stakeholders in the NeWater project. The report describes the methodology that was used to learn about this context and presents the results as well as their limitations. The report concludes by discussing the implications of the findings for the future of the stakeholder processes in the test basins.

Generally speaking a sound basis in the six basins that provided data to this report seems to exist for going forward with the stakeholder processes, even if in some basins – mainly due to cultural constraints – the limits of who can be included in the process might be reached much quicker than in other sites.

Another result is that in all basins activities will be challenged by complexity – due to the transboundary nature of the work – and often by the multitude of issues that could be dealt with. One obvious way forward is the limitation of the work on agreed key issues.



Table of contents

Preamble	i
Executive Summary	iii
Table of contents	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Objectives	5
1.2 Structure	5
1.3 Definitions	5
1.4 Does context matter for the success of participation?	5
1.5 Does context matter for the way the participatory activity is conducted?	6
1.6 The method used in NeWater for analyzing context in the test basins	6
2. The results	7
2.1 Favorable context factors	8
2.2 Problematic context factors	9
2.3 Factors seen diversely in the various test basins	10
3. Limitations of the results	10
4. Implications	11
4.1 Possible limits of stakeholder participation in some cases	11
4.2 General challenges for all basins	11
4.3 A sound basis for further developing cooperation in all basins	11
5. List of references	13
6. Annex I: Survey questionnaire sent to the participants	14
7. Annex II: Returned results from the test basins	17



1. Introduction

1.1 Objectives

Deliverable 3.1-2 compares the contexts for stakeholder participation in the test basins of NeWater. This report, in other words, shows to what extent the external conditions in the basins favour or hinder the involvement of local water practitioners in the project.

Thus the purpose of this evaluation is not a detailed stakeholder analysis (including the characterization of actors, force fields and interests) for all river basins but rather an overview of conditions for success for a participatory research approach.

1.2 Structure

After clarification of the key concepts “stakeholder”, “participation” and “context”, the report will discuss the relevance of “context” as a concept, then explain the methodology that was used to describe the context in the test basins, after that provide the results of this description, and finally discuss implications of the results for the project.

1.3 Definitions

Who exactly can be a NeWater “stakeholder” is not explicitly defined in the project’s Description of Work. However, the objective of the project to develop adaptive water management strategies jointly with “water practitioners” in the test basins (NeWater 2004, 11) creates a variety of stakeholders: not only local water managers and policy makers, but also water users (such as representatives of farmer and water user organizations), civil society representatives that try to influence water decision-making (e.g. environmentalists) and other interested scientists who are not project partners. In reality, representatives of these groups have – to different degrees – been invited to project meetings in the test basins.

“Participation” is then to be understood as these stakeholders pursuing objectives that they set jointly with the researchers of NeWater. The overall joint goal for the project partners and the stakeholders is be in each case to discover new ways for adaptive river basin management. The stakeholders provide their specific needs but also background information as well as ideas about possible methods and tools. The researchers for the most part offer new concepts, methods and tools that they – in some cases - test jointly with the researchers.

The concept of participation as used in this report is thus different from the idea of “public participation” because in the latter also non-organized – but concerned – actors get involved in influencing goal setting and decision-making.

1.4 Does context matter for the success of participation?

For the participation of stakeholders in the test basin a certain “context” exists, that is, factors that participants cannot easily control or influence – at least not at when the work starts.



According to Beierle and Konisky (2000, 598) process factors (e.g. to what extent all relevant parties were represented in the stakeholder group or how early they got involved in the project) appear to be more important for the success of a participatory activity than context factors. In other words “participation can be successful in a variety of contexts”

On the other hand, some context factors – such as an escalated conflict between some of the parties involved - might have such a strong influence on participatory activities that they override everything that one tries to do during the process. Delli Priscoli and Creighton (1983, 429) illustrate: “It has to be recognized that if the stakes are too high, the alternatives too limited, or antagonisms too engrained, public involvement is unlikely to resolve the problem... . Even voting, the most universally accepted method of citizen participation, was incapable of resolving the issue of slavery in America.”

Von Korff 2005) who reviewed of the relevant literature on context¹ concludes: “Context often does not matter so much but in specific situations it might explain a lot. Therefore, it has to be systematically studied in each case.”

1.5 Does context matter for the way the participatory activity is conducted?

Besides deciding about the chances for success, the initial mix of actors, interests, and power relationships should normally influence the way a participatory process is set up (Gregory 2000). For Rowe and Frewer, who comprehensively reviewed the literature on public participation evaluation, the question which method to use in which situation is the primary research question in the field of public participation evaluation at the moment (Rowe and Frewer 2004).

Yet as the purpose of this evaluation of the NeWater case studies is not a detailed stakeholder analysis for all river basins but rather an overview of conditions for success for a participatory research approach we will in the following focus on more general factors with the merit to allow comparison between basins.

1.6 The method used in NeWater for analyzing context in the test basins

Rowe and Frewer (2004, 549) summarize: “[T]here is ... no accepted and widely used typology” for what “the most important contextual variables affecting participation effectiveness might be...”.

Yet, Beierle and Konisky (2000) developed a list of relevant “context attributes” from a literature study on participatory processes in the Great Lakes Region in North America. Von Korff (2005) later used this list in a somewhat adapted form to serve as an evaluation grid for context in NeWater. The list has emerged as follows:

¹ This literature especially discussed public participation and not so much the participation of organized stakeholders. However, we see no reason why the context factors for successful public participation should not also apply to the successful participation of organized stakeholders.



Table 1: Context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project

Name of factor	Hypothesis – The following context factors will help the <u>research and action process to be successful</u>
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good	The quality of relationships among those stakeholders and WP partners that are directly working together (site team) is good – i.e. there is basic trust or at least no distrust.
No major conflicts of interest	There is little pre-existing conflict between what the stakeholders on the one hand and the WP and case study partners on the other expect to achieve with the project
Interest in issue	Stakeholders and WP partners care about achieving the results that they have set
Confidence in process	Stakeholders and WP partners are confident that the selected process will help resolve the problem
Number of problems small	There are only a few problems to be addressed in the stakeholder process
Culture of participation among decision-makers	Water managers are used and open to joint research and action processes in which the opinions of all those who have a stake in the issue are considered.
Culture of participation among the public	The wider public is used to being involved in meaningful participation processes (at least in democratic elections)
Geographic and legal complexity low	The problem area is a small basin and not transboundary
Resources sufficient	There is enough time and funds available for stakeholders and WP partners to do the required work

Each test basin partner was required to comment on and then to fill in the table presented in Annex I. They were also asked to comment their answers. The final table that test basin partners had to fill in is represented in Annex I.²

Answers were received from the following basins: Amudarya, Elbe, Lower Guadiana, Upper Guadiana, Tisza, Niederrhein. Their detailed responses are listed in Annex II.

After that answers were compiled in the table below (next section) and results were interpreted regarding the question whether context rather favours or hinders participation of stakeholders (Sections 2.1 – 2.3).

2. The results

The summary of the results is represented in Table 2 below:

² As can be seen in Annex I, partners were not only asked to assess the context for stakeholder participation in the project but also the context for public participation activities wherever they were going on in any of the test basins. However, only two partners filled in answers to this second request and this not in a complete form, - not enough to conduct a relevant cross analysis on that item.



Table 2: Summary of results: Context factors influencing the interaction of the stakeholders with NeWater in the test basins

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (partners checked the appropriate box with an “x”)		
	Yes/given	Partially yes/ given	No/ not given
1. Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good	ENTU	A	L
2. No major conflicts of interest	AET	N	LU
3. Interest in issue	AENTU	L	
4. Confidence in process		AENTU	L
5. Number of problems in the stakeholder process is small	A ³ EN	T	ALU
6. Culture of participation among decision-makers	T ⁴	ENT	ALU
7. Culture of participation among the public	⁵	ET	ALU
8. Geographic and legal complexity small			AELNTU
9. Resources sufficient		LN	AETU

Key: A-Amudarya, E-Elbe, L-Lower Guadiana, N-Niederrhein, T-Tisza, U-Upper Guadiana.

2.1 Favourable context factors

Stakeholders interested in collaboration

The most positive response is that the stakeholders are mostly very interested (item 3 in the table) in collaborating with the NeWater partners, though some scepticism (Amudarya) is also reported from the side of the stakeholders concerning NeWater’s ability to deliver (for the comments see Annex II).

Good working atmosphere

With one exception, all sites report a good or at least reasonable working atmosphere between NeWater partners and stakeholders. Of course, it would have been more meaningful to check this factor at the very beginning of the project to see which partners got a head start by already having established relationships with stakeholders while others still had to spend time on building trust. In fact, the one site which reported the absence of a positive working atmosphere (Lower Guadiana) commented that meetings yet had to happen and that for this reason they could not say anything. An interesting comment in this regard also came from the Amudarya who gave this factor a middle ranking stating that “for some WP teams that are new to the basin relationships still have to be built and the often existing scepticism towards foreigners might pose some difficulties in building these relationships”. As around March 2006 WP partners began to interact in sites where they had not been before, it can be assumed that this situation in one form or another also exist for other sites. So the good working atmosphere should possibly be interpreted as existing

³ The Amudarya stated two “x”.

⁴ The Tisza checked two “x”.

⁵ Niederrhein: na



mainly between the case study partners and the stakeholders but not between the other WP partners and the stakeholders.

Not much conflict of interest between case study partners and stakeholders

Conflict of interest was not reported between case study partners and stakeholders. The Upper Guadiana reported relatively strong conflict among stakeholders (and this is why they placed a low mark) while the Lower Guadiana could not say anything yet (and this is why they as well gave a low mark). The Niederrhein case study had some doubts about the willingness of all stakeholders to commit to a long term vision (therefore a mark in the middle).

It needs to be emphasized that the potential conflict of interest between the other project WP partners (WBs 1,2 and 4) and the stakeholder is not yet reflected in the table. There might be a potential for conflicting interests here, as the various research interests will have to be integrated with the project interests of the stakeholders.

2.2 Problematic context factors

High complexity

Rather unsurprisingly, all sites reported high geographical and legal complexity due to the transboundary nature of the test basins. The comment from the Tisza is perhaps representative for many of the other basins: “The Tisza RB is a large transboundary river basin that contains different climate zones, a considerable part of high relief energy (Carpathians) as well as the territory of the basin belongs to 5 countries which are not all partner of the EU”.

Little resources

All test basins, even when they gave middle marks, expressed considerable doubts in their comments with regard to the available resources. The Tisza (and Amudarya in the almost same wording) for example writes: “For the ambitious goals of Newater the financial CS budget and especially the time budget of the WP partners are not sufficient. For the creation of a trustful long term cooperation which is the base for real participation processes time and budget of the project are not sufficient.” The Niederrhein apparently only expressed doubts about the resources (time) of the stakeholders not about project resources.

Culture of participation among decision-makers rather underdeveloped

All respondents expressed serious doubts about the ability of decision-making stakeholders to embrace the idea of including other affected parties into decision-making processes. Even the Niederrhein – where one would expect a certain acquaintance with participatory processes - expressed: “Not all stakeholders in the Arbeitsgruppe [= work team] are used to work with scientists and other non-governmental parties. There seems to be a close governmental circle of contacts.” The most extreme situation was perhaps expressed by the Amudarya: “Water managers in Uzbekistan are not always used and open to joint research and action processes. The system is, in general, a top-down and closed system of governance in which consulting the opinion of all stakeholders does not make sense to them. Only



the main decision makers are used and open to consult with one another. However, international development projects are asking for more participation, which is often met by “pseudo” participation”

Culture of participation among the public also often underdeveloped

Similar results were reached as for the culture of participation among decision-makers.

2.3 Factors seen diversely in the various test basins

Small number of problems in the stakeholder process

Some sites reported that the number of problems are “complex” (Upper Guadiana) other that problems are many but that it is planned to narrow them down (Lower Guadiana, Amudarya), while others again reported that they were going to treat only a limited number of issues (Elbe). The Niederrhein did not seem directly respond to the question and the Tisza made no comments. In general it seems fair to say that there is a diverse situation in the test basin when it comes to the number of issues that are treated with some basins still trying to narrow down complexity.

Confidence in process

Here the results fall into three baskets: For the Niederrhein and the Lower Guadiana the process was either not yet defined or it was not known to what extent stakeholders were confident - in any case no statement could be made. The Amudarya and the Tisza reported some stakeholder scepticism about NeWater terminology (being “adaptive”) and stakeholder uncertainty about where this project will lead to. The Elbe and the Upper Guadiana stated that there was confidence but only as far as limited objectives are concerned.

3. Limitations of the results

Before discussing the implications of the results for stakeholder participation in the test basins, it is appropriate to qualify the results stated in the preceding section.

Three limitations apply:

No triangulation

The survey relied only on the statement of the case study partners. Theoretically it would have been possible to also question other WP partners as well as stakeholders and thus get triangulated results. Given the existing time constraints, this was not done.

Subjective feedback

Directly related to the previous point is the fact that the description of the context situation was made by the case study partners themselves (and not by a “neutral” observer). For the case study partners, who are maximally involved in the test basin, it might be sometimes difficult to observe things in a detached way.



Possibly some confused answers

Some questions might have been sometimes misunderstood. For example, the Lower Guadiana answered a question about the question of conflict between stakeholders and project partners regarding conflict among stakeholders only. To avoid confusion in result interpretation, we have pointed out perceived misunderstandings in the preceding results section wherever it was feasible.

4. Implications

With the mentioned limitations in mind, the implications of the context factors for the participatory stakeholder activities in the test basins can now be discussed.

Overall there seem to be no overwhelming obstacles for implementing participatory stakeholder processes, though for all river basins significant challenges exist. In some cases, however, there seem to be important limitations concerning how far the participatory process can go. On the other hand, the basic conditions for developing the cooperation with the stakeholders seem to be sound everywhere.

4.1 Possible limits of stakeholder participation in some cases

Especially the Amudarya and the Lower Guadiana and in maybe milder form also others, have expressed significant hesitations when it comes to the prevailing culture of participation, notably among water managers and decision-makers. Whether it can be possible to stage a multi-party stakeholder process under these conditions remains to be seen. However, one possible way forward has already been traced by the Amudarya: “Public participation ... needs to be developed (awareness raising) among the decision makers first, then it can be introduced gradually”.

4.2 General challenges for all basins

Challenges for all basins exist especially in the form of geographic and legal complexity and a perceived limit of resources given the problems in the basins. Some basins seem to have already responded to these two challenges by concentrating only on a few key issues. This might also be an acceptable way forward for other basins that have not yet reduced complexity.

Maybe another challenge that is only partially reflected in the responses is the fact that not all WP partners who expect to work in the basins have made contacts yet. In some places – such as Uzbekistan – this might for cultural reasons be more difficult than in places like Holland where researchers from Germany or the UK appear culturally closer than – say - on the Amudarya.

4.3 A sound basis for further developing cooperation in all basins

Something the partners in all discussed basins can apparently capitalize on is the strong general interest of stakeholders in collaboration with NeWater even if there is also usually some doubt about what the project might be able to achieve and even



though some stakeholders might wonder about what it might finally mean to move towards “adaptive” management.

Another strong point is the quality of the working relationships that reportedly have been established.

With this situation in mind, it should – despite all obstacles - be possible to develop the participatory processes further even if limits in some cases – for example because of a “top-down” local culture - might be reached soon.



5. List of references

- Beierle, T.C., and Konisky, D.M. 2000. Values, conflict, and trust in participatory environmental planning. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 19 (4): 587-602.
- Delli Priscoli, J. and Creighton, J.L. 1983. Developing public involvement evaluations: A federal agency perspective. In: *Public involvement techniques. A reader of ten years experience at the Institute of Water Resources*. Institute for Water Resources. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Alexandria, VA: 420-33.
- Gregory, A. (2000). Problematizing Participation: A Critical Review of Approaches to Participation in Evaluation Theory. *Evaluation*, 6(2), 179-199.
- Rowe, G. and Frewer, L.J. 2004. Evaluating public participation exercises. A research agenda. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 29 (4), 512-556.
- Von Korff, Y. 2005. Towards an Evaluation Method for Public Participation Processes in AquaStress and NeWater. A proposal for both projects. *Unpublished Working Paper*. Cemagref.
- NeWater 2004. Annex I – “Description of Work”. In: Sixth Framework Programme. Priority 6.3. Global Change and Ecosystems.



6. Annex I: Survey questionnaire sent to the participants

Guidelines for reporting on the background for participation processes

For reporting about the background for participation processes we differentiate two levels of participation and therefore also two different contexts (our preferred term for background) for participation:

On the **first level** we are interested in the conditions for the interactions between stakeholders, case study partners, and project WPs. So we are addressing the conditions for participation on the levels of the participation of the stakeholders with the project. On this level, it is usually the site partners that are coordinating participation activities. This kind of participation will happen in all case study sites.

On a **second level** we will look at the conditions for public participation, that is, the interaction of the wider public with one or several of the local lead agencies. On this level, it is usually a local water management institution (but it can also be another body – e.g. an NGO) that is coordinating participation activities. Examples for this are public consultations according to the WFD, or local flood management projects, or yet other interventions.

Below, please find some tables with the criteria that we will use for evaluating the context on the two levels. The criteria are derived from the literature (notably: Beierle, T.C., and Konisky, D.M.. 2000. Values, conflict, and trust in participatory environmental planning. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 19 (4): 587-602. The focus on this work emerged from a literature review which is described in von Korff, Y. 2005. Towards an Evaluation Method for Public Participation Processes in AquaStress and NeWater. A proposal for both projects. Unpublished working paper. Cemagref: Montpellier)

Your task will be to look at the criteria (Tables 1 and 3) and to explain and comment (only in Tables 2 and 4) to what extent they apply. **Please note that a comment/ explanation is needed for each criterion (in Tables 2 and 4) so that the reader can understand the situation with regard to each respective criterion.**

The deadline for reporting back is **March 31st**.

I. Reporting about stakeholder participation in project-coordinated activities

Please describe first your case study in not more than ten lines (objectives, partners, roles of partners, geographical scope, planned way of interaction with stakeholders):



Now please fill in Table 2 below. Table 1 is for your information only.

Table 1: context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project

Name of factor	Hypothesis – The following context factors will help the research and action process to be successful
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good	The quality of relationships among those stakeholders and WP partners that are directly working together (site team) is good – i.e. there is basic trust or at least no distrust.
No major conflicts of interest	There is little pre-existing conflict between what the stakeholders on the one hand and the WP and case study partners on the other expect to achieve with the project
Interest in issue	Stakeholders and WP partners care about achieving the results that they have set
Confidence in process	Stakeholders and WP partners are confident that the selected process will help resolve the problem
Number of problems small	There are only a few problems to be addressed in the stakeholder process
Culture of participation among decision-makers	Water managers are used and open to joint research and action processes in which the opinions of all those who have a stake in the issue are considered.
Geographic and legal complexity small	The problem area is a small basin and not transboundary
Resources sufficient	There is enough time and funds available for stakeholders and WP partners to do the required work

Table 2 (below) is to be filled in with **complete** comments and explanations! Explanations serve to illustrate the situation for specific case studies. Comments are your estimation to what extent you see the respective factor having an impact potential on the planned participation process.

Table 2: Context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project illustrated

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (check the appropriate box with an "x")			Comment/ Explanation
	Given	Partially given	Not given	
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good				
No major conflicts of interest				
Interest in issue				
Confidence in process				
Number of problems small				
Culture of participation among decision-makers				
Culture of participation among the public				
Geographic and legal complexity small				
Resources sufficient				



II. Reporting about the participation of the public in specific sub-cases

Tables 3 and 4 state almost the same criteria as the previous two tables, however they are geared to public participation processes that are usually coordinated/ lead by stakeholders. You might have in your research area (basin) none, one, or more than one of these processes. If you have none, don't bother with the tables below. If you have one, give a short description of the case and then fill in Table 4. If you have more than one case, please describe each case, copy Table 4 and fill it in **for as many cases as you have** in your research area.

Please describe first the case(s) in not more than ten lines (objectives, lead agency, participants, role of lead agency, participants and your role, geographical scope, planned way of interaction with the public):

Now fill in Table 4. Table 3 is for your information only.

Table 3: Context criteria for the public participation case “[state name here!]”

Name of factor	Hypothesis – The following context factors will help the participation of the public to be successful
Atmosphere among the participants is good	The quality of relationships among those from the public who are participating is good – i.e. there is basic trust or at least no distrust.
No major conflicts of interest	There is little pre-existing conflict between the goals of the participants
Attitude towards lead agency positive	The attitude of participants towards the lead agency of the public participation process is positive
Interest in issue	Participants care about solving the problem
Confidence in process	Participants are confident that the selected process will help resolve the problem
Number of problems small	There are only a few problems to be addressed in the public participation process
Culture of participation in lead agency	The lead agency is used to and experienced in processes in which the opinions of all those who have a stake in the issue are considered.
Culture of participation among the public	The wider public is used to being involved in meaningful participation processes (at least in democratic elections)
Geographic and legal complexity small	The problem area is small and there are no overlapping jurisdictions (e.g. between county and state)
Resources sufficient	There is enough time, knowledge and funds available for participants and the lead agency to do the required work

Table 4: Context criteria for the public participation case “[state name here!]” - illustrated

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (check the appropriate box with an “x”)			Comment/ Explanation
	Given	Partially given	Not given	
Atmosphere among the participants is good				
No major conflicts of interest				
Attitude towards lead agency positive				
Interest in issue				
Confidence in process				



Number of problems small				
Culture of participation in lead agency				
Culture of participation among the public				
Geographic and legal complexity small				
Resources sufficient				

7. Annex II: Returned results from the test basins

Amudarya

Table 2: Context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project illustrated

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (check the appropriate box with an "x")			Comment/ Explanation
	Given	Partially given	Not given	
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good		x		The quality of relationships among the stakeholders and NeWater WP partners who are directly working together is good. There is a good atmosphere and much interest in working together. However for some WP teams that are new to the basin relationships still have to be built and the often existing scepticism towards foreigners might pose some difficulties in building these relationships
No major conflicts of interest	x			Stakeholders and WP teams want to achieve the same objectives. There might be some differences in the means the different groups consider appropriate to reach those aims.
Interest in issue	x			Both want to achieve the goals and improve water management in the basin. Some stakeholders seem to be somewhat sceptical about whether NeWater can deliver anything new and useful.
Confidence in process		X		Since the NeWater concept and approaches are pretty new, and there is no culture of participation in the river basin, nor a strong civil society, stakeholders are to some extent sceptical about the process because they do not see where it will lead to. More generally it is one of the major tasks of NeWater in the river basin to determine processes that can help resolve current problems in the given socio-economic, political and natural context.
Number of problems small	x		x	Number so far still too large, but will be narrowed down in the specific stakeholder processes (processes will only address specific issues)
Culture of participation among decision-makers			x	Water managers in Uzbekistan are not always used and open to joint research and action processes. The system is, in general, a



				top-down and closed system of governance in which consulting the opinion of all stakeholders does not make sense to them. Only the main decision makers are used and open to consult with one another. However, international development projects are asking for more participation, which is often met by "pseudo" participation
Culture of participation among the public			x	Public is used to the authorities saying what has to be done, authorities used to having to educate the public. Public participation in Uzbekistan is a new concept and needs to be developed (awareness raising) among the decision makers first, then it can be introduced gradually.
Geographic and legal complexity small			x	Large and transboundary, processes at many scales
Resources sufficient			x	In comparison with the ambitious goals of NeWater and for the creation of a trustful long term cooperation which the base for real participation of all stakeholders, the financial CS budget and especially the time budget of the WP partners are not sufficient.

Elbe

Table 2: Context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project illustrated

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (check the appropriate box with an "x")			Comment/ Explanation
	yes	Partially yes	no	
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good	x			The quality of relationships among those stakeholders and WP partners that are directly working together is good – i.e. there is basic trust or at least no distrust.
No major conflicts of interest	x			There is little pre-existing conflict between what the stakeholders on the one hand and the case study partners on the other expect to achieve with the project.
Interest in issue	x			Stakeholders and WP partners care about achieving the results that they have set
Confidence in process		x		Stakeholders and WP partners are confident that the selected process will help resolve some problems, but not major problems in the basin
Number of problems in the stakeholder process is small	x			There are only a few problems to be addressed in the stakeholder process
Culture of participation among decision-makers		x		Only some water managers are used and open to joint research and action processes in which the opinions of all those who have a stake in the issue are considered.
Culture of participation among the public		x		
Geographic and legal complexity small			x	The problem area is a large transboundary basin



Resources sufficient			x	There is neither enough time nor funds available for stakeholders and WP partners to solve major identified problems in the basin, the team can only do some steps forward to solving them.
----------------------	--	--	---	---

Lower Guadiana

Table 2: Context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project illustrated

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (check the appropriate box with an "x")			Comment/ Explanation
	Given	Partially given	Not given	
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good			X	No interaction yet. 1st transboundary workshop is on April 18 th .
No major conflicts of interest			X	Not known yet.
Interest in issue		X		There is a general interest in the issues being analysed.
Confidence in process			X	Not known yet.
Number of problems small			X	Many problems to be addressed in the stakeholder process. There will be the need to select the most important ones.
Culture of participation among decision-makers			X	There is no culture of participation among decision-makers. This may have a negative impact on the planned process.
Culture of participation among the public			X	There is no culture of participation among the public. This may have a negative impact on the planned process.
Geographic and legal complexity small			X	Large transboundary basin
Resources sufficient		X		Hard to estimate at the moment if resources are sufficient

Upper Guadiana

Table 2: Context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project illustrated

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (check the appropriate box with an "x")			Comment/ Explanation
	Given	Partially given	Not given	
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good	X			Stakeholders feel NeWater offers a valuable interaction framework. WP partners have long since interacted with the area's stakeholders in a friendly manner.
No major conflicts of interest			X	Conflict is very much a daily reality in the basin. This comes across in the stakeholder meetings.
Interest in issue	X			The issue of aquifer exploitation is very much present in the Upper Guadiana basin media.



				Transbasin conflicts also exist. Therefore stakeholders present a high degree of interest.
Confidence in process		X		Only as a non-binding informal framework for discussion.
Number of problems small			X	Issues under discussion are complex.
Culture of participation among decision-makers			X	Although decision makers are increasingly moving towards a broader type of stakeholder involvement.
Culture of participation among the public			X	Although stakeholders have got more organised in recent years and have begun to form more or less powerful lobbies.
Geographic and legal complexity small			X	Though the Upper Guadiana basin is fairly small, legal controversies are present. Transbasin conflicts are also significant.
Resources sufficient		X		Perhaps, if properly managed. Certainly not as things currently stand.

Niederrhein

Table 2: Context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project illustrated

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (check the appropriate box with an "x")			Comment/ Explanation
	Given	Partially given	Not given	
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good	X			Early contacts were ok. A 'site team' has been formed, but is not yet operational.
No major conflicts of interest		X		There have been no conflicts, but there are partially different interests: not all stakeholders seem to be convinced of the importance of a long-term vision.
Interest in issue	X			There is interest in the issue. The developed work plan has been agreed upon by the Arbeitsgruppe.
Confidence in process		X		The process just started (details are not yet defined). Confidence still has to grow.
Number of problems small	X			There are no strong controversies.
Culture of participation among decision-makers		X		Not all stakeholders in the Arbeitsgruppe are used to work with scientist and other non-governmental parties. There seems to be a close governmental circle of contacts.
Culture of participation among the public				n/a (no public involved)
Geographic and legal complexity small			X	The case study is transboundary and the Rhine basin is rather large.
Resources sufficient		X		The resources / time of the stakeholders (in particular in Nordrhein-Westphalia is limited.



Tisza

Table 2: Context criteria for the interaction of the stakeholders with the project illustrated

Name of factor	Existence of Factor (check the appropriate box with an "x")			Comment/ Explanation
	Given	Partially given	Not given	
Atmosphere among stakeholders and WP partners good	x			The quality of relationships among the stakeholders and Newater WP partners that are directly working together is good. The information flow is quick and sound.
No major conflicts of interest	x			
Interest in issue	x			All parties involved are interested in the issues we discuss.
Confidence in process		x		In particular the Newater methodologies to detect and to assess of "being more adaptive" produce some doubts among the stakeholders in terms of: are they already developed enough to be applicable? OR What is exactly adaptive capacity?
Number of problems small		x		
Culture of participation among decision-makers	x	x		Especially water engineers are not always used and open to joint research and action processes in which the opinions of all those who have a stake in the flood risk and flood mitigation issues as well as in the ecological assessment according to the WFD.
Culture of participation among the public		x		
Geographic and legal complexity small			x	The Tisza RB is a large transboundary river basin that contains different climate zones, a considerable part of high relief energy (Carpathians) as well as the territory of the basin belongs to 5 countries which are not all partner of the EU.
Resources sufficient			x	For the ambitious goals of Newater the financial CS budget and especially the time budget of the WP partners are not sufficient. For the creation of a trustful long term cooperation which is the base for real participation processes time and budget of the project are not sufficient.