

**Raw H-diagrams and action plans from the PATH conference**

**“How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?”**

<p><b>Negative reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- they are so broad, not clear where to use which one</li> <li>- the question is more how to take into account scales other than that at which the process is being held... and that is very often not clear at all</li> <li>- scale issue not only dependent on methods but more on facilities, knowledge, experiences</li> <li>- be aware “the public” is differently engaged at different scales i.e. locally and in early stakeholder</li> <li>- different methods require different data, problem setting, etc. not always possible to get this data on all scales</li> <li>- expenses at EU scale!</li> <li>- We still need to test CIT participant global scale :o)</li> <li>- Lack of capacity to deliver</li> <li>- Whilst they can be used in this way few examples exist</li> <li>- It requires skills and large resources to design large multiple scale processes neither of which are very available</li> <li>- Pan Europeand trans national approach</li> </ul>	<p>How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?</p> <p>Scores: 4/5/6 → 4/5/6 5 → 5 7/8 → 7/8 10 → 10</p>		<p><b>Positive reasons</b></p> <p><b>Code S1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- methods can be adapted to scale</li> <li>- the toolbox is quite big and diverse</li> <li>- to ascertain about any method can be adopted to any scale</li> <li>- the problem is not method but lack of initiatives at i.e. trans-national scale</li> <li>- many of the methods are flexible in adapting to different scales (e.g. MCE, focus groups,...)</li> <li>- you can design your own methods to be appropriate for your scale or combine methods</li> <li>- good practice is tailored to the situation so it is possible to design a process that works and includes multiple scales</li> <li>- IT/ the Net make multiple scale dialogue more possible</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</b></p>		
	<p>UN &amp; EU should give us some experience on trans-national level</p>	3	
	<p>Case examples to demonstrate what is possible at 2-3 scales within same process</p>	4	
	<p>Institutional support from internat. NGOs or processes that happened already (NES, Rio, Kyoto, World Social Forum)</p>	2	
	<p>Capacity development</p>	3	

**Comment Card:**

Not enough time

Question not explicit enough, too general. E.G where, for what issue?

Scales = political scales

Not happy with the “scale” question. If passed framing of the problem

Methods fit for each different scale?

Question understood by some to mean different scales by others to mean a process had to work at multiple scales.

<p><b>Negative reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- scale limits rich information</li> <li>- high transaction costs</li> <li>- how are ideas/ data funnelled “up” into decision making?</li> <li>- “elephant description” problem</li> <li>- deeper contextual information is better gathered at local, small scale</li> <li>- information transfer to public is often too technical</li> <li>- some methods work better with small groups and hence are not appropriate for larger scales</li> <li>- active involvement tends to focus at local community level +passive = national stakeholder involvement at higher scales often turns out to be constricted to certain issues</li> <li>- who speaks for whom at international level?</li> <li>- Individual voices may not be heard at bigger, larger scale</li> <li>- Lack of financial resources and expert knowledge on PP among those who conduct it</li> </ul>	<p>How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?</p> <p>Scores: 3 → 4 2 → 2 4 → 4 4 → 4</p>	<p><b>Positive reasons</b></p> <p><b>Code S2AC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good consultative process</li> <li>- Sound variety of methods, particularly at local/ regional scale</li> <li>- Nested systems are possible</li> <li>- Some “grass roots” international networks via the web</li> <li>- Examples e.g. America speaks show can be deliberate at national scale</li> <li>- Examples of people learning from local scale processes</li> <li>- Communication networks make participation feasible at all scales</li> <li>- With adequate resources it is possible to involve people at all scales</li> <li>- Meeting problems at their suitable scale</li> <li>- There are a range of methods suitable for different scales</li> <li>- Problems have their own scales which force interaction</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</b></p>	
	<p>More resources into participation at larger scale</p>	2
	<p>Strengthen downward accountability of representatives</p>	3
	<p>Improve communication and knowledge transfer between governments and experts in PP</p>	1
	<p>Remember how scale can frame the problem</p>	2
	<p>Resource multi-directional linkages often using NGOs</p>	2
	<p>(conduct) (share) research into what methods work at what scales</p>	2

**Comment Card:**

None

<p><b>Negative reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it is a relatively new subject → methods are not developed enough</li> <li>- there are not many occasions/ not many experiences</li> <li>- it's costly</li> <li>- resources – money, time</li> <li>- multi-scale assessments are expensive and hard to operationalise</li> <li>- some issues are hard to upscale e.g. risks to biodiversity → rather case specific</li> <li>- benefits of participation are different on different scales</li> <li>- we don't have a proper scientific-social framework</li> <li>- top-down, bottom-up are not global</li> <li>- methods today are issue dependent</li> <li>- public authorities are not used to act on different scales</li> <li>- selection representative of participants</li> <li>- it is very difficult to identify the scale an actor is acting upon</li> <li>- interests, values, data in general differ a lot between the scales</li> <li>- conflicting results may be produced by different levels</li> <li>- intercultural differences</li> <li>- barriers to deliberation across societies (international scale)</li> </ul>	<p>How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?</p> <p>Scores: 6 → 3 4 → 4 5 → 5 8 → 8 1 → 1 4 → 4</p>	<p><b>Positive reasons</b></p> <p><b>CodeS3AC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- people can integrate different scales (geographical, political) in their deliberations</li> <li>- systematic procedures work for big groups town meetings</li> <li>- developments in S&amp;KI (??) new media</li> <li>- new information tools improving</li> <li>- methods exist or are being developed</li> <li>- methods exist to involve quite large numbers – America Speaks online deliberation</li> <li>- methods can be used separately at different scales</li> <li>- it is possible to get multiple perspectives represented in n-forums</li> <li>- analysis of stakeholders unveils multi-scales entities that must be addressed somehow</li> <li>- participatory methods share a “tradition” of multi-scale assessment</li> <li>- informal processes in public sphere can work at multiple levels simultaneously</li> <li>- processes being analysed are multi-scale by nature</li> <li>- possibility of meeting others problems and worries</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</b></p>	
	Function specific use of new media	2
	Better understand cross-scale interactions	3
	More institutional experimentation	5
	Comparison of ongoing assessments	4
	EU policy promoting citizen's involvement on multiple scales (local → EU)	2
Changing in “multiplicity” concept (social-economic – institutional different way of understanding of linkages)	1	

**Comment Card:** None

<b>Negative reasons</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- difficult to achieve meaningful participation at large scales</li> <li>- very few multi-level engagements</li> <li>- expense of large scale</li> <li>- relatively much attention paid to individual (lobby) groups</li> <li>- even at local scale participation tends to be issue driven rather than (participant) problem driven</li> <li>- logistical and representative challenges</li> <li>- policy processes on a larger level are less transparent</li> <li>- people easier to mobilise on a local level</li> <li>- lack of concrete integration of the results in decision processes</li> <li>- quite a lot of experiences on a local level; more difficult on a larger level</li> </ul>	How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?  Scores: 2/8 → 2/8 (2lge scale; 8 small scale) 3 → 3 4 → 4 4 → 4		<b>Positive reasons</b> <b>Code S4AC</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are lots of local project – led methods from PRA (eq. the “H” method)</li> <li>- A lot of participation approaches have been developed for different scales</li> <li>- Small scale is achievable</li> <li>- Some academics are thinking about the big questions of “high risk stakes”</li> <li>- Promising techniques may become useful, e.g. internet</li> <li>- Experiences on all different scales exist</li> <li>- There are ways to ensure representativeness</li> <li>- Maybe participation needs to be different (even less) at the larger scale?</li> <li>- The methods are not the real problem</li> <li>- Cannot read one at all !</li> </ul>
	<b>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</b>		
	Get people involved & excited	3	
	Basic education about participatory democracy (citizen level)	1	
	Analysis of what scale participation should occur	2	
	Develop evidence so there can be an evidence-based approach to PP	2	
	Transparency of integration of decisions into policy making at different levels	2	
Transmit values of democracy @ early ages	2		

**Comment Card:**

None

Negative reasons	How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?	Positive reasons	Code S5			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the methods work better at the local scale – easier to secure representation</li> <li>- it is very difficult to engage the general public in policy making at large (e.g. EU) spatial scale</li> <li>- It seems easier to engage at local scales</li> <li>- Lots of conflict when “downstream” public is confronted with “upstream” policy</li> <li>- There is a EU government but is there an EU public?</li> <li>- At regional and national scales, demands more courage to participants</li> <li>- Methods can mostly be used at any (?) scale but do we know if it makes sense?</li> <li>- There are problems with participatory methods that reduce their effectiveness at any spatial scale</li> <li>- Methods could be developed e.g. use of new information society rules</li> <li>- Election turnouts are low, especially at EU level</li> <li>- How do you establish the “scale” of a problem? →contentious process itself worthy of PP</li> <li>- Regional level is least problematic and from there on (and national, EU,...) it doesn’t get easier</li> <li>- Methods are not always used in a reflected way</li> </ul>	Scores: 2 → 2 5 → 5 5 → 5 6 → 6 6 → 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the methods seem to have the capacity to work on different scales</li> <li>- multiple methods are used which fits with at least one or more scales</li> <li>- there are many different participatory methods for different spatial scales – you just need to select the right method</li> <li>- we have elections on most scales: local, regional, national, EU</li> <li>- participatory approaches can amend faulty top-down policy</li> <li>- organisation of different methods and transitions between them can engage different scales</li> <li>- even at national scales the dynamics of “small groups” work</li> </ul>				
	<b>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</b>					
	The larger the scale → need replication of the process → to increase legitimacy			3		
	Look into how new information society tools can be used for real participation. Internet, discussion fora, e-surveys			5		
	Use PP as a means to an end			3		
	More funding for better PP at all spatial scales			3		
	More knowledge (research) to know which method to apply when			1		

**Comment Card:**

The posted questions assume (?) that PP are an end in themselves. However, they are a means to an end!

<p><b>Negative reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- different or versatile methods needed to cover different scales</li> <li>- should end personal pressures on potential lay person participants</li> <li>- processes are open to being captured by interest groups</li> <li>- manipulation by powerful groups</li> <li>- processes are too often limited by governments; aversion to democratic participants</li> <li>- resources and practicality limit the ability of participatory methods to effectively involve people at multiple scales</li> <li>- large scale processes involving lots of people are seen as too expensive by public bodies</li> <li>- lack of participatory experience on some scales</li> <li>- funding given</li> </ul>	<p>How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?</p>		<p><b>Positive reasons</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Code S6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Attempts to integrate different methods can mean that diverse publics can participate</li> <li>- Multiple methods improve scale</li> <li>- Consultation or politicalisation of institutions remains at local level</li> <li>- Enlarging the scale could help in finding “super-ordinated goals” for conflict resolutions</li> <li>- For making people more aware of their diversities X scales</li> <li>- They are a good starting point for getting scale</li> <li>- Growing bottom-up movement</li> <li>- Possible effect of communication on learning process</li> <li>- “grounding” of large- scale decisions in local knowledge</li> <li>- make better decisions (robust, etc.)</li> <li>- the alternatives are generally even more faulted</li> </ul>
	<p>Scores: 1 → 1 1 → 1 1 → 1 5 → 3 3 → 3 3 → 3</p>		
	<p><b>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</b></p>		
	<p>Trying to bridge the various scales according to their possible interdependencies and not on their oppositions/ conflicting positions</p>	1	
	<p>Institutionalise processes that encourage multiple methods that nest achieve diversity off scale (within practical budgets)</p>	5	
	<p>Share experiences of using multiple methods that work at various scales and evaluate their effectiveness</p>	3	
	<p>Make schools into models of participations → future decision makers and citizens will act on various scales</p>	1	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- question of responsiveness keeps emerging from non-participants – esp on local scale</li> <li>- Effect of silent minority exist to most of methods</li> <li>- Many processes by their nature exclude some people</li> <li>- People (practitioners?) can get stuck on a single method which may not fit all scales</li> <li>- Multiple scales increase possible conflicting diversities among groups of people</li> <li>- Attitude of workshops as “play” in professional environment</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--

**Comment Card:**

At first we are assuming that we are talking about scale in terms of numbers of participants. Could also mean: scales of attitudes; temporal scales; geographic – local, national  
Multiple scales will mean effective representation of diversity or publics.

<p><b>Negative reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- missing standardisation → less generalisation of results</li> <li>- Assimilation of outputs difficult when using multiple scales?</li> <li>- Deliberative processes tend to prioritise small group discussion – hard to scale up</li> <li>- Local people involved at local level, others involved at regional, national levels – never the twain shall meet</li> <li>- Lack of experimentation to discover ways to improve capacity to work at multiple scales</li> <li>- No tools and kits for conventional participation</li> <li>- Many people don't believe this work can be done at larger scales and resist participating in those designs choosing to remain with their existing bias</li> <li>- Rate of speed necessary to cover key issues works against depth of discussion on each issue</li> <li>- Bias in sampling interested people for participation less resources for participation as a scientific method</li> <li>- Time and cost of processes limit scale</li> <li>- Expensive to involve people in regional and national processes</li> <li>- Depth of discussion required limits possible scale</li> </ul>	<p>How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?</p> <p>Scores: 2 → 4 3 → 5 3/4 → 5/6 3 → 3</p>		<p><b>Positive reasons</b></p> <p><b>Code S7</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UK land use planning links involvement in local and regional planning</li> <li>- UK strengthening of nations and regions has increased participation at these scales</li> <li>- There are good projects trialling different methods and scales within one project</li> <li>- These are well documented cases of methods working at many different sites</li> <li>- Single, participatory methods being substituted by multilevel methods</li> <li>- Geographical information systems are being used to help people understand and contribute to decisions at different scales</li> <li>- Technology now allows much wider participation</li> <li>- New approaches will improve public participation</li> <li>- Bringing different perspectives together by multiple scales and common methods</li> <li>- Processes with small numbers can be repeated (leading to increased numbers participating)</li> <li>- Genuine interests in researching outcomes at multiple levels by site</li> <li>- Increasing recognitions by professionals in the field that the work needs to be done at different scales</li> </ul>
	<b>Actions that could be taken to improve the score in future:</b>		
	Invest more resources in doing projects at multiple scales to increase our knowledge of effective practices	4	
	Sharing and publicising good practices to help shift mind sets and biases about participation at multiple scales	3	
	Hold more conferences like this: a) national-local; b) national – EU- International (on multiple scales)	2	
	Expand the deliberative – democracy consortium of researchers and practitioners on-line and F2F, global	3	

**Comment Card:**

We found the wording of this question made it difficult to know what the central focus of the question really was. Did you really want us to evaluate individual methods in their capacity to do multiple scales? Whether the range of available methods is ????dle of getting to multiple scales. We weren't sure either whether we should be considering how good the links are between scales of involvement.

## Action Planning

### “How good are participatory methods at involving people at multiple scales?”

Suggested actions were taken from the H-diagrams and participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

- Why is it important?
- Who should be responsible for what to make it happen?
- How can they encourage it to happen?
- When should it be done?
- How will we know when it is done?

<b>Action</b>	Further look into how new tools of the information society can be used on PP (eg. Internet referendums, discussion for a, e-surveys etc etc) Also in actual meetings these instruments could perhaps be used, possibilities to have larger meetings???
<b>Why ?</b>	The new technologies have a potential which has so far not materialised. If it could be materialised it might be very cool – efficient and open possibilities, which have so far not been available. But that remains to be examined. They facilitate involvement of large numbers of people, also in different locations and (to some extent) in different cultural contexts
<b>Who?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- researchers</li> <li>- technology companies</li> <li>- participatory practitioners</li> <li>- NGOs</li> <li>- Governments</li> </ul>
<b>How?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide funding</li> <li>- Disseminate existing tools and raise awareness of need</li> </ul>
<b>When?</b>	now
<b>Done?</b>	It is a process which is probably never complete
<b>Action</b>	Resource participatory research through multi-directional linkages to learn what works at what scales
<b>Why ?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Problems have their own scales</li> <li>- Rhetoric not backed by resources at present</li> <li>- Knowledge base needs strengthening</li> </ul>

<b>Who?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Research funding agencies: research on participation</li> <li>- Authorities at all levels and foundations/NGOs: practice of participation</li> </ul>
<b>How?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- raising awareness</li> <li>- based on a better theoretical understanding of the scale issue</li> <li>- within a strategic framework</li> </ul>
<b>When?</b>	Soon... tomorrow at 15.32!
<b>Done?</b>	When milestones in the strategic framework are met.
<b>Action</b>	Share experiences of using multiple methods that work at various scales and evaluate their effectiveness to feed into institutionalising processes that encourage multiple methods that best achieve diversity of scale (within practical budgets)
<b>Why ?</b>	It needs to become an accepted practice that achieves both participatory processes at multiple scales
<b>Who?</b>	Start at the European level for co-ordination. EC provides start-up funding (in area of ERANET). Some national actors to do the application.
<b>How?</b>	Integration on the European level. The national actors take care of the regional and local level
<b>When?</b>	as soon as possible
<b>Done?</b>	It's a continuous process. Milestones could be first common participating activity
<b>Action</b>	Appraise systematically under what conditions participatory processes are successful and when other types of processes would work better More institutional experimentation How to institutionalise participation at unequal levels and across levels?
<b>Why ?</b>	Methods are being developed but we need to find out more about what works, by what criteria, under what conditions
<b>Who?</b>	Authorities in co-operation with practitioners and researchers
<b>When?</b>	Start now
<b>Action</b>	Strengthen downwards accountability of representatives
<b>Why ?</b>	Clear link between small number of deliberators and their constituencies so all feel linked to the process
<b>Action</b>	Case examples that demonstrate what is possible in designing and delivering processes that work at 2-3 spatial scales within the same process
<b>Why ?</b>	To be able to manage the specificities of the different scales simultaneously (translate between levels)

<b>Action</b>	Get people excited and involved in PP by giving people basic education of participatory democracy and transmitting values of democracy at early ages. Developing evidence so there can be an evidence based approach to PP and by being transparent in the integration of decisions into policymaking at different levels.
<b>Why ?</b>	If people are not engaged they cannot participate! If people are successfully engaged at the local/project level then it will be easier to engage them at the larger more strategic levels.
<b>Action</b>	Increase networking on participatory methods at multiple scales through; -conferences between practitioners and policymakers at multiple levels Expansion of deliberative democracy, consortia of researchers and practitioners (on-line, face to face, global)
<b>Why ?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- share learning and practice</li> <li>- increase awareness</li> <li>- build political support</li> <li>- high potential for breakthrough thinking</li> </ul>
<b>Action</b>	Invest more resources in doing projects at multiple scales (to increase our knowledge of effective practices).
<b>Why ?</b>	We need the case studies to prove potential and effectiveness.