



LIFE PROJECT – FoResMit

LIFE14 CCM/IT/000905

DELIVERABLE ACTION D.3

**LIST OF LOCAL, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL
STAKEHOLDERS WHO WILL BE INVOLVED IN THE
GOVERNANCE OF CARBON CREDITS**





HELLENIC REPUBLIC
DECENTRALIZED ADMINISTRATION of MACEDONIA & THRACE
GENERAL DIRECTORATE of FORESTS & RURAL AFFAIRS
XANTHI FOREST DIRECTORATE

Stakeholder analysis

The project LIFE14-CCM-IT-905-FoResMit has identified and classified the main stakeholders of the pilot area located in Monte Morello peri-urban forest, in order to involve them in the future activities of the project.

In the scientific literature the term “stakeholder” is used for any individual or group of people, organized or unorganized, who share a common interest or stake in a particular issue or system (Grimble and Wellard 1997). When referring, to a project, stakeholders are defined as the individuals, groups, or entities, which may affect or be affected by the project (Freeman 1984) regardless of whether they have an official role in the project or not (Loch and Kavadias 2011). In reason of this fact, when developing a project, a relevant part of project management is to interact with the stakeholders in order to make them contribute what the project needs (Eskerod and Vaagaasar 2014) and to avoid or limit possible conflicts arising from project activities.

In this project, we have used a narrow definition of stakeholders considering only the organized groups of people such as public administrations, research institutes and Universities, private organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), while the single individuals were not considered in the stakeholder analysis.

The various stakeholders, in reason of the group they belong to, possess various sorts of resources in relation to the project development: expertise, decision power, proximity, influential contacts, interest and so on. In the management of a project the stakeholder analysis is recognized as crucial because is aimed at identifying and classifying the stakeholders in order to determine the extent of their future involvement in the decision-making process (Reed et al. 2009, Miron and Preda 2009). This stage is particularly delicate because on one side a large number of stakeholders can delay the decision-making process, while on the other hand the exclusion of relevant stakeholders can compromise the process, delegitimize the decisions taken and increase potential conflicts between groups of interests. In other words, the stakeholder analysis is used to identify and analyze the potential “supporters” and “opponents” to the project (Čiegis and Gineitiene 2008). In this sense, the stakeholder analysis can be represented graphically by Venn diagram. This kind of diagram is a tool to synthesize the information concerning the stakeholders’ power and relationships and to highlight supporters and opponents to the project.

In the LIFE14-CCM-IT-905-FoResMit project, the stakeholder analysis is performed by project's researchers and local experts through two main steps: (1) Identification of all possible stakeholders; (2) Analytical categorization of stakeholders.

Identification of all possible stakeholders

In the first step of stakeholder analysis, all the stakeholders belonging to organized groups who affect and/or are affected by the decisions and actions of the FoResMit project were recognized and listed. All stakeholders who could have a direct or indirect interest in the issues of the project

or that are affected by the results of the project were identified during two brainstorming sessions (April-May 2017). A brainstorming session was evaluated as the best tool for project's researchers and participants to lay expectations, objectives and needs related to the FoResMit project on a table and to evidence potential stakeholders, developing a preliminary list of all possible stakeholders. The brainstorming sessions lasted about 1 hour and half involving 5 and 6 project's researchers respectively.

During the brainstorming sessions participants considered the following aspects to identify all possible stakeholders: (1) potential stakeholders in different geographic or administrative areas within one organization; (2) potential stakeholders belonging to organizations of civil society having direct interest in the project.

At the end of brainstorming sessions, 32 stakeholders have been identified (Table 1) and shared in five groups of interest, basing on their field of activity (public administrations, environmental Non-Governmental Organizations-NGOs, forest-wood chain actors, actors of tourism sector, Universities and research institutes). In particular, 10 public administrations, 5 environmental NGOs, 4 forest-wood chain actors, 10 actors of tourism sector, and 3 universities and research institutes were identified.

Table 1. List of all possible stakeholders of the LIFE14-CCM-IT-905-FoResMit project.

Name of stakeholders	Field of activity	Group
La Racchetta	Protection of forest fires	Environmental NGO
Città Metropolitana di Firenze	Management of municipality forests	Public administration
Pro Loco Sesto Fiorentino	Local development and tourism promotion	Tourism sector
Poseidon	Management of urban forests, parks and gardens	Forest-wood chain actor
Agri-ambiente Mugello	Management of urban forests, parks and gardens	Forest-wood chain actor
CAI Sesto Fiorentino	Tourism development, trekking and hiking	Tourism sector
"Cammina che ti passa" association	Trekking and hiking	Tourism sector
Club Ausonia ASD	Trekking and hiking	Tourism sector
Gruppo Mico-Ecologico Sestese	Activities in mushrooms and environment	Environmental NGO
Sport Club Gualdo	Trekking and hiking	Tourism sector
Rifugio Gualdo	Catering activities	Tourism sector
Consigli restaurant	Bar, restaurant	Tourism sector
Briganti di Monte Morello MTB	Biking	Tourism sector
Morello's brothers MTB	Biking	Tourism sector
Comandi Regione Toscana CC Forestali	Forest monitoring	Public administration
Gruppo Carabinieri Forestali Firenze	Forest monitoring	Public administration
Comando stazione Carabinieri Forestali Sesto Fiorentino	Forest monitoring	Public administration
Tuscany Region	Forest policy and legislation	Public administration
Consorzio di Bonifica Toscana Centrale	Reclamation and environmental protection	Public administration
Consorzio di Bonifica 3 Medio Valdarno	Reclamation and environmental protection	Public administration
Calenzano Heating District Plant (HDP)	Energy production by forest biomass	Forest-wood chain actor

DELIVERABLE D.3

Legambiente Sesto Fiorentino	Environmental protection	Environmental NGO
WWF Tuscany	Environmental protection	Environmental NGO
Caravan serraglio	Bar, restaurant	Tourism sector
Sesto Fiorentino municipality	Management of environment and forests	Public administration
Office for forests fires protection Tuscany Region	Protection against forests fires	Public administration
Unione dei Comuni Valdarno e Valdisieve	Land management	Public administration
Massoni P.E.M. SRL	Forest enterprises	Forest-wood chain actor
Circolo Arci I Risorti	Environmental and cultural activities	Environmental NGO
Tuscia University	Research and education	Universities and research institutes
Florence University	Research and education	Universities and research institutes
Mediterranea of Reggio Calabria University	Research and education	Universities and research institutes

Finally, a contact list of all identified stakeholders was developed with the stakeholders' names, field of activity, group of interest, postal addresses, email address and phone numbers.

Analytical categorization of stakeholders

During the second step of the stakeholder analysis, all stakeholders previously identified will be assessed considering some key attributes. In the international literature, there are many systems for the classification of stakeholders based on stakeholders' attributes and resources (Table 2).

Table 2. Main characteristics/resources of different categories of stakeholders.

Attributes	Category of stakeholders
Proximity	Internal stakeholders
	External stakeholders
Proximity and interest	Local people
	Interest group
	General public
Power and legitimacy	Key stakeholders
	Primary stakeholders
	Secondary stakeholders
Interest	Primary parties
	Secondary parties
	Peripheral parties
Interest and power	Primary stakeholders
	Secondary stakeholders
Power, legitimacy and urgency	Definitive stakeholders
	Expectant stakeholders
	Latent stakeholders
Power, legitimacy, urgency and proximity	Definitive stakeholders
	Expectant stakeholders
	Latent stakeholders

Source: modified by Grass et al. (1997), Hamersley Chambers and Beckley (2003), ODA (1995), Walker and Daniels (1997), Mitchell et al., (1997), Lupo Stanghellini (2010).

In the project FoResMit, stakeholders were analyzed according to their role in the ambit of project management and development, considering three attributes: power, interest and proximity.

Power can be considered as the ability of an individual in a relationship to exert influence on another individual, in order to obtain the expected outcomes (Simpson et al. 2014). In a more detailed way, power can be defined - in the ambit of a project - the potential to influence other individuals and is a basic force in social relationships (Keltner et al. 2003), and influence can be considered the exercise of power (Turner 2005). On the other hand, the influence is a kind of social relationship that modifies the original behavior of someone by means of e.g. communication, charisma, persuasion (Nye 2008).

Interest is the willingness to engage to the project. Stakeholders may have an interest in a project for several reasons such as mission relevance, economic interest, legal right, political support, health and safety, lifestyle, opportunism and survival (Travaglini et al. 2016). Stakeholders' interest for a project can be distinguished in public interest and private interest. In accordance with Paletto et al. (2014) in the forest management public administrations should have the purpose to maximize the common good favoring those forest functions that enhance the well-being of citizens (i.e. air and water quality, direct protection of forest against natural hazards), while the forest-wood chain actors and the tourism sector actors have the objective to maximize personal utility (maximization of short-term self-interest yields outcomes).

Proximity indicates both the spatial proximity of stakeholders to the resource (in this case Monte Morello peri-urban forest) and the stakeholders' dependence for their livelihoods from resource (in this case dependence from Monte Morello forests' products and services). Besides, spatial nearness is an important factor in the stakeholder recognition and interaction (Driscoll and Starik 2004).

All stakeholders previously identified by project's researchers were assessed by local experts in forestry and environmental sectors. Each local expert has assigned a score to each stakeholders considering the three key attributes (power, interest and proximity). The assessment was done using a 5-point Likert scale format (from 1=very low to 5=very high).

Mean values are used to prioritize stakeholders distinguishing between: primary groups of stakeholders, secondary groups of stakeholders, and peripheral groups of stakeholders. In particular, the relevance of each stakeholders (I_p) was calculated using the following formula:

$$I_p = \frac{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n P_{ij}}{n} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n I_{ij}}{n} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n V_{ij}}{n}}{N}$$

Where: P_{ij} is the level of power assigned by local expert i to the stakeholder j , I_{ij} is the level of interest assigned by local expert i to the stakeholder j , V_{ij} is the level of importance of proximity assigned by local expert i to the stakeholder j , n is the total number of local experts, and N is the number of key attributes ($N=3$).

DELIVERABLE D.3

The stakeholders with a I_p higher than 4.0 have been classified as primary stakeholder, the stakeholders with a I_p between 3.0 and 3.9 have been classified as secondary stakeholder, while the stakeholders with a I_p lower than 3.0 have been classified as peripheral stakeholder.

During the period September-December 2017 categorization will be realized and stakeholders to be involved in future steps of project's governance will be identified. Selected stakeholders will be involved in a process of awareness related to the Project's activity and will collaborate to the S.W.O.T. (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis of the project.

References

- Čiegis R., Gineitiene D., (2008). Participatory aspects of strategic sustainable development planning in local communities: Experience of Lithuania, *Ukio Technologinis ir Ekonominis Vystymas* 14(2): 107-117.
- Driscoll C., Starik M. 2004. The primordial stakeholder: advancing the conceptual consideration of stakeholder status for the natural environment. *Journal of Business Ethics* 49: 55-73.
- Eskerod P., Vaagaasar A. L. (2014). Stakeholder management strategies and practices during a project course. *Project Management Journal*, 45(5), 71-85.
- Freeman R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman/Ballinger.
- Grass G., Biggs S., Kelly A. (1997). Stakeholders, science and decision making for poverty-focused rural mechanization research and development. *World Development* 25(1): 115–126.
- Grimble R., Wellard K. (1997). Stakeholder methodologies in natural resource management: a review of principles, contexts, experiences and opportunities. *Agricultural Systems* 55(2): 173-193.
- Hamersley Chambers F., Beckley T. 2003. Public involvement in sustainable boreal forest management. In: Burton P.J. (ed.) *Towards sustainable management of the boreal forest*, Ottawa: National Research Council of Canada NRC Research Press, 113-154.
- Keltner D, Gruenfeld DH, Anderson C (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review* 110: 265-284.
- Loch C, Kavadias S (2011). Implementing strategy through projects. Morris PWG, Pinto JK, Söderlund J (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Project Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 224-251.
- Lupo Stanghellini P.S. (2010). Stakeholder involvement in water management: the role of the stakeholder analysis within participatory processes. *Water Policy* 12: 675-694.
- Miron D., Preda M., (2009). Stakeholder Analysis of the Romanian Energy Sector. *Review of International Comparative Management* 10(5): 877-892.
- Mitchell R.K., Agle B.R., Wood D.J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review* 22: 853-886.
- Nye J.S. (2008). *The powers to lead*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- ODA-Overseas Development Administration (1995). *Guidance note on how to do stakeholder analysis of aid projects and programmes*. ODA, London, UK.
- Paletto A, Giacobelli G, Grilli G, Balest J, De Meo I (2014). Stakeholders' preferences and the assessment of forest ecosystem services: a comparative analysis in Italy. *Journal of Forest Science* 60: 472-483.
- Reed, M.S., A. Graves, N. Dandy, H. Posthumus, K. Hubacek, J. Morris, C. Prell, C.H. Quinn, and L.C. Stringer. 2009. Who's in and why? A typology of stakeholder analysis methods for natural resource management. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90: 1933-1949.
- Simpson JA, Farrell AK, Oriña MM, Rothman AJ (2014). Power and Social Influence in Relationships In: Mikulincer M., Shaver P.R. (eds.): *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*. American Psychological Association, Washington. 393-420.
- Travaglini A, Dunović IB, Mancini M (2016). Megaproject case studies: a stakeholder management perspective. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 8th-10th March 2016: pp. 1348-1358.
- Turner JC (2005). Explaining the nature of power: A three-process theory. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 35 (1): 1-22.
- Walker G.B., Daniels S.E. 1997. *Foundations of Natural Resource Conflict: Conflict Theory and Public Policy*. In: Solberg B., Miina S. (eds) *Conflict Management and Public Participation in Land Management*, EFI Proceedings 14, Joensuu, European Forest Institute: 13-36.