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Executive summary

The Guidelines for Engaging Stakeholders in Managing Protected Areas have been developed as part of the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkeys’ Steppe Ecosystem Project. The guidelines are designed for managers and staff of protected areas, as well as conservation scientists and stakeholders involved in the management of protected areas in Turkey.

They cover a strong theoretical base highlighting the relevance and importance of stakeholder participation in protected area management, as well as the current state of stakeholder participation in Turkey’s protected areas system.

The guidelines focus primarily on the international and national development of stakeholder engagement in protected areas. They also discuss the process of establishing, planning and managing protected areas, and explain how to engage with stakeholders at the national level through internationally accepted approaches.

Purpose and use of the guidelines

This document is one of seven sets of guidelines developed to provide standards and recommendations for the integrated management of the country’s natural assets. The main purpose of the guidelines is to provide strategies and practical tools for the engagement of stakeholders during the establishment, planning and management of protected areas.

The specific objectives of the guidelines are to:

- clarify the meaning of stakeholder engagement;
- outline the most effective principles and approaches for stakeholder engagement in protected area establishment, management planning and implementation;
- help managers and staff of protected areas identify relevant stakeholders and analyse their needs and expectations.

The guidelines are designed to provide specialized support for protected area planners, decision-makers, managers and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry staff, with a view to maximizing stakeholder participation and facilitate participatory conservation and management of protected areas.
Contents

The guidelines consists of six main chapters and a final case study chapter. Chapter 1 is theoretical and aims to highlight the relevance and importance of stakeholder participation in protected area management. It presents the rationale for stakeholder participation in the processes of protected area management and clearly defines the meaning of “stakeholder” and “stakeholder involvement” in the context of good governance of protected areas. In addition, it identifies the benefits of and barriers to stakeholder engagement, and describes the primary methods for identifying relevant stakeholders and tools that can be used to maximize the effectiveness of stakeholder involvement.

Chapter 2 summarizes the current state of stakeholder engagement in Turkey’s protected areas system. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 of the guidelines present strategies and tools for engaging stakeholders in the establishment, planning, and management processes of protected areas in Turkey. Chapter 6 offers a general evaluation and a proposal for tools and levels of participation for the establishment and planning phases of protected areas. Finally, Chapter 7 provides three case studies with descriptions and analyses of stakeholder engagement in protected area projects in Turkey.
Introduction

Contemporary natural resource management practices were initially used solely for the purpose of conservation and the advancement of scientific knowledge, but eventually came to include careful consideration of social and economic aims. This was especially evident in efforts to determine the purposes and management of protected areas as well as the needs of local stakeholders, and actions to optimize stakeholder participation.

Historically, management of protected areas has focused almost exclusively on technical aspects via centralized control. The literature shows that stakeholder participation is an essential component of and, indeed, a prerequisite for achieving short and long-term natural resource management goals. Stakeholder participation in natural resource management mitigates conflicts between stakeholders and improves communication between all relevant stakeholders (Karadeniz et al., 2010).

The Government of Turkey engages with stakeholders on protected area management and planning, albeit to a limited extent. Accordingly, experience and knowledge concerning stakeholder participation and government capacity to effectively promote stakeholder engagement remain inadequate (Yenilmez Arpa, 2011).

In order to address these shortcomings, The Guidelines for Engaging Stakeholders in Managing Protected Areas have been drafted under the umbrella of the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkeys’ Steppe Ecosystem Project. The guidelines focus primarily on the international and national development of stakeholder engagement in protected areas. They discuss the process of establishing, planning and managing protected areas, and explain how to engage with stakeholders at the national level through internationally accepted approaches. They also describe methods for effectively allocating government staff to stakeholder engagement activities.

The methodologies described in the guidelines are based on international principles and best practices, including participatory rural appraisals and open forum meetings. This type of engagement will facilitate improvement of stakeholder knowledge and increase awareness of the benefits of protected areas among stakeholders, as well as their sense of ownership of such areas and their benefits. Implementation of the guidelines will ideally generate broad-based support for protected area establishment, planning and management among all relevant stakeholders, while balancing conservation and operational goals.

Implementation of the strategies presented in the guidelines will enable
stakeholders to more fully understand the potential ecological and economic benefits of protected area establishment, and give them an opportunity to actively voice their opinions and define for themselves what they consider to be best practices in conservation.

Seven sets of guidelines have been developed within the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Turkey’s Steppe Ecosystems Project, all of which provide standards and recommended practices for the management of Turkey’s natural assets. The full list of guidelines is as follows:

- **The Guidelines for Establishing Protected Areas** outline the standards for the establishment process, from site proposal to final establishment of the site (including ministerial and presidential approval).

- **The Guidelines for Protected Area Management Planning** outline the standards and methods for the management planning of established protected areas.

- **The Guidelines for Biodiversity Monitoring** outline the standards and methods for the development of monitoring systems at the protected area level.

- **The Guidelines for Engaging Stakeholders in Managing Protected Areas** outline the standards and recommended practices for engaging stakeholders in the participatory planning and management of protected areas.

- **The Guidelines for Assessing the Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas** outline the standards and methods for assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of protected area management.

- **The Guidelines for Grazing Management Planning** outline the standards and methods for transitioning Turkey’s grazing management practices to align with globally defined ecological sustainability.

- **The Guidelines for Grazing and Livestock Monitoring** outline the standards and methods for monitoring animal performance and the impact of livestock on the ecosystem.

All the guidelines adhere to national and international standards and are closely linked, as shown in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Overview of the seven guidelines and their interrelations
Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines (2020).
Chapter 1

General aspects of stakeholder engagement
1. General aspects of stakeholder engagement

1.1 Overview of stakeholder engagement

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, more commonly known as the 1992 Rio Summit, clearly established the importance of engaging stakeholders in the planning and management processes of protected areas.

In recent decades, there has been an increase in recognition of the need for and potential benefits from greater engagement of stakeholders in decision-making processes. In terms of progress towards a more democratic, equitable civil society, substantive engagement of stakeholders is expected to lead to

- increased involvement of underrepresented groups in decision-making;
- better accounting for the diversity of values among stakeholders;
- enhanced stakeholder trust in and ability to act on decisions; and
- social learning where stakeholders develop new relationships, learn from each other, and co-create new knowledge.

Moreover, in terms of PA governance, other practical benefits may include

- higher quality management decisions, due to increased diversity of participant knowledge, that are better adapted to the local social-cultural and environmental contexts;
- development of common ground, trust, and reduction of conflict among stakeholders;
- increased support for successful implementation due to stakeholder “ownership;” and
- reduced implementation costs (Brumbaugh, 2017).

Today, stakeholder engagement appears to be a common legal requirement or prerequisite for the planning and management of protected areas in most countries.

In 1998, 47 member states of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) signed the Convention on Access to Information, Public
Participation in Decision Making, and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, known as the Aarhus Convention, which entered into force in 2001. Turkey has yet to sign the Convention. Governments that sign the Convention commit themselves to taking steps necessary to ensure public participation and access to information for decision-making on all environmental issues. Stakeholder engagement is also a prerequisite for receiving funding from international funding agencies.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, governments of socialist countries in Central and Eastern Europe approved many resolutions on the conservation of biodiversity. These resolutions were affirmed in the new democratic context that developed after 1989. In Poland, for example, nature protection legislation since the 1990s increasingly incorporated provisions for participation, although implementation still poses problems. Despite an emphasis on the active involvement of local residents in decision-making processes relating to protected areas, there is a need to increase the participation skills of public officials and improve financial resources, (Niedziałkowski et al., 2018).

Stakeholders can also be involved in the determination of Natura 2000 areas in EU member states, by means of written consultations, steering committees or advisory board membership, or through participation in discussion forums or workshops. However, in most EU countries, public authorities identified Natura 2000 areas without informing landowners, an approach that resulted in significant problems. Stakeholder engagement and coordination among institutions and organizations, as well as participation and cooperation with a range of stakeholders, have been highlighted as important tools to enhance the adoption of Natura 2000, and crucial to avoiding conflicts and strengthening the implementation process (Laktić and Pezdevšek Malovrh, 2018).

The management of parks in South Africa involves multiple agencies, including international agencies, national governments, the Environmental Affairs Department and South African National Parks (SANParks). Protected Areas Law (No. 2003/57) requires all national parks to consult with stakeholders prior to the preparation of management plans. Such plans detail instructions for management units at all levels, regulate relevant processes, guide budget expenditures, and ensure accountability and capacity building, (Martin, Boer and Slobodian, 2016).

Public participation is best understood as a continuum; as such, there are an infinite number of points along the scale. The four major categories on this continuum are shown in Figure 2.

Ensuring participation in a process should start with the provision of information, then move on to listening to interest groups and including them in solving problems, before ultimately achieving a compromise. However, this approach is not always followed and is susceptible to interruptions at different points. In order to fully engage all relevant stakeholders in protected area management in Turkey, it is necessary to develop clearly defined, transparent mechanisms. Furthermore, the key concepts and terminology of stakeholder engagement should be clearly defined and standardized and fully understood by all relevant parties. The general principles for stakeholder engagement are presented in Box 1.

**Box 1. Main principles of stakeholder engagement**

The following main principles are crucial for successful stakeholder engagement:

- **Efficiency.** This principle requires clear and well-designed procedures as well as a stakeholder engagement plan for informing, consulting and obtaining the active participation of stakeholders in decision-making.

- **Inclusion and transparency.** This principle requires an open and transparent engagement process and the inclusion of a wide range of participants from the community with a particular focus on the proper selection of key stakeholders and tailored consultation processes.

- **Effectiveness.** This principle requires taking stakeholder views into account and ensuring that they have a real impact on planning or policy development and implementation. In cases when there is no clear, genuine role for stakeholders to play, or when it is not evident that they can influence decisions, their involvement will not be considered as reasonable and could produce negative effects (Marega, 2010).
1.2 Benefits of stakeholder engagement

Human impacts on the Earth’s natural environment have generated systemic crises resulting in climate change and food insecurity. The emergence of these crises has focused the resolve of organizations specializing in environmental protection and nature conservation with a view to finding viable solutions. Moreover, these crises have resulted in an unprecedented level of cooperation among concerned stakeholders, including individual actors, businesses, governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and environmental bodies.

Stakeholder engagement in protected area management helps to ensure that society at large receives the numerous benefits provided by protected areas. It can also lead to improved environmental outcomes and an increase in social, human and natural capital (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006).

Stakeholder engagement supports the development of strong, constructive and responsive relationships that are critical for the conservation and utilization of protected areas. Effective stakeholder engagement enhances ownership and strengthens the social and environmental sustainability of supported interventions in protected areas.

Public participation is also a democratic necessity: involving people in the management process implies recognition of their worth, their vital role and their credentials as citizens (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006).

The other key argument is that sharing knowledge and understanding is vital for the success of protected areas. Stakeholders possess uniquely different perspectives regarding the nature of specific problems and what constitutes improvement. Since knowledge and understanding are socially constructed, the knowledge and beliefs of individual actors are a function of unique contexts and experiences (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006).

Participation is a powerful and important tool for protected areas, and is based on the idea that informed, involved and empowered individuals make stronger choices and can also help managers and decision-makers make better decisions. Adopting a participatory approach to the management of protected areas provides several benefits (Pound, 2010; Anonymous, 2002; Creighton, 2005; Krick et al., 2005; Thomas and Middleton, 2003).
Depending on the structure of the participation process and the underlying rationale, a deliberative process can:

- lead to more equitable and sustainable social development
- improve the quality of decisions
- enable the pooling of resources (knowledge, people, funds and technology) to solve problems and attain objectives
- allow for better management of risk and reputation
- minimize cost and delay
- facilitate consensus and cooperation
- increase the ease of implementation
- avoid worst-case confrontations
- maintain credibility and legitimacy
- improve staff and community technical knowledge
- improve the quality of decision-making by agencies
- enhance social capital and the flow of social and economic benefits
- enhance and inform political process
- anticipate public concerns and attitudes
- inform, educate and influence stakeholders
- build trust between partners and stakeholders
- provide greater compliance through increased ownership of solutions
- provide greater community advocacy for biodiversity protection
- ensure greater access to community skills and knowledge
- develop civil society.

Benefits of the participatory approaches are given in Box 2.
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Stakeholder engagement draws knowledge about problems and needs into the management process, elicits opinions on options from protected area inhabitants, allows for the development of solutions, and provides an opportunity for the public to discuss and understand issues. It facilitates better quality decisions and generates a common basis for coherent action. The process raises awareness of key issues and different perspectives, helps to overcome conflicts, and increases public support and social empowerment. Stakeholder engagement also strengthens the legality of the management and decision-making process, as it allows for dialogue and discussion about the topics at hand, while soliciting stakeholder feedback on the acceptability and usefulness of management actions in protected areas.

Box 2. Benefits of the participatory approaches

- **Increased sense of ownership.** Stakeholders living in or near the protected area, visitors and other users will feel a far greater commitment to the area if they have had the opportunity to be involved in managing and taking decisions about it.

- **Greater support** for the protection of the area. The success of a management plan will depend on public and political support. It is essential to maintain regular communication with the public on decisions that affect them, and on the management and use of the protected area.

- **Greater public involvement** in decision-making, helping people be aware of and feel they can influence changes in management direction of the protected area.

- Stakeholder participation enables **planning for conservation linked with planning for development.** Not taking into account the needs of people in terms of social and economic development means a management plan has a poor chance of achieving its objectives.

- Stakeholder participation provides **a mechanism for communication,** where views, concerns and opinions on management of the area can be shared between the managers and stakeholders. This can lead to the identification and resolution of problems and to a greater understanding and support for the protected area.

- Stakeholder participation provides **more resources for management.** Local people who support the objectives of the protected area may be more willing to contribute their time and resources to its management and protection (Appleton 2009).

Stakeholder engagement draws knowledge about problems and needs into the management process, elicits opinions on options from protected area inhabitants, allows for the development of solutions, and provides an opportunity for the public to discuss and understand issues. It facilitates better quality decisions and generates a common basis for coherent action. The process raises awareness of key issues and different perspectives, helps to overcome conflicts, and increases public support and social empowerment. Stakeholder engagement also strengthens the legality of the management and decision-making process, as it allows for dialogue and discussion about the topics at hand, while soliciting stakeholder feedback on the acceptability and usefulness of management actions in protected areas.
1.3 Stakeholder participation level

Participatory approaches have become widespread in conservation and protected area management in recent years, with managers realizing that the exclusion of local residents from decision-making is neither practical nor desirable. Participation can, however, have a wide range of meanings, ranging from the simple provision of information through to active involvement in decision-making, and even the assumption of management control.

The ladder of engagement proposed by Arnstein (1969) offers a framework for discussing the potential extent of stakeholder engagement, visualizing this in terms of the active contribution to management and/or governance of a project or programme from which a stakeholder will benefit. The Ladder of Citizen Participation is easily adapted to different frameworks when discussing the appropriate degree of stakeholder involvement in a project or programme. The initial steps in the ladder are the most passive, with very limited stakeholder participation, while the last forms of participation include more active participation. The eight rungs of Arnstein’s participation ladder are shown in Figure 3.

1. **Manipulation.** At this level of engagement, stakeholders are placed on rubberstamp advisory committees, invited to participate in surveys or provide feedback, or given other activities to perform that create an illusion of engagement; however, in practice little notice is taken of their contributions. The purpose of this type of engagement is primarily to make the stakeholders feel engaged rather than using the engagement to influence decisions and outcomes. The benefit can be reduced stakeholder opposition – at least in the short term – but very little real value is created to enhance the overall outcomes of the project.

2. **Therapy.** This level of stakeholder engagement involves engaging stakeholders in extensive activities related to the project, but with a view to changing their view of the work while minimizing their actual ability to create change. Helping the stakeholders adjust to the values of the project may not be the best solution in the longer term, but every organizational change management guideline advocates this type of engagement in order to sell the benefits that the project or programme has been created to deliver.

3. **Informing.** Informing stakeholders of their rights, responsibilities and/or options can be the first step towards effective stakeholder participation in a project and project outcomes. However, too frequently the emphasis is placed on a uni-directional flow of information from the project to the stakeholders. When this information is provided at a late stage, it leaves stakeholders little opportunity to contribute to a project which is supposed to deliver benefits for them. Distributing information is a key stakeholder engagement activity, but mechanisms for effective feedback have to be in place for this process to maximize its potential value.

4. **Consultation.** Inviting stakeholders’ opinions – like informing them – can be a legitimate step towards full participation. However, if the consultation is not combined with other modes of participation, there is no guarantee that the concerns and ideas of stakeholders will be taken into account. Effective participation means providing stakeholders with a degree of control over the consultation process, as well as full knowledge of how their inputs will be considered and used.

5. **Placation.** At this level, stakeholders have some degree of influence, although there remains the potential for tokenism. The inclusion of stakeholders in processes such as focus groups or oversight committees, where they lack real power, or have not received sufficient training to exercise power, provides the appearance of genuine stakeholder engagement
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without any of the benefits.

6. Partnership. At this level, power is genuinely redistributed, and stakeholders work with the project team to achieve an outcome that is beneficial to all. Power-sharing may seem risky, but if the right stakeholders with a genuine interest in the outcome are encouraged to work with the technical delivery team to constructively enhance the project’s outcomes (which is implicit in a partnership), everyone potentially benefits.

7. Delegated power. In many aspects of projects and programmes, particularly those associated with implementation, rollout and/or organizational change, delegating management authority to key stakeholder groups has the potential to significantly improve outcomes. These groups do need support, training and governance, but concepts such as self-managed work teams demonstrate the value of the model.

8. Stakeholder control. In certain cases, stakeholders do control projects and programmes, but this tends to take the form of elite management fulfilling roles such as sponsors, steering committee members and so on. Genuine stakeholder control expands this narrow group to include many more affected stakeholders. Where the purpose of a social project is to benefit stakeholders, involving the proposed beneficiaries can demonstratively improve outcomes. However, even technical projects can benefit from the wisdom of the crowd (Arnstein, 1969).

The eight rungs of the participation ladder define the involvement of stakeholders from the most passive to the most active. Different types of participation may be appropriate for different stakeholders, areas and management programmes, although it is recommended that managers adopt the most active forms of participation (Appleton, 2009). Table 1 details the different degrees, types and modes of participation, and related topics.
The level of involvement can range from passive consultation, where stakeholder groups provide information, to active participation in which a two-way exchange of information is carried out with stakeholders as an equal interest group. Stakeholders can, thus, help to guide the goals and objectives of any project or activity.
Tools and methods for stakeholder engagement

Participatory methods were initially used in the agricultural sector, which is the most common field of activity in rural areas. They then spread more widely across other sectors, such as health, tourism, nature conservation, environment, education, industry and urbanization, encompassing a wide range of stakeholders.

Numerous tools and methods are available to encourage stakeholder engagement, such as information, consultation and active participation in decision-making. The selection of methods and tools depends on the desired objectives for achievement within the participatory process. If the expected effects are related to public awareness and knowledge, information tools are acceptable. If the objective is to receive feedback from stakeholders, consultation tools specifically oriented to this purpose should be selected. If the intention is to engage stakeholders in developing new policy options, methods and tools to encourage active participation should be used.

Some commonly used participatory approach methods for engaging and receiving feedback from interest groups include:

- Diagnosis and Design (D&D)
- Farming Systems Research (FPR)
- Participatory Analysis and Learning Methods (PALM)
- Participatory Rural Appraisal and Planning (PRAP)
- Participatory Research Methods (PRM)
- Participatory Technology Development (PTD)
- Rapid Appraisal (RA)
- Rapid Assessment Techniques (RAT)
- Participant Observer (PO)
- Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA)
- Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)
- Participatory Action and Research (PAR).

These are the well-known participatory approaches had been used, especially between 1980 and 1990 (Yenilmez Arpa 2011).

The participation methods and tools that are widely used in international platforms today can be classified as follows (World Bank, 2018).
1.4.1 Workshop-based methods

Collaborative decision-making often takes place in the context of stakeholder workshops. Sometimes referred to as “action-planning workshops”, these activities are used to bring stakeholders together to design development projects. The purpose of such workshops is to initiate and sustain stakeholder collaboration and foster a “learning-by-doing” atmosphere. A trained facilitator guides stakeholders with diverse knowledge and interests through a series of activities to build consensus.

The World Bank (1998) describes the most commonly used workshop-based methods:

- Workshop-based methods
- Appreciation-influence-control (AIC)
- Objectives-oriented project planning (ZOPP)
- Team Up

1.4.2 Community-based methods

In many projects, task managers and project staff leave their offices to undertake participatory work with local communities. Task managers work with trained facilitators to draw on local knowledge and promote collaborative decision-making. In such settings, local residents act as the experts, while outsiders facilitate the use of specific techniques and are otherwise there to learn. The techniques energize people, facilitate contact with local knowledge and lead to clear priorities for action plans.

The World Bank (1998) describes the most commonly used community-based methods as follows:

- Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)
- SARAR (self-esteem, associative strength, resourcefulness, action planning and responsibility).

SARAR is a methodology used to incorporate the creative capacities of interest groups at different levels into the problem-solving and planning process. It is employed during the evaluation, prioritization and planning of different initiatives to strengthen stakeholders at different levels, (World Bank, 1998).
1.4.3 Methods for stakeholder consultation

Consultations with stakeholders are especially relevant for discussions about existing problems, visioning, searching for alternative solutions and scenarios, setting special objectives and making value judgments. Consultation allows stakeholders to indirectly influence decision-making. Feedback from stakeholders can be gathered passively and unsolicited or actively by inviting them to respond (Marega and Uratarić, 2010). Two key techniques that focus on listening and consultation among a range of stakeholder groups are: beneficiary assessment (BA) and systematic client consultation (SCC).

Creighton (2005) presents the most frequently used techniques and delivery channels for providing information and engaging stakeholders (Box 3).
Guidelines for engaging stakeholders in managing protected areas

**Briefings:** Briefings consist of dedicated visits, small group meetings or telephone/video calls to inform the public about progress made or a recent achievement. They provide a way to keep the main nominated officials, agencies or key interest groups informed, and often lead to two-way communication, and thus act as a means to received valuable information.

**Exhibits and displays:** One way to inform and motivate people to participate in community participation initiatives is to mount exhibits or displays in public spaces with lots of foot traffic (e.g. local shopping centres), fairs or sporting events. Although preparation of an exhibit or display can be expensive, they can frequently be designed for re-use at other events or locations.

**Feature stories:** Sending a news release to a newspaper or radio/television station is a key way to interest the media in publishing a story. If the news release is related to matter of public interest, it is more likely to receive consideration.

**Information repositories:** As Internet access becomes widespread, information repositories such as open-access Web pages can be an important tool to inform stakeholders of developments.

**Internet:** The Internet and social media have considerable potential as a channel to encourage and promote community and stakeholder participation.

**Mailing:** Direct mailing of leaflets and other publications can also be an effective means to engage with stakeholders and inform them of developments.

**Media interviews and appearances on talk shows:** Direct interviews and media appearances can be an effective way to reach large numbers of stakeholders and increase understanding of issues.

**Media kits:** Preparing a media kit which includes a summary of key information for reporters can be an effective way to reach and inform a wider number of participants.

**News conferences and media briefings:** A news conference is a media event organized for the purposes of making an announcement or giving a briefing. These events can provide an opportunity to inform both the public and stakeholders of key developments.

**Newsletters:** Newsletters are an effective tool for reaching large stakeholder groups and sustaining attention during and after a decision-making process.

**News releases:** News releases are usually short and contain a message about upcoming activities or communicate recent decisions.

**Panels:** Panels are an effective way to present data during consultation sessions or public information meetings.

**Presentations to community groups:** The organization of presentations to civic or environmental groups is an effective means to communicate with powerful people in the community.

---

**Box 3.** Information channels and techniques for stakeholder engagement

(Creighton, 2005).
A number of barriers exist to the implementation of the above-mentioned methods and tools for stakeholder participation processes. Opponents of stakeholder and public involvement in environmental management and/or integrated assessment frequently criticize the fundamental basis of these approaches, while problems that arise are often linked to implementation barriers that could be improved through better management, among other factors (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006).

Taking into account such implementation barriers, appropriate stakeholder dialogue in natural resource management is not always easy to achieve. In particular, there is no guarantee that a participatory approach will necessarily be effective (e.g. deliver the expected goals). An important constraint when designing and implementing participatory approaches is the unwillingness to share power (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006). Governments and/or regional or local managers may not support stakeholder involvement or public participation, especially if they regard such efforts as a threat to their own power or as an encouragement to opposition groups. The limitations of some well-known stakeholder engagement methods are given in Table 2 (O’Haire et al., 2011).
Table 2. Strengths and limitations of stakeholder engagement methods/tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>- Participants can draw upon their own know-how to inspire and guide discussion</td>
<td>- They can be time consuming and challenging to coordinate and perform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The flexible nature of questioning allows for exploration of different opinions, attitudes and perceptions</td>
<td>- Some people may be unwilling to express their opinions in a group context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants can focus discussions on matters specific to each group and explore how to address them</td>
<td>- Group dynamics may create difficulties around the prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Particularly useful when dealing with sensitive subjects.</td>
<td>- Outlining of topics by the interviewer may affect the prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enable more efficient use of time and resources than one-on-one interviews</td>
<td>- An unimportant sample limits the generalizability of results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Effective for engaging with users</td>
<td>- May produce different views, making it difficult to reach an agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person interviews</td>
<td>- An effective method for capturing public and individual perspectives.</td>
<td>- The sample size is frequently too small to support statistical analysis of differences in perspectives; results are not generalizable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inexpensive if the geographic dispersion is limited.</td>
<td>- Can be time consuming if the goal is to engage with numerous stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A good way to facilitate collaboration and categorize priorities with decision-makers.</td>
<td>- The process is difficult if interest groups are geographically dispersed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inadequate consensus building between interest groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>- Enable the inclusion of individuals from a range of socio-economic and professional backgrounds and diverse experience</td>
<td>- Low response rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Easy to complete and available in a wide variety of formats</td>
<td>- Anonymity can lead to low levels of accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interest groups do not need to respond immediately and can fill out questionnaires as appropriate</td>
<td>- Very difficult to seek clarifications or make additional inquiries regarding the meanings behind different opinions and perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Anonymity of responses allows interest groups to share their views without worrying about the reactions of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Possibility to survey a large sample of interest groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Method Strengths Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Symposions/conferences                      | · Allow for the identification of more inclusive/general themes  
· Can be used to check the validity of investigation priorities produced by key informant meetings and focus groups | · Planning and coordinating can be difficult  
· Such events are expensive  
· Representation not assured; some participants may feel uncomfortable expressing their ideas in an official group  
· Some minority groups can dominate the prioritization process |
| Citizen juries                              | · A useful method to actively engage with and elicit views from the public  
· They offer an opportunity to bring together different groups of citizens  
· Close the gap between top-down and bottom-up participation  
· Programme flexibility allows discussion to reach a natural conclusion  
· All assessors have an equal opportunity to participate in the process and express their opinions, and even minority views are included in the final outcome  
· Usually include a training component that is not incorporated in other methods  
· Provide an environment in which findings including conflict and uncertainty can be expressed | · The overall impact of the jury on the activity is difficult to assess  
· A costly and time-consuming process  
· Findings cannot always be generalized to the wider population  
· It may be difficult to educate the public about the subject for discussion within such a short time frame  
· Jurors often struggle to separate research from service provision  
· Strong personalities can influence jury members and thus undermine necessary discussions |
| Nominal group technique                     | · Particularly good for collaborative, community-based projects  
· Ensures that all workshop participants have an equal voice.  
· Allows the ideas of workshop members to be shared and discussed in a non-threatening environment | · Difficult to prioritize future research needs  
· Costly and time-consuming  
· Samples usually lack representative value and findings cannot be generalized to larger populations |
| Scoping study (literature review with key informant interviews and focus groups) | · Combines two methodological approaches:  
-- current literature review and analysis and expert opinions, and  
-- perspectives from stakeholders in the field. | · Lack of methodological quality review can lead to uncertainty regarding how to weigh literature when identifying strengths and weaknesses of the suggestion  
· Does not integrate non-expert views and priorities |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snowball sampling</td>
<td>· Easy to secure conversations without data protection issues</td>
<td>· The sample may be perceived as biased by the social networks of primary individuals in the snowball group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Lower number of rejected phone calls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest-influence matrices</td>
<td>· Stakeholder participation prioritization is possible, making energy dynamics more pronounced</td>
<td>· Prioritization may marginalize (and underestimate) certain groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Assumes that interest-impact stakeholder classes are relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder-led stakeholder</td>
<td>· Stakeholder categories are based on stakeholders’ perceptions</td>
<td>· Diverse stakeholders may be placed in the same categories by different respondents, making categories meaningless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categorization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q methodology</td>
<td>· Different social dialogues surrounding an issue can be identified, and individuals can be categorized according to their “fit” within these dialogues</td>
<td>· Does not identify all possible dialogues, only those exhibited by the interviewed stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network analysis (SNA)</td>
<td>· Provides insights into the boundaries and structure of the stakeholder network Identifies influential (primary) stakeholders and peripheral (secondary)  stakeholders</td>
<td>· Time-consuming and hence costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· Questionnaire is a bit tedious for respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>· The method requires a specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge mapping</td>
<td>· Identifies stakeholders that would work well together as well as those with power balances</td>
<td>· Knowledge needs may still not be met due to differences in the types of knowledge held and needed by different stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical transactiveness</td>
<td>· Identifies stakeholders and issues that may be overlooked and minimizes risks to the future of the project</td>
<td>· Time-consuming and hence costly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Stakeholder analysis in protected areas

A stakeholder includes any individual, group or community living within the influence of the site or likely to be affected by a related management decision or action, and any individual, group or community likely to influence the management of the site (Marega, 2010; Pound, 2010).

The variety of potential stakeholders is diverse and may include target beneficiary groups, locally affected populations or individuals, national and local government institutions, academic groups, civil society actors including NGOs, politicians, opinion leaders (e.g. teachers, religious leaders, ‘Muhtars’) private sector entities, local administration units, municipalities and other special interest groups.

In general, stakeholders in the accession process can be divided into four main groups:

- central-level public institutions
- field-level public institutions
- non-governmental organizations and research units
- local residents

Crucially, stakeholders can also include groups opposed to the proposed interventions. The “benefit” status associated with protected area management for each of these different groups may vary.
Guidelines for engaging stakeholders in managing protected areas

When developing a participatory process it is important to understand which groups may be positively or negatively affected by the decisions and actions taken, and which have the power to influence protected area management. Before starting the process, it is important to carefully identify key stakeholders who will be directly or indirectly affected by the activities, and who have relevant knowledge, expertise and experience, and control or influence the means of implementation. This analysis will help ensure full representation of stakeholders and enable prioritization of interest groups in relation to their interests and potential impact on natural resource conservation and protected area management processes.

In natural resource management processes, it is important to address the conflicting interests of different stakeholders, as the same resources serve different purposes. It is therefore essential to understand the different perspectives of all groups involved, and create a platform to allow stakeholders to understand and share the process, learn by verification and reach consensus. Although interest group analysis does not involve the creation of such a platform, it can be used as a tool to contribute to negotiations or to promote sharing and learning among groups. Thus, stakeholders analysis can elicit multiple perspectives and facilitate an approach in which the “real” is socially structured (Reed et al., 2009).

One of the main goals of stakeholder analysis is to highlight and, thus, potentially reduce power imbalances among weaker groups which often come to light during the policy reform process. Strategies may be tailored to address their different concerns, depending on the attributes of the stakeholder (e.g. level of influence vs. their salience on the issue).

Stakeholder analysis¹ seeks answers to the following fundamental questions:

- **Who** are the key stakeholders in the proposed project?
- **What** are their interests in relation to the project?
- **How** will their interests be affected (positively and/or negatively) by the project?
- **Which** stakeholders are the most vulnerable and subject to potential adverse impacts?
- **Which** stakeholders wield the most influence to affect project outcomes?
- **Which** stakeholders require capacity building to enable their participation?

¹- [www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/stakeholderanalysis.htm#matix](http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/stakeholderanalysis.htm#matix).
In theoretical terms, stakeholder analysis employs descriptive, normative and instrumental approaches. Descriptive analyses can be considered a preliminary step to normative and instrumental analyses. Normative approaches are becoming increasingly popular as they can be adopted to strengthen stakeholder engagement in decision-making processes related to natural resource management. In this context, stakeholder analysis can function to legalize decisions taken with the participation of key and/or representative groups (Reed et al., 2009).

Instrumental stakeholder studies are more realistic and mostly dedicated to understanding how a project, organization or decision-maker can determine, explain and manage the behaviour of stakeholders to achieve the desired results (Reed et al., 2009).

Reed et al. (2009) have developed a typology based on this theoretical framework, (Figure 4):


Table 3 highlights the resources that may be needed depending on the typology and interest group engagement methods outlined above.
While methods such as social network analysis (SNA) can be used for more than one purpose, such as exploring and categorizing relationships among stakeholders, most methods are tailored towards a specific purpose, and the resources needed differ accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>A small group brainstorms stakeholders (their interests, influence and other attributes), and categorizes them accordingly</td>
<td>Room hire, food and drink, facilitation materials (e.g. flip-chart paper and post-its)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td>Interviews with a cross-section of stakeholders to check/supplement focus group data</td>
<td>Interview time, transport between interviews, voice recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowball sampling</td>
<td>Individuals from initial stakeholder categories are interviewed, new stakeholder categories and contacts are identified</td>
<td>As above: successive respondents in each stakeholder category are identified during interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest-influence matrices</td>
<td>Stakeholders are placed on a matrix according to their relative interest and influence</td>
<td>Can be done using a focus group setting (see focus groups), individually through interviews (see semi-structured interviews) or by researcher/practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder-led stakeholder categorization</td>
<td>Stakeholders themselves categorize stakeholders into categories they themselves have created</td>
<td>See semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q methodology</td>
<td>Stakeholders classify the outputs from a meeting according to how well they match their own ideas: analysis enables the identification of social discourses</td>
<td>Materials for statement sorting, interview time, transport between interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor linkage matrices</td>
<td>Stakeholders are tabulated into a two-dimensional matrix and their relationships are described using codes</td>
<td>Can be done using a focus group setting (see focus groups), individually through interviews (see semi-structured interviews) or by researcher/practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network analysis (SNA)</td>
<td>Used to identify the network of stakeholders and measure relational ties between stakeholders through the use of a structured interview/questionnaire</td>
<td>Interviewer, questionnaire, training in the approach and analyses, time, software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge mapping</td>
<td>Used in conjunction with SNA; involves semi-structured interviews to identify interactions and knowledge</td>
<td>See semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical trans-activeness</td>
<td>Snowball sampling to identify fringe stakeholders; development of strategies to address their concerns</td>
<td>Training in the approach, time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A systematic approach is necessary to ensure that all potential stakeholders are identified, and that their interests well understood, to ensure that they are involved appropriately throughout the project. Various methodologies exist to undertake stakeholder analysis, but all usually involve three main steps:

- identifying stakeholders
- specifying stakeholder interests, mapping power relations and influence
- prioritizing engagement across different stakeholder groups.²

Defining interest groups is often an iterative process. As this process continues, new stakeholder groups may be added as a result of expert opinion, focus groups, semi-structured interviews, snowball sampling methods/tools or a combined method. The topic focused on in the stakeholder analysis is usually defined in a top-down manner by the team directing the analysis. The interest group analysis may therefore reflect the tendencies of the team that steer the analysis rather than the interests of the groups (Reed et al., 2009).

This is an important limitation that could lead to stakeholder groups that need to be involved in planning or management processes being disregarded. The four main characteristics of the following stakeholder groups should be examined and understood in order to neutralize this limitation:

- the attitude of interest groups regarding the process
- the level of influence (power) they hold
- the level of interest they have in the project under discussion
- the group/ coalition to which they belong or with which they can reasonably be associated.³

³- www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/stakeholderanalysis.htm#matix.
Methods to characterize and classify stakeholders tend to follow two broad approaches, (Reed et al., 2009):

- **top-down “analytical categorizations”**
- **bottom-up “reconstructive methods”**.

### 1.5.1 Top-down “analytical categorizations”

These are a set of methods in which classification of stakeholders is carried out by those conducting the analysis based on their observations of the phenomenon in question and “embedded in some theoretical perspective on how a system functions”. Examples of analytical categorizations include those using levels of interest and influence, cooperation and competition, cooperation and threat, and urgency, legitimacy and influence. Venn schemes or matrices are often used in such analyses and are more preferred in policy-development.

The Venn Diagram is a tool using circles as a symbol to understand the importance of local groups and institutions and the level of connections among institutions and with local groups in the process of participation, (Jain and Triraganon, 2003). It reveals how individuals, institutions, projects, or services relate to each other or overlap in terms of their responsibilities (Figure 5).
The relationships among stakeholders and between areas


Each entity is represented by a circle: the larger the circle, the greater the importance. The proximity of circles to each other is an indication of the level of interaction between them. Large circles represent large institutions, overlapping circles indicate institutions that interact with each other, and a smaller circle within a large circle represents a component of that institution (Yenilmez Arpa, 2011).
Primary and secondary interest groups can also be identified through stakeholder analysis. For instance, during the expansion of Etosha National Park (Namibia), stakeholder analysis was used to determine the positions of primary and secondary interest groups involved in the process. As shown in Figure 6, a value of 1 indicated a strongly negative/opposing position, while a value of 10 indicated that the stakeholder group held a strongly positive/supportive position, (Mannetti et al., 2019).

**Figure 6.** Categorization of interest groups according to their positions during expansion of a protected area

The relationship between stakeholders can also be analysed using a coordinate system or mapping. According to Murray-Webster and Simon (2006), this analysis usually takes the form of a two-dimensional analysis highlighting Power-Interest or Interest-Attitude relationships. Figure 7 presents an example of two-dimensional analysis.

**Interest – effect matrix**

- OI: Other Interested
- KB: Protection Unit
- FS: Fish seller
- CG: Central Government
- PW: Place of worship
- CP: City planner
- D: Diver
- ER: Education and research
- FG: Fishing guides
- LE: Law enforcement
- LG: Local government
- IFM: International facility managers
- H: Hotels
- SL: Secondary landlords
- TM: Tour management

**Figure 7.** Classification of stakeholders according to their interest-influence status

Source: Adapted from Murray-Webster and Simon, 2006.

However, consideration of just two dimensions does not fully represent the whole picture. For this reason, Murray-Webster and Simon (2006) proposed a different three-dimensional analysis and created a matrix for this purpose. Figure 8 presents the three-dimensional Power, Interest and Attitude approach. Eight different classes are formed in the matrix according to the stance of the interest groups, which depend on their Power, Interest and Attitude.
The classes formed in the three-dimensional stakeholder matrix and their meanings are as follows:

- **Saviour** – powerful, high interest, positive attitude or alternatively influential, active, backer. They need to be paid attention to; you should do whatever necessary to keep them on your side – pander to their needs.

- **Friend** – low power, high interest, positive attitude or alternatively insignificant, active, backer. They should be used as confidant or sounding board.

- **Saboteur** – powerful, high interest, negative attitude or alternatively influential, active, blocker. They need to be engaged in order to disengage. You should be prepared to ‘clean-up after them’.

- **Irritant** – low power, high interest, negative attitude or alternatively insignificant, active, blocker. They need to be engaged so that they stop ‘eating away’ and then be ‘put back in their box’.

- **Sleeping Giant** – powerful, low interest, positive attitude or alternatively influential, passive, backer. They need to be engaged in order to awaken them.

- **Acquaintance** – low power, low interest, positive attitude or alternatively insignificant, passive, backer. They need to be kept informed and communicated with on a ‘transmit only’ basis.

- **Time Bomb** – powerful, low interest, negative attitude or alternatively influential, passive, blocker. They need to be understood so you can ‘defused before the bomb goes off’.

- **Trip Wire** – low power, low interest, negative attitude or alternatively insignificant, passive, blocker. They need to be understood so you can ‘watch your step’ and avoid ‘tripping up’.

Source: Adapted from Murray-Webster and Simon, 2006.
Stakeholders are organized according to their relative power/influence and salience, to determine their potential support or opposition for a proposed reform. In many cases, a graph is used to identify which stakeholders will gain or lose from a proposed reform and whether they can significantly impact the process. In order to guide strategic responses, stakeholders are categorized by their power and salience in an Influence/Impact matrix according to the following roles: key players, context setters, the public and the crowd (Figure 9):

**Key players** are stakeholders who should be actively involved in the process because they have high interest in and influence over a particular phenomenon.

**Context setters** are highly influential but have little interest. As a consequence, they may pose a significant risk and should be monitored and managed.

**The public** have high interest but low influence. Although by definition supportive, they lack a capacity for impact, but they may become influential by forming alliances with other stakeholders. Public are often marginal stakeholders that development projects seek to empower.

**The crowd** comprises stakeholders with little interest in or influence over the desired outcomes. There is little need to consider them in detail or engage with them. Interest and influence typically change over time and the impacts of such change can be considered (Reed *et al.*, 2009).
Imset, Haavardtun and Stian Tannum (2018) use the rainbow diagram (adapted from Chevalier and Buckles, 2008) (Figure 10) and the Attitude-Power-Impact model (adapted from Murray-Webster and Simon, 2006) to classify the characteristics of interest groups. Accordingly, interest groups were scaled according to five quality classes: impact, degree of influence, power, attitude and interest (Table 4). The rainbow diagram thus classifies stakeholders according to the degree to which they can affect or be affected by a problem or management action.

![The rainbow diagram](source: Adapted from Chevalier and Buckles, 2008; Reed et al., 2009.)

**Figure 10.** The rainbow diagram

**Table 4.** Stakeholder attributes and their definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Definition (adapted by authors)</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>To what degree the stakeholder is able to informally influence the living lab initiative</td>
<td>Least - Most</td>
<td>Chevalier &amp; Buckles, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree affected</td>
<td>To what degree the initiative/project, and the outcome of it, will affect the situation for the stakeholder</td>
<td>Least - Most</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>How much power/authority is held by stakeholders of relevance to the initiative/project</td>
<td>Insignificant-Influential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Stakeholders’ current attitude towards the initiative/project</td>
<td>Blocker - Backer</td>
<td>Murray &amp; Webster, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>How interested the stakeholder is in the initiative/project</td>
<td>Passive - Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Imset, Haavardtun and Stian Tannum, 2018.
Imset, Haavardtun and Stian Tannum (2018) then produced another subjective assessment by scoring the strength of each relationship between interest groups using values ranging from 1 (weak) to 3 (strong). An example of the resulting matrix is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. A sample result from the analysis of relationships between interest group, (Imset, Haavardtun and Stian Tannum, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Imset, Haavardtun and Stian Tannum, 2018.
1.5.2 Bottom-up “reconstructive methods”

To reduce the limitations of the top-down approach, a bottom-up classification approach has been developed in which interest groups define their own parameters and classes. For example, in the card-ranking method, each stakeholder is asked to classify all interest groups by sorting the cards according to their own criteria. As a direct method, Q methodology describes the ways in which participants think and talk about a particular topic when on common ground or using a common perception (Reed et al., 2009).

Another bottom-up approach is Strategic Perspective Analysis. In this method, interviews or workshops with stakeholders enable definition of the objectives of different groups, and the opportunities and limitations related to these objectives, and the comparison of targets. Through repetition (of interviews) it becomes possible to identify categories of stakeholders that share similar objectives. The information collected through this process may also be useful for discussions among conflicting groups (Reed et al., 2009).
Three principal methods have been used to analyse the relationships between stakeholders (Reed et al., 2009).

1. **Actor-linkage matrices** are a commonly used means of describing stakeholder interrelations. Stakeholders are listed in rows and columns on a grid and the relationships between them are defined using key words. For example, the relationship between stakeholders can be determined as cooperation, conflict or complementary. This approach is flexible and simple to use.

2. **Social network analysis (SNA)** provides insights into patterns of communication, trust and influence between actors in social networks. Data are typically gathered through structured interviews, questionnaires or observations. In the management of natural resources, SNA can be used to help identify interest groups, avoid marginalizing key groups, identify conflicts between interest groups and select representatives based on how the network is structured. Similar to actor-link matrices, SNA matrices are used to organize data on relational bonds that connect groups of interest. Instead of using keywords in SNA matrix cells as in actor-linkage matrices, the data are arranged using numbers representing 1) the presence or absence of the linkage and 2) the relative strength of the linkage. Each matrix represents a unique relationship, such as communication, friendship, advice, conflict and trust.

3. **Knowledge mapping** analyses the content of information between these actors. When used in conjunction with SNA, it can be a highly useful method to:
   - ascertain “who knows who”
   - determine the dominant information flow
   - identify information bottlenecks
   - find information leaks
   - ensure that individuals in the system understand the different information that individuals and groups hold within the system
   - help researchers group stakeholders more effectively in order to encourage learning.

The stakeholder analysis could be prepared in a matrix form to present stakeholders’ interests, actual roles, power, responsibilities, capacities for participation, and potential contributions to the planning and implementation of management actions.
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2. Current work on stakeholder engagement in Turkey

2.1 Current status of protected areas

Turkey is a country with a high level of biological diversity, due in part to three different types of bioclimate and three biogeographical zones, namely: Euro-Siberian, Mediterranean and Irano-Turanian.

Other contributory factors include Turkey’s topographic, geological, geomorphologic and soil diversity; the existence of different types of aquatic bodies such as seas and rivers, as well as freshwater, salt water and mineral water lakes; altitude differences that range between 0 and 5 000 metres; and the presence of deep canyons and widely varying types of ecosystems. The region was less affected by the glacial period in comparison with European countries, and the existence of the Anatolian Diagonal, which links Northern Anatolia to Southern Anatolia, resulted in ecological and floristic differences. Lastly, the country is situated at the intersection of three continents. In brief, the borders of Turkey encompass agricultural, forest, mountain, steppe, wetland, coastal and marine ecosystems in different forms and combinations (Anonymous, 2014; Anonymous, 2007a).

Protected areas in Turkey are one of the most important tools for the protection of biodiversity and natural and cultural resources. Their protection is of vital importance for life on Earth, including the health and welfare of human beings. Aside from biodiversity, the protected areas in Turkey supply people with ecosystem services such as nutritional, cultural, spiritual and recreational values, and offer opportunities to increase scientific knowledge through the study of ecological processes. Land and water resources under conservation management also provide wider social and environmental benefits (Yenilmez Arpa, 2013).

Legal conservation of species and natural assets in ecosystems began in 1937 with the enactment of the Abrogated Forest Law No. 3116 and the Abrogated Terrestrial Hunting Law No. 3167.
These laws constituted the first pieces of legislation on the conservation of nature and wildlife in Turkey (GDNPNC Institutional Report, 2018).

- Forest Law No. 6831 defined and declared the notion of a forest reserve, gene conservation forest and national park.
- Terrestrial Hunting Law No. 3167 defined and declared the notion of a wildlife protection and improvement area.

The term “national park” was first used in Forest Law No. 6831 of 1956. Within the protective limits of this law (Article 25), national parks were recognized as rare and unique landscapes. National parks were also given the opportunity to create recreational areas for public use and outdoor activities. Based on this law, the Belgrad Forest Recreational Area was established in 1956, and Yozgat Çamlığı (Pine Grove) was declared a national park in 1958. Belgrad Deer Breeding Station, the first station for wildlife, was established in 1958 under Terrestrial Hunting Law No. 3167. Projects related to national parks, hunting wildlife and recreational areas were implemented by the General Directorate of Forestry up to 1976 (Yenilmez Arpa et al., 2017).

After 1983, in order to be able to identify, protect, plan and manage ecosystems and non-forest habitats where non-forest immovable assets are located, and fulfil the obligations of international and regional conventions to which Turkey is a party, the following legislative acts entered into force:

- Law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Assets No. 2863
- Environment Law No. 2872
- National Parks Law No. 2873
- Special Environmental Protection Areas Decree No. 383.

In addition to terms recognized and applied prior to 1983, such as forest reserve, gene conservation forest, national park and wildlife protection and improvement area, a number of additional terms were added:

- National Parks Law No. 2873 introduced the terms “natural park”, “natural reserve” and “natural monument”.
- The Law on the Protection of Cultural and Natural Assets No. 2863 introduced the terms “natural site”, “historical site”, “archaeological site” and “urban site”.
- Environment Law No. 2872 introduced the term “wetlands of national and local importance”.
- Decree No. 383 introduced the term “special environmental protection areas” (GDNCNP, Corporate Report on Nature Conservation 2019).
Efforts for the conservation of biodiversity continued in a systematic manner from the early 1990s onwards with the emergence of concepts such as “Important Bird Areas”, “Important Plant Areas”, “Important Turtle Nesting Areas” and “Key Biodiversity Areas”. Over the last 10 years, the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP), the General Directorate of Forestry (GDF), non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and universities, with some support from the private sector, have conducted protected area projects in a variety of regions and ecosystems. In addition, the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization is responsible for Special Environmental Protected Areas under the Barcelona Convention. The historical and cultural value of these areas is managed and conserved by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (Yenilmez Arpa, 2017).

Turkey uses in-situ and ex-situ conservation programmes to protect its biodiversity. In-situ conservation programmes such as National Parks, Nature Protection Areas, Natural Parks, Wildlife Reserves, Specially Protected Areas, Natural Preservation Sites, Natural Monuments, and Gene Conservation and Management Areas have been gradually established in Turkey since the 1950s.

Turkey has also declared approximately 6.7 million hectares of land as protected areas, representing 6.69 percent of the nation’s total territory. There are 18 protected categories, ranging from national parks to seed stands, (GDNCNP Doğa Koruma Raporu, Korunan Alan İstatistikleri 2019).

Table 7 provides a list of protected areas in Turkey listed by category. Statistical data on protected areas managed by MAF were gathered from GDNCNP’s Department of Wildlife, the Department of National Parks, the Department of Sensitive Areas, GDF’s Forest Trees and Seed Stands Research Institute and the Department of Non-Wood Forest Products.4

Statistical data on protected areas managed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization were supplied by the General Directorate of Conservation of Natural Assets, and data related to areas managed by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism were gathered from the Ministry’s website.5

5- https://tvk.csb.gov.tr
### Table 6. Protected area categories in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected areas managed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. National Park</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>880 019 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Natural Park</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>107 230 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Natural Reserve</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46 726 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Natural Monument</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>9 389 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wildlife Protection and Improvement Area</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1 162 788 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland of National Importance</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>869 697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland of Local Importance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar Site</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>184 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Forest Reserve</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>251 493 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gene Conservation Forest (in-situ)</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>43 813 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Seed Stand (in-situ)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>41 558 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Seed Orchard (ex-situ)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1 423 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Urban Forest</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>10 263 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Biosphere Reserve Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25 258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected areas managed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MEU)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Specially Protected Area</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 582 968 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Natural Site (1st degree natural sites, 2nd degree natural site, 3rd degree natural site)</td>
<td>2 554</td>
<td>1 768 948 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Natural Assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument trees</td>
<td>8 411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caves</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural and Cultural Conservation projects by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism**

| 16. Cultural Heritage Site                                              | 16     |           |
| 17. Natural Heritage Site                                               | -      |           |
| 18. Mixed Heritage Site                                                 | 2      |           |

Information on protected areas reflects the situation in June 2020

The distribution of protected areas in Turkey is shown in Figure 11, and the locations of Special Environmental Protection Areas are shown in Figure 12.

**Figure 11.** Distribution of protected areas in Turkey  

**Figure 12.** Distribution of specially protected areas in Turkey  
2.2 Background information on stakeholder engagement in protected area management

Despite the availability of appropriate legislation, policies and mechanisms for the management of protected areas, the participation of local residents and other interest groups has been insufficient, and the active support of interest groups could not be obtained through all levels of the management process. The management of protected areas is generally carried out through a centralized top-down approach. On the other hand, effective management of all protected areas relied on the development and implementation of participatory planning and participatory assessment initiatives by government institutions, with the support of various projects funded by external donors (Karadeniz et al., 2010). However, in most of these initiatives, participation is limited to the duration of the project, and its continuity cannot be ensured.

Furthermore, there is a lack of knowledge as to which approaches were adopted for the participatory practices, and a lack of observations to confirm whether participatory approaches had any effect on practices. Participation has been considered only in terms of disseminating and obtaining information, and there is insufficient evidence of interactive and functional participation approaches, including for implementation and decision-making processes.
In this context, an evaluation of participation status for protected areas reveals the existence of several gaps at the national level (Yenilmez Arpa, 2011):

- The role and meaning of the concept of participation in the legislative system is not clear.
- The identity of the participants and when and how much they participate in the processes is uncertain.
- The processes and methods associated with the impact and level of participation are not discussed.
- The benefits and opportunities that can be achieved with participation and the associated risks are unclear.
- There is a lack of certainty regarding the available resources related to participation.
- The impact of participatory processes is not evaluated.
- There is a lack of knowledge regarding techniques, approaches and indicators to measure the impact of participation.
- There is no strategic document appropriate for the conditions of the country which take into consideration the socio-economic and cultural conditions of participation.

Several publications have been produced within the scope of the GEF-II Biodiversity and Natural Resource Management Project, which was implemented between 2000 and 2007. They detailed the main characteristics of stakeholders who need to be involved in the management of a protected area, the aims and forms of participation, the characteristics of governance mechanisms for protected areas and necessary mechanisms for participation at different levels. They were supported by case studies on protected area planning and management (Anonymous, 2007b).

According to the publication Protected Areas Planning and Management (Anonymous, 2007b), the benefits of a participatory management plan are an increased sense of ownership, support for conservation of the area, the integration of sustainable development with nature protection, and greater support for problem-solving efforts. Stakeholder engagement is defined as including information, consultation, joint decisions and joint action.
As part of the project Preparation of Reference Materials for Wetland Managers, the organizers prepared a set of Guidelines on Wetland Management Planning and identified an appropriate participatory multi-stakeholder process. The guidelines describe degrees of participation as well as positive and negative aspects, the process of stakeholder analysis, and issues relating to facilitation and conflict management (Anonymous, 2007c).

Within the scope of the Yıldız Mountains Biosphere Reserve Project, Conservation and Sustainable Development of Biodiversity and Natural Resources in the Yelda Mountains (2009–2010), the organizers defined a participatory planning process and carried out associated planning work. The participation of interest groups in the planning process was carried out in three phases (Yenilmez Arpa, Yalınkılıç and Akıncıoğlu, 2010):

- **Phase 1**: Identify and conduct an analysis of stakeholders, set up a facilitation team and outline the involvement of stakeholders in sustainable future planning for the Yıldız Mountains.

- **Phase 2**: Initiate dialogue with stakeholder groups, ensure that stakeholders express their views and desires about the Yıldız Mountains and exchange information about the project, and introduce a community-based approach to managing natural resources in the Yıldız Mountains based on existing management systems such as cooperatives and hunting associations.

- **Phase 3**: Create a management planning unit consisting of local and central representatives who know the area, to carry out the management planning process, and establish a Stakeholder Working Group representing villages, public institutions and NGOs, to liaise with the management planning unit.

Five approaches were envisaged at the beginning of the participatory process: open dialogue, limited dialogue, consultation, giving information and taking information. Out of these, the open dialogue approach was chosen. This option involves taking decisions together and then sharing them with the concerned interest groups. The process also employed participatory rural appraisals (study trips, in-depth interviews, questionnaires, semi-structured questionnaires, meetings, workshops, case studies, etc.) and the participatory learning and action method (brainstorming, mapping, illustration, etc.). At the end of the participatory process, a common plan was created and a management model was determined and integrated into the plan (Anonymous, 2009).

In addition to these projects, managers of protected areas have conducted several initiatives at the field level. These are rooted in an awareness of the importance of stakeholder engagement to the preparation of management
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plans and the sustainable management of the unique values of protected areas, both of which are strongly linked to the needs and priorities of relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, the engagement of key stakeholders as part of protected area management processes is required and supported both legally and administratively by Turkey’s natural conservation system.

Government institutions directly related to nature conservation and protected area management, in Turkey, are presented in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central-level government institutions</th>
<th>Field-level government institutions</th>
<th>Civil society, research institutions, and others</th>
<th>Local residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Republic of Turkey Presidency Department of Strategy and Budget</td>
<td>Governorships, District Governorships</td>
<td>Nature conservation and environmental NGOs</td>
<td>Muhtars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Urbanization</td>
<td>Local authorities and local public institutions/services</td>
<td>Research institutions</td>
<td>Local inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Protected area management units</td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Schools, teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Defence</td>
<td>Village management units</td>
<td>Local forums</td>
<td>Training institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Transportation</td>
<td>Forestry and agriculture sector representatives</td>
<td>Local community organizations and local interest groups</td>
<td>Imams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources</td>
<td>Tourism sector representatives</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>Opinion leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.

The current administrative and legislative structure for stakeholder engagement with participation level in Turkey, are presented in Table 8. The majority of the listed regulations encourage natural conservation administrations to foster stakeholder engagement and encourage public involvement, with a view to increasing more effective conservation.
### Table 8. Current administrative and legislative structure for stakeholder engagement in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Related institutions</th>
<th>Related articles on participation</th>
<th>Proposed stakeholders for participation</th>
<th>Participation level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Park Law (No. 2873)</td>
<td>MAF-GDNCNP</td>
<td>Article 3 and 4</td>
<td>Public institutions/orrganizations</td>
<td>Giving information · Receiving information · Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Law (No. 2872)</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Urbanization</td>
<td>Article 9</td>
<td>Local governments, universities, non-governmental organizations and other relevant public institutions and organizations</td>
<td>Receiving information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Article 30</td>
<td>Participation of all parties in the process of receiving information</td>
<td>Receiving information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and Natural Heritage Protection (No. 2863)</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Receiving the opinions of relevant administrations in defining the boundaries and the area</td>
<td>Giving information · Receiving information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks Regulation</td>
<td>MAF-GDNCNP</td>
<td>Article 9</td>
<td>Public institutions/organizations</td>
<td>Giving information · Receiving information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting Law (No. 4915)</td>
<td>MAF-GDNCNP</td>
<td>Article 3</td>
<td>Establishment of Central Hunting Commissions; public institutions and organizations, universities, NGO representatives</td>
<td>Giving information · Decision-making · Cooperation in management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Article 4</td>
<td>Cooperation with village legal entities and municipalities over conservation</td>
<td>Giving information · Decision-making · Cooperation on management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Information Law (No. 4982)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Article 2, 4 and 5</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Receiving information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands Regulation</td>
<td>MAF-GDNCNP</td>
<td>Article 33</td>
<td>The regulation strives to maintain participation at the highest level by envisaging the establishment of central and local wetland commissions.</td>
<td>Giving information · Decision-making · Cooperation on management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area Planning Regulation</td>
<td>MEU</td>
<td>Article 6, 7, 8 and 9,</td>
<td>A commission consisting of representatives of relevant institutions, ministry officials and the project owner and/or representatives must be established. The Ministry may invite representatives from universities, institutes, research organizations, chambers, trade unions, unions, NGOs and members of the committees to Commission meetings.</td>
<td>Giving information · To support and envisage participation in decision-making processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
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3. Stakeholder engagement in the establishment phase for protected areas

The authorities responsible for the establishment and management of protected areas in Turkey are the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MEU), and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MCT). In-situ conservation is carried out mainly by the General Directorate of Natural Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP), although the General Directorate of Forestry (GDF) is involved in in-situ and ex-situ protection of forest areas and biodiversity within the framework established by MAF.

MAF manages the majority of protected areas in Turkey, including national parks, natural parks, natural monuments, nature reserves, wildlife protection and improvement areas, protected forests and gene conservation forests. The Ministry of Environment and Urbanization manages Special Environment Conservation Areas, Natural Site Areas and Natural Assets. The Ministry of Culture and Tourism manages Natural, Cultural and Mixed Heritage Sites.

Current legislation and administrative policies governing protected areas encourage stakeholder engagement in the establishment phase for potential protected areas. However, there is no standard definition of stakeholder engagement, and no rules or procedures have been established for this purpose. Because of the gaps and uncertainty around stakeholder engagement in this process, action is very limited with activities generally conducted by protected area staff and decision-makers.
The process for establishing protected areas is explained in detail in the Guidelines on Establishing Protected Areas in Turkey, prepared under the present project. In Turkey, the process is usually initiated by NGOs, local organizations or specialists, who submit the initial proposal to the MAF. This proposal is then evaluated; if a positive decision is reached, the borders of the proposed area are defined and the area is visited and assessed by a technical team. If the response is positive, the inventory department and field supervisors prepare an area proposal file.

The process of registration, approval and announcement for national parks, natural parks, natural monuments and nature reserves is as follows (Anonymous, 2012):

1. In accordance with Articles 6 and 7 of National Park Regulation No. 19309 of 12 December 1986, which was published in the Official Newspaper, the Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry sends a report to the General Directorate regarding identified national parks, natural parks, natural monuments and nature reserves.

4. Natural parks, nature monuments and natural reserves located in forests and forest regimes, identified by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, are registered with the approval of the Minister of Forest and Water Affairs.

5. Reports about national parks identified by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forests are announced and presented by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization to the Presidency

6. Following a positive decision from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry on the establishment of natural parks, natural monuments and nature reserves situated outside forests or forest regimes, the opinions of related ministries are gathered and presented to the Minister, and then, together with the Minister’s proposal, to the Presidency

7. The registration process is completed following publication of the decision in the Official Newspaper. The decision on registered areas is then transmitted to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry for dissemination to related organizations and subsequent implementation.
The detection, registration, approval and announcement of protected areas established within the framework of National Parks Law No. 2873, Terrestrial Hunting Law No. 4915 or the Regulation on the Protection of Wetlands, fall under the purview of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, as long as they are located within a forest or forest regime. If the area is located outside a forest regime, the process is supervised by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization.

The process and approach used to establish a protected area will directly affect the identification of stakeholder groups, and how and when they will participate in the process, as well as the participatory processes and tools used. The process for establishing areas protected by GDNCNP is shown in Figures 13, 14 and 15.

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
**Figure 14.** Process to declare wetlands of national and local importance under the responsibility of the GDNCNP

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.

**Figure 15.** Process to declare Ramsar areas under the responsibility of the GDNCNP

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
The stakeholder engagement stages for the establishment process are as follows:

- Identifying and analysing stakeholders
- Defining methods and tools
- Identifying subjects to be included in the participatory processes
- Deciding the types and level of participation
- Managing the participatory processes.

Each stage should be interrelated and complementary, so as to increase the effectiveness of participation and ensure a holistic process. The stages for stakeholder engagement are shown in Figure 16.

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
3.1 Identifying and analysing stakeholders

The stakeholders in a participatory process for the establishment of protected areas are represented by four main groups (Table 10):

- Central-level government institutions
- Field-level government institutions
- NGOs and research institutions
- Local residents.

The current situation of key interest groups, the linkages between interest groups and the proposed area, and the type of participation during the establishment phase for protected areas are detailed in Table 10.

Table 9. Stakeholders involved in the establishment of protected areas under the GDNCNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central-level governmental institutions</th>
<th>Field-level governmental institutions</th>
<th>NGOs and research institutions</th>
<th>Local residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>Field extension offices of MAF</td>
<td>Nature conservation and environmental NGOs</td>
<td>Muhtars/ village management units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Urbanization</td>
<td>Field extension offices of MEU</td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Field extension offices of MCT</td>
<td>Research institutions</td>
<td>Local community organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Defence</td>
<td>Governorships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion leaders (teachers, imams etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
Table 10. Types of stakeholder engagement during the establishment phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest groups</th>
<th>Linkages and effects of the interest groups</th>
<th>Current participation type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry central offices</td>
<td>Participation through provision of information</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Field extension offices</td>
<td>Participation through provision of information</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents (in particular, Muhtars and members of the local community)</td>
<td>Inhabit the area Make their living from the area Make use of the land and its resources Possess strong knowledge of the area and its resources</td>
<td>Passive participation Participation through provision of information Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inhabit the area Make their living from the area Make use of the land and its resources Possess strong knowledge of the area and its resources</td>
<td>Passive participation Participation through provision of information Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users of natural resources (fishermen and women, farmers, hunters, shepherds)</td>
<td>Inhabit the area Make their living from the area Make use of the land and its resources Possess strong knowledge of the area and its resources</td>
<td>Passive participation Participation through provision of information Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions, cooperatives</td>
<td>Make their living from the area Represent specific groups in the area</td>
<td>Passive participation Participation through provision of information Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGOs</td>
<td>Inhabit the area Make attempts to promote and protect the area</td>
<td>Passive participation Participation through provision of information Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions (that have authority and responsibility for the proposed area)</td>
<td>Responsible for managing the resources of the area Decision-makers for the proposed area</td>
<td>Passive participation Participation through provision of information Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governments</td>
<td>Local decision-making and implementing institutions</td>
<td>Passive participation Participation through provision of information Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities (local and regional)</td>
<td>Conduct scientific research about the proposed area</td>
<td>Passive participation Participation through provision of information Consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Defining methods and tools

When analysing and listing stakeholders it is important to establish how they can most effectively participate in the establishment process. While there are no standard engagement models or procedures for this purpose, some traditional and official methods and tools can be used to encourage and facilitate the participation process. The number of tools and methods to support stakeholder participation in the establishment of a new protected area is limited and may change depending on legislation, the profile of the stakeholders, and the experience and knowledge of the protected area staff.

Table 11 presents the tools used during the establishment processes by different institutions, along with the stakeholder profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Participation tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government institutions (General Directorate scale)</td>
<td>Official letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government institutions (field-based)</td>
<td>Official letter, face-to-face meeting, field study, workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local administrations (municipalities, governorships)</td>
<td>Official letter, face-to-face meeting, field study, workshop, mapping, brainstorming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents and/ or their representatives/ Muhtars</td>
<td>Informational meetings face-to-face meetings Field studies, mapping, mobility mapping, ranking, questionnaires, brainstorming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Informational meetings face-to-face meetings Field studies, mapping, mobility mapping, ranking, questionnaire, brainstorming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Informational meetings face-to-face meetings Field studies, mapping, mobility mapping, ranking, questionnaire, brainstorming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
### 3.3 Identifying subjects for inclusion in participatory processes

Once the key interest groups, the linkages between these groups and the proposed area, and the types of participation, have been identified, and the participation processes have been listed and analysed, another important stage is to identify the subjects for inclusion in the participatory processes.

The process to determine protected areas in Turkey consists of three main stages:

- proposal for the site
- evaluation of the proposal by the administration
- establishment of the protected area.

The subjects and related stakeholders for participation at each of these stages are detailed in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects to be included in participatory processes</th>
<th>Related stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification of proposed site</strong></td>
<td>Universities, site managers, NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of proposed site to the relevant units</td>
<td>Field-level PA staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of proposal by the administration</strong></td>
<td>GDNCNP staff, universities, site managers, NGOs, field-level PA staff, local residents (Muhtar and other village representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of a report related to the proposal site, reporting</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visit to the proposed site to undertake a detailed investigation (basic surveys on biodiversity and other values of the site, traditional and cultural places, land use types and ownership, institutions responsible for the site, threats, barriers, challenges, and opportunities; future plans and projects investigated during the field study)</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff, universities, site managers, NGOs, field-level PA staff, local residents (Muhtar and other village representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of borders</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation of site proposal document</strong></td>
<td>GDNCNP staff and/or Ministry of Environment and Urbanization staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the establishment dossier to the relevant government institutions to obtain their views and comments</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of proposal document for approval</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
3.4 Decisions on types and levels of participation

As noted earlier, when analysing and listing stakeholders it is important to establish how they can most effectively participate in the establishment process. The type and level of participation is also key concept for this purpose. Participation may take different forms and can change in accordance with legislation, cultural and social structures, and traditional lifestyles. The current and proposed levels and types of participation for the process to establish protected areas are summarized in Table 14.

The key interest groups in the establishment phase, the connections between them and the proposed area, and the current types of participation are detailed in the Table 13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Type and level of</th>
<th>Mode of participation</th>
<th>Subjects to be included in participatory processes</th>
<th>Related stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOST PASSIVE</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
<td>A one-way, top-down process, no feedback</td>
<td>Identification of the proposed site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Stakeholders are consulted, their views are taken into account but not necessarily considered and acted upon</td>
<td>Submission of the proposed site to the relevant units</td>
<td>Universities, site managers, NGOs, field-level PA staff, municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Effective collaboration with stakeholders but decisions are taken by the relevant institutions</td>
<td>Preparation of report on the proposed site</td>
<td>Field-level PA staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive participation</td>
<td>Participation is temporary; once this stage ends, the participatory process is finished</td>
<td>Detailed investigation of the proposed site, field surveys</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff, universities, site managers, NGOs, field-level PA staff, local residents (Muhtars and other village representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determination of borders</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff, universities, site managers, NGOs, field-level PA staff, local residents (Muhtar and other village representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation of the nomination dossier</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of the establishment dossier to the relevant government institutions</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of the dossier to the approving authority</td>
<td>GDNCNP staff and/or Ministry of Environment and Urbanization staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Yenilmez Arpa, 2011.
### Guidelines for engaging stakeholders in managing protected areas

#### Degree of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and level of participation</th>
<th>Mode of participation</th>
<th>Subjects to be included in participatory processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional participation</strong></td>
<td>At the establishment stage, groups can be formed to take on preliminary work related to declaration of the site</td>
<td>This level of participation in the establishment phase is not undertaken effectively in Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive participation</strong></td>
<td>People are closely involved in information-gathering and border and status determination processes; local representation is preferred, thus encouraging the involvement of local interest groups in all kinds of implementation and decision-making processes</td>
<td>This level of participation in the establishment phase is not undertaken effectively in Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-directed action</strong></td>
<td>Participants take initiative in declaring the site a protected area, are actively involved in the decision-making process and implement actions. Outside units provide technical support and act as facilitators rather than directly implementing actions</td>
<td>This level of participation in the establishment phase is not undertaken effectively in Turkey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14. Stakeholders and current types of stakeholder engagement in the establishment process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Linkages and effects on the site</th>
<th>Current participation type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>Responsible for the highest-level management of the site&lt;br&gt;Authority for final decision-making</td>
<td>Independent from the participation process&lt;br&gt;Decision-maker&lt;br&gt;Directly manages the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry local units</td>
<td>Responsible for management at the site level</td>
<td>Independent from the participation process&lt;br&gt;Decision-maker at site level&lt;br&gt;Directly manages the process at site level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents (in particular, Muhtars and members of the local community)</td>
<td>Inhabit the area&lt;br&gt;Make their living from the area&lt;br&gt;Use the land and resources&lt;br&gt;Possess strong knowledge of the area and its resources</td>
<td>Passive participation&lt;br&gt;Participation through provision of information&lt;br&gt;Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users of natural resources (fishermen and women, farmers, hunters, shepherds)</td>
<td>Inhabit the area&lt;br&gt;Make their living from the area&lt;br&gt;Make use of the land and its resources&lt;br&gt;Possess strong knowledge of the area and its resources</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions, cooperatives</td>
<td>Make their living from the area&lt;br&gt;Represent specific groups in the area</td>
<td>Passive participation&lt;br&gt;Participation through provision of information&lt;br&gt;Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGOs</td>
<td>Inhabit the area&lt;br&gt;Make attempts to promote and protect the area</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions (that have authority and responsibility for the proposed area)</td>
<td>Responsible for managing the resources of the area&lt;br&gt;Decision-makers for the proposed area</td>
<td>Passive participation&lt;br&gt;Participation through provision of information&lt;br&gt;Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governments</td>
<td>Local decision-making and implementing institutions.</td>
<td>Passive participation&lt;br&gt;Participation through provision of information&lt;br&gt;Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities (local and regional)</td>
<td>Conduct scientific research about the proposed area</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Yenilmez Arpa, 2011.
3.5 Managing participation processes

Existing legal documents do not identify all interest groups involved in the establishment phase of protected areas. As a consequence, the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders are not clear in this phase, and efforts and initiatives regarding the participation of stakeholders are generally formed by the individual approaches of site managers. This situation represents an obstacle to continuity in the participatory process. In such cases, the key stakeholders and followed participation methods should be either explicitly defined in legislation or enforced by supporting documents.
Chapter 4

Stakeholder engagement in the planning phase for protected areas
Stakeholder participation in the planning of protected areas is important for several key reasons. First, it improves trust in the protection goals and associated management actions. Second, it is impossible for any protected area organization to permanently and successfully conserve the protected area by itself. The success of the protection and management of a protected area thus depends on numerous stakeholders whose actions are connected to nature (Nastran and Pimat, 2012).

Stakeholder participation in management planning processes also increases the quality of a management plan. As stated in the IUCN Guidelines for Management Planning in Protected Areas, stakeholder participation provides a number of benefits, including the following (Thomas and Middleton, 2003):

- increased sense of ownership
- greater support for the protected area
- Improved links between planning for conservation and planning for development
- a mechanism for communication.
The process of preparing protected area management plans follows a sequence of steps similar to those taken during the determination phase. The key difference is the level of participation regarding the diversity, responsibilities and participation methods of the stakeholders. The involvement of stakeholders during this phase is the most important and time-consuming part of the protected area planning process.

Within the ongoing cycle of management planning, there are four categories: (1) data gathering and inventory, (2) evaluation, (3) planning, and (4) implementation and monitoring. These categories are assigned to 15 steps, shown here in Figure 17.

Figure 17. The participatory planning process and relationships with stakeholders

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
Figure 18 shows a framework for interest group participation in the planning process.

Figure 18. Relationship between participation and management planning

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.

Stakeholder participation during the planning process plays a significant role in increasing the effectiveness of protected area management, supporting protection of the area and increasing a sense of ownership of the management plan. Participation also provides a mechanism for communication. Therefore, in order to guide planners and site managers in effective stakeholder participation approaches, it is important to carefully design a participation strategy (list all stakeholders, define methods and tools, identify subjects for inclusion in accordance with the planning stages, and determine the types and level of participation), integrate participatory processes into the planning process, implement participatory processes during the planning stages, and monitor participatory processes for the planning of protected areas.

As noted earlier, stakeholder engagement for the planning process follows steps similar to those used for the establishment process for the protected area. The success of the overall management plan is reliant on an effective stakeholder participation strategy and programme. This necessitates a detailed study of stakeholder participation during the planning phase.
The key question in participatory planning is how to select and include stakeholders. Stakeholders in planning protected areas, generally speaking, have a common interest in a specific issue problem that concerns and affects them, or over which they exert influence either directly or indirectly. They can be individuals or groups active at all levels, from local to global (Nastran and Pirnat, 2012). Before deciding which methods to use to regulate stakeholder participation, research must be conducted to identify the key stakeholders in the protected area, to ascertain who will be affected by the measures in the management plan, and to determine who will carry out these measures.

The steps for stakeholder engagement in the planning process are as follows:

1. Identifying and analysing stakeholders
2. Defining methods and tools
3. Identifying subjects to be included in participatory processes
4. Deciding on types and levels of participation
5. Managing participation processes
4.1 Identifying and analysing stakeholders

As with the protected area establishment process, stakeholders are divided into four main groups of participants, each representing a specific sector:

- central-level government institutions
- field-level government institutions
- civil society and research institutions
- local residents.
The most powerful stakeholder group in the planning stage is central and field level government institutions and organizations. Protected area managers and staff give priority to the participation of this group in the management planning process, in large part due to include of public institutions and organizations in the relevant legislation and necessity of taking opinions.

Other important stakeholders during the planning process are universities, commercial firms and NGOs. Among the above-mentioned stakeholders, private firms participate directly in the process of preparing management plans. Generally, plans for protected areas are developed by private firms that specialize in providing planning services. These hired firms therefore play an active part in this stage of the process. Universities and NGOs also participate actively by similarly providing planning services, especially in the case of academics hired by private firms.

Probably the most important stakeholders at the planning stage are local residents living in the affected territories. These inhabitants have a long relationship with the area and have used and shaped it for different reasons. In addition to obtaining benefits from the environment, they often have a strong spiritual bond with the site. However, in some cases once a site is declared as a protected area, local inhabitants may face new restrictions. For this reason, locals should be treated as a priority group of stakeholders. Paying necessary attention and taking care of this group during the planning process will significantly affect the implementation and sustainability of the plan.

For the planning phase, stakeholders should be grouped according to sectoral representation, thematic subject, interests, functions and sections of society.

The identification of stakeholders is only possible when the overall context of the planning process is clear, and when the desired purpose to be achieved through stakeholder engagement is clearly defined. Only in this context is it possible to identify those who will be affected or can affect decisions related to management planning issues. In the absence of this knowledge, it will be difficult to know which stakeholders to involve.

The key stakeholder groups for the different stages of the ongoing planning process are described in Table 15.
Stakeholder engagement in the planning phase for protected areas

When working with stakeholders, a number of key points should be considered to ensure the rational management of the area (Box 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of management planning</th>
<th>Key stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data gathering and inventory</strong></td>
<td>Public institutions (at the level of the General Directorate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Preliminary stage</td>
<td>Public institutions (at the local level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Launch and informing stakeholders</td>
<td>Local governments (municipalities, governorships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Gathering data in the field</td>
<td>Local residents and/or their representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muhtars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Public institutions (at the level of the General Directorate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Evaluation of data</td>
<td>Local governments (municipalities, governorships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: Identification of constraints,</td>
<td>Local residents and/or their representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities and threats</td>
<td>Muhtars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation and creation of the plan</strong></td>
<td>Public institutions (at the level of the General Directorate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6: Development of a management vision and</td>
<td>Local governments (municipalities, governorships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>targets</td>
<td>Local residents and/or their representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7: Planning of programmes and actions</td>
<td>Muhtars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8: Defining zones</td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9: Preparation of the draft management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 10: Gathering public opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 11: Preparation of the final plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 12: Approval of the plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Public institutions (at the level of the General Directorate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 13: Step-by-step implementation of</td>
<td>Local governments (municipalities, governorships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions</td>
<td>Local residents and/or their representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 14: Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Muhtars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 15: Reviewing and updating the</td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
Box 4. Points for consideration when working with stakeholder groups during the planning process

- Provide information at the right time.
- Ensure continuous and regular information.
- Use feedback mechanisms.
- Give everyone the right to speak and work to create the impression that all opinions are valuable.
- Convey the impression that all stakeholders are equally important.
- Use mechanisms of collaborative decision-making.
- Observe the traditional values of local residents.
- Observe local power and gender balances.
- Pay attention to language and styles of speaking.
- Pay attention to the time, place and order of meetings.
- Find and utilize means of communication that ensure continuity.
- Provide opportunities to support participation (e.g. transportation and logistical support).
- Prepare a seasonal and cultural calendar and following the calendar of stakeholders.
4.2 Defining methods and tools

The most effective tools to promote stakeholder participation in the planning process are official letters delivered by government institutions and distributed at meetings in village coffeehouses. These are followed by home visits and announcements made at the local office of the institution. In recent years, telephone calls, e-mail and the internet have all functioned as effective tools to invite stakeholders to join participatory processes (Yenilmez Arpa, 2011).

One other effective tool is direct discussion between rangers/protected area staff and stakeholders during the field study and control stages. The most common tools for stakeholder participation in the planning process are (Yenilmez Arpa, 2011):

- official correspondence and protocols
- establishment of focus groups, councils, committees and working groups
- study trips and joint activities
- workshops, meetings and conferences
- press and visual media, press releases
- local festivals and bazaars
- incentives and promotional materials
- use of participatory tools (drawing, problem trees, brainstorming)
- rapid rural assessments
- surveys and in-depth interviews
- e-mail, telephone, web pages and television
- roundtables
- training programmes
- research and inventories
- voting, demonstration, lobbying and campaigns
- SWOT analyses.

The current planning process and tools used for stakeholder participation are listed in Table 16.
## Table 16. Participation tools currently used in the planning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management planning process</th>
<th>Participatory tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data gathering and inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Preliminary stage</td>
<td>Official correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Launch and informing stakeholders</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Gathering data in the field</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Evaluation of data</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: Identification of constraints, opportunities and threats</td>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation and creation of the plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6: Development of a management vision and targets</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7: Planning of programmes and actions</td>
<td>Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8: Defining zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 9: Preparation of the draft management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 10: Gathering public opinion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 11: Preparing the final plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 12: Approval of the plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation and monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Official letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 13: Step-by-step implementation of actions</td>
<td>Implementation plan and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 14: Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Official correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 15: Reviewing and updating the management plan</td>
<td>Protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
4.3 Identifying topics for inclusion in participatory processes

At present, stakeholders are involved in the planning process but lack adequate representation. They participate in diagnosing problems and solutions, determining and defining legal and physical constraints, and identifying actions, but do not participate adequately in decision-making processes. Topics that can support the involvement of stakeholders in the planning stage are given in Table 17.

Table 17. Topics in which stakeholders are involved during the planning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management planning stages</th>
<th>Topics of involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Data gathering and inventory | Data gathering  
Step 1: Preliminary stage  
Step 2: Launch and informing stakeholders  
Step 3: Gathering data in the field  
Basic inventory work |
| Evaluation | Defining threats and possible solutions  
Step 4: Evaluation of data  
Step 5: Identification of constraints, opportunities and threats  
Identifying and listing legal and physical constraints |
| Preparation and creation of the plan | Determining the vision  
Step 6: Development of a management vision and targets  
Step 7: Planning of programmes and actions  
Step 8: Defining zones  
Step 9: Preparation of the draft management plan  
Step 10: Gathering public opinion  
Step 11: Preparing the final plan  
Step 12: Approval of the plan  
Developing management goals  
Defining zones  
Gathering the opinions of institutions |
| Implementation and monitoring | Area guidance services  
Step 13: Step-by-step implementation of actions  
Step 14: Monitoring and evaluation  
Step 15: Reviewing and updating the management plan  
Park services (security, cleaning services, protection and maintenance services, etc.)  
Monitoring actions (monitoring species, monitoring water resources, etc.) |

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
4.4 Deciding on types and levels of participation

When analysing the stakeholders, it is important to establish when and how they should become a part of the participatory process and how their participation could be most effectively incorporated into the planning process. The engagement plan describes this process: it considers the engagement objectives and characteristics of particular stakeholders, and based on the answers defines appropriate techniques and tools for informing, consultation and the active participation of stakeholders in decision-making.

The interest groups involved in the planning process, their current participation type and level, and the linkages and effects on the site according to the planning steps, are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Linkages and effects on the site</th>
<th>Current type and level of participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected area managers and staff (local level)</td>
<td>Responsible for management of the site, implementation of legislation, and the management plan</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible for linkages and communication with stakeholders</td>
<td>Participation through provision of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected area managers and staff (central level)</td>
<td>Authorize decisions taken regarding the protected area in accordance with legislation, policies and plans</td>
<td>Participation through provision of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make decisions on field actions</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents (in particular, Muhtars and members of the local community)</td>
<td>Inhabit the area</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make their living from the field</td>
<td>Participation through provision of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make use of the land and its resources</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possess strong knowledge of the area and its resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sites and decisions related to the sites affect them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions (that have authority and responsibility for the protected area)</td>
<td>Responsible for managing the resources of the area</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-makers for the proposed area</td>
<td>Participation through provision of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users of natural resources (fishermen and women, farmers, hunters, shepherds)</td>
<td>Inhabit the area</td>
<td>Passive participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make their living from the area</td>
<td>Participation through provision of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make use of the land and its resources</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possess strong knowledge of the area and its resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Linkages and effects on the site</td>
<td>Current type and level of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Decision-makers and managers related to the protected area                 | Take decisions regarding management of the area as required by legislation  
 The priorities are given for land use demands instead of strict conservation of the sites  
 Decisions taken related with how the sites affect local residents and resources both negatively and positively | Consultation  
 Interactive participation  
 Self-directed action                      |
| Local administrations                                                      | Take decisions related to the area as required by legislation, affecting the sites both positively and negatively                                                                                                                   | Passive participation  
 Participation through provision of information  
 Consultation                                    |
| Unions, cooperatives                                                       | Take decisions related to the area as required by the legislation, affecting the sites both positively and negatively                                                                                                           | Passive participation  
 Participation through provision of information  
 Consultation                                    |
| Local NGOs (Kaynakların ve değerlerin korunmasına katki sunanlar)          | Make attempts to promote and protect the area, as voluntary advocates for the protected areas                                                                                                                                         | Passive participation  
 Participation through provision of information  
 Consultation                                    |
| Universities (local and regional)                                          | Interested in baseline survey studies in the sites, and can influence conservation and the introduction of site values  
 Can support sites positively through the creation of a lobby                                                                                                           | Passive participation  
 Participation through provision of information  
 Consultation                                    |
| Regional NGOs                                                              | Not directly effective but effect indirectly. Lobby for the protection of rare and threatened species and sites at the global level                                                                                                  | Passive participation  
 Participation through provision of information  
 Consultation                                    |
| Law-enforcement officers and Turkish armed forces                          | Able to control illegal practices in the area  
 They tend to cooperation due to having environmental conservation responsibilities according to the their legislation                                                                                                      | Passive participation  
 Participation through provision of information  
 Consultation                                    |
| Regional training and research institutions                                | Interested in scientific research of the natural/cultural assets of the area; working on capacity development                                                                                                                         | Passive participation  
 Participation through provision of information  
 Consultation                                    |
| Private sector                                                             | Able to make investment decisions for the areas; in general, their decisions negatively affect the area and value of the sites                                                                                                     | Passive participation                                    |
| Media                                                                      | Inform and disseminate information to the public; their interests are related to public information as news                                                                                                                        | Passive participation                                    |

Source: Adapted from Yenilmez Arpa, 2011.
4.5 Managing Participation Process

Existing legal documents do not identify all interest groups involved in the planning phase of protected areas. As a consequence, the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders are not clear in this phase, and efforts and initiatives regarding the participation of stakeholders are generally formed by the individual approaches of site managers. This situation represents an obstacle to continuity in the participatory process.

On the other hand, protected area management planning process for each site is implemented within the scope of a detailed Terms of Reference. Therefore, if this technical specification includes the participants of the planning process, together with their participation level and the tools for participation, the basis for the implementation of the participatory process will be established. In this context; A stakeholder engagement strategy can be established by taking into account the stakeholder engagement recommendations for protected area planning in this guide, and a facilitator who has good communication skills from the planning team can be appointed to coordinate this process. The participatory process is managed with a short but applicable communication and participation strategy by the facilitation of appointed facilitator.
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Stakeholder engagement in management processes for protected areas
Increased public interest in questions concerning natural conservation has led to a growing need for participatory public involvement in managing natural conservation areas.

Protected areas are but one sector and profession that, in recent years, have experienced increasing demands to collaborate with a diversity of stakeholders. Environmental and natural resource management has evolved away from a top-down, regulatory style towards one characterized by close and diverse partnerships and collaborations between management agencies and local communities, resource users, other management agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector.

This is consistent with broader arguments regarding the role of citizens and the sharing of power and participation in political and policy decisions, and a transition from direct government control to more inclusive governance involving multiple parties. This debate and trend has focused particularly on environmental and natural resource management, with the majority of literature on this topic emerging from industrialized democracies (Dovers et al., 2015). Institutions and/or organizations in natural resource management want to engage in such dialogues for protected area management for a variety of reasons.
i) First, there is the perceived need for further development of representative decision-making by providing a broad range of actors with opportunities to become involved in processes affecting their lives. This constitutes an important motivation for participatory practices in planning and policy-making, and can be seen as a part of a broader democratization process taking place in many societies worldwide (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006).

ii) The second motivation is related to effectiveness: decisions and management practices are more likely to be implemented and accepted if key actors support them. The early involvement of actors helps to avoid surprises and usually leads to more sustained commitment on their part. The opposite is often the case for decisions imposed from above without consultation (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006).

iii) The third reason relates to quality. The problems affecting the world today are increasingly complex, and the proposed solutions demand knowledge from many different domains. No single agent possesses all relevant knowledge; rather, many different actors have access to specialized knowledge bases, which need to be combined and drawn upon (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006).

Stakeholder participation for protected areas management in Turkey is very limited. There is no collaborative management policy and framework for management of protected areas; however, stakeholders may participate in some field-based applications and activities such as environmental clean-up projects, local guidance implementation, and the preparation and implementation of joint projects.

In fact, protected area managers and staff are keen to encourage the participation of different stakeholders in the process of protected area
management. It is thought that stakeholder participation will bring benefits such as promoting a sense of ownership among protected area managers and other interest groups, ensuring good management of the protected area, encouraging the sharing of responsibilities among interest groups, reducing political pressure and authority, safeguarding the sustainability of the area, and enabling the efficient and effective use of resources (Yenilmez Arpa, 2011).

However, there is an insufficiency of projects and efforts to increase stakeholder participation in the protected area management processes. The main reason is a prevalence of traditional approaches in the management of protected areas, and the fact that flexible and collaborative management approaches (involving several stakeholders) are not adequately taken into consideration. Two key reasons for this situation are the current legal regulations and the administrative structure of protected areas.

Legal constraints are probably the most important factor in this regard. For example, National Parks Law No. 2873 provides no clear explanation about the joint management of protected areas with stakeholders. Although stakeholder involvement in implementing actions has been added to protected area management plans and different responsibilities and roles assigned to these interest groups, such attempts concern implementation more than management.

The situation differs slightly with regard to Terrestrial Hunting Law No. 4915. Article 3 on Hunting Commissions grants some responsibility to key stakeholder groups for the process of hunting and, consequently, wildlife protection and improvement of area management (see Box 5). Although this article does not define a mechanism for participation in area management, it is possible to speak about indirect participation in area management in connection with species protection.
Box 5. The approach to stakeholder engagement during the process of hunting and wildlife protection within the scope of Terrestrial Hunting Law No. 4915

### Hunting commissions

Article 3 – The Central Hunting Commission is established with a total of twenty-one members: with the Minister or Undersecretary as a Chairman, three members from the related units of the Ministry and the central office of the General Directorate; two members from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, one being a plant protection specialist and one a veterinarian; one representative each from the General Command of the Gendarmerie, the General Directorate of Forestry, the General Directorate of Youth and Sports, forestry faculties and voluntary organizations; nine representatives of hunting organizations from nine geographic areas taken as a basis; and one representative of private hunting grounds. In 8 504 districts the Regional Hunting Commission is established under the Chairmanship of the Governor or Deputy Governor, with a total of eleven members: two members from the Ministry, one representative each from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, the Directorate of National Education, the Regional Directorate of Youth and Sports, the Gendarmerie and voluntary organizations; and three members from local hunting organizations. When necessary, the Governorship may establish a district hunting commission with a structure similar to the Regional Hunting Commission. The decisions of a district hunting commission are evaluated by a regional commission, and the decisions of a regional commission are evaluated by the Central Hunting Commission. The Central Hunting Commission makes necessary decisions about the protection and development of hunting and wildlife outside the sphere of responsibilities given by this Law to the Ministry. The decisions of the Central Hunting Commission are final.
Among the protected areas managed by the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP), the most effective means of stakeholder participation in the management process is probably the approach used in wetlands. Through the establishment of National and District Wetlands Commissions, the Regulation on Wetlands Protection enabled effective and participative processes, which include area management. In particular, the joint management mechanism holds the District Wetland Commission responsible for implementing the management plan for a protected wetland; as a result, participation can be applied at its highest level. The commissions and their responsibilities as described in the Regulation of the Wetlands Protection are detailed in Box 6 and Box 7.
Box 6. The national level stakeholder engagement approach to Wetlands Management Process according to the Regulation on the Conservation of Wetlands

National Wetlands Commission

Article 31 – (1) The National Commission, under the Chairmanship of the Undersecretary of the Ministry or Deputy Undersecretary, is established with a total of 13 members: the head of the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks; the head of Water Management; the head of State Water Affairs; the head of Forestry; the head of Environment Management in the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization; the head of the General Directorate of Conservation of Natural Assets in the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization; the head of Spatial Planning in the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization; the head of Fishery and Water in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Livestock; representatives of agriculture and biology departments of higher education institutions, one from each department; two members from NGOs working in the sphere of wetlands. If necessary, sub-commissions can be established.

(2) Representatives of higher education institutions and NGOs are determined by the Ministry and change once every two years. Members whose time of service has expired may be reappointed.

(3) The services of the secretary are performed by the General Directorate.

Duties of the National Commission

Article 32 – (1) The duties of the National Commission are:

a) To define national wetlands policy and strategies;

b) To ensure the implementation of decisions and recommendations of the Convention made at the conference of the parties;

c) To make decisions about solving issues connected with wetlands of national importance and Ramsar areas and follow their implementation,

d) To define and update the list of wetlands of national importance in accordance with the criteria set in the Ramsar Convention;

e) To make decisions in order to solve problems connected with implementation of wetlands management plans;

f) To make decisions in order to solve problems connected to implementation of action plans for the protection and development of rare and endangered species which live in the wetlands of national importance and Ramsar Areas;

g) To support actions towards promotion of wetlands of national importance and Ramsar areas domestically and abroad.
**Box 7.** The field level stakeholder engagement approach to Wetlands Management Process according to the Regulation on the Conservation of Wetlands

**District Wetlands Commission**

Article 35 – (1) District Wetlands Commissions should be established in all regions.

(2) The District Commission, under the Chairmanship of the Governor or Deputy Governor is established with the Regional Directorate of the Ministry; the Director of the Branch Office; State Water Affairs Regional Director; Forestry Regional Director; Environment and Urbanization Regional Director; Food, Agriculture, and Livestock Regional Director; governor of the district where the wetland which is on the agenda is located, if the wetland is located in a municipal contiguous area, then the mayor of the municipality; the head of the Regional Agricultural Chamber; if such exist, then one member from each fishery cooperatives and hunting and shooting associations; two representatives of related departments of universities in the district (on condition of representing different departments); one representative of a district NGO working in the sphere of wetlands.

(3) Members from higher education institutions and NGOs are identified by the Governor’s Office on the basis of the Branch Office and, if necessary, are changed by the Branch Office.

(4) The services of the secretary are performed by the Branch Office.

**Duties of the District Commission**

Article 36 – (1) The Commission performs the following actions within its region:

a) To provide the Ministry with opinions on the level of importance of the area which was identified by the Ministry’s local agency as a wetland;

b) To determine principles of protection and usage of permanent or seasonal water streams and wetlands of district importance and evaluate annual monitoring reports;

c) To ensure implementation of the decisions of the National Wetlands Commission concerning wetlands of national importance and Ramsar areas;

c) To ensure implementation of national wetlands policy and strategies;

d) To ensure implementation of principles of wetland protection areas;

e) To provide necessary support and contribution to the process of management plans preparation;

f) To ensure implementation of wetland management plans;

g) To ensure implementation of action plans towards the protection and development of rare and endangered species connected to wetlands;

(g) To support actions towards the promotion of wetlands domestically and abroad;

h) To support actions connected with the protection of other wetlands located in the region where the commission works.
It can be argued that the regulations governing protected areas managed by GDNCNP, define effective participation in the case of wetland management. Despite the lack of management for wildlife protection and improvement areas, an effective participation mechanism is defined for species protection, but current regulations for the management of national parks only partially support stakeholder participation in area management.

Another constraint is the management system for protected areas. In cases where protected areas are managed using a bottom-up approach, and current legislation encourages the participation of stakeholder groups in management processes, it is possible to make reference to participatory processes. However, the lack of a legal basis for the participation of stakeholder groups in the management of protected areas, with the exception of wetlands, leads to potential difficulties and problems linked to participation and collaboration with stakeholder groups in protected area management. With the exception of wetlands, it is almost impossible to find evidence of a continuous participatory management approach.

It is understood that the evolution of natural resource management towards adaptive governance – and participatory protected area management – is a difficult process that demands continuity from an administrative, organizational and professional perspective. The purpose here is to create comprehensive processes where stakeholders are involved and to achieve tangible results. Traditional legal and administrative regulations performed by government institutions generally cannot facilitate long-term, cooperative, experimental and flexible management processes (Dovers et al., 2015).
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Recommendations for engaging stakeholder in the processes of protected area establishment, planning, and management
The participation of stakeholders in the process of establishing, planning and managing protected areas is vital. These groups often have considerably different opinions on how and why natural assets should be protected, and their relationship to the area involves different interests and benefits. However, the legal frameworks for protection measures in protected areas imply certain limitations that all sectors should consider when planning and taking action.

The participation of key stakeholder groups in the process of managing protected areas carries many advantages. The most important of these is heightened confidence in the goals of protected area management. This improves the likelihood of success of protective measures and helps ensure effective implementation of management plans. Indeed, the participation of key stakeholders makes it easier to legitimize a protected area or its management plan and to decrease conflicts between various interest groups. Moreover, enlisting the participation of stakeholders in management ensures that their experience and knowledge will not be ignored (Raymond et al., 2010).

Recommendations for participatory methods to involve stakeholders in the process of establishing, planning and managing protected areas are summarized in the following section, to help managers and personnel of protected areas, as well as planners, easily monitor their engagement (Walton, Gomei and Di Carlo, 2013) (Box 8).
Box 8. Recommendations for participatory methods to involve stakeholders in the protected areas

Step 1. Understanding and engaging with stakeholders

**Characterization of stakeholders:** determine the identity of the stakeholders for protected areas, their interests and relationships, and the best approaches for communicating and engaging with them over the long term.

**Tips for stakeholder characterization**
- Identify stakeholders at the outset
- Include broad interests, (benefits, expectations)
- Acknowledge diverse backgrounds
- Balance participants
- Encourage equal participation.

**Interacting with stakeholders:** build a foundation of mutual trust, create opportunities for sharing information and identify areas of common interest.

**Tips for interacting with stakeholders**
- Invest time
- Lay the groundwork
- Verify perceptions
- Identify the Stakeholders as protected area representatives
- Ensure continuous engagement.
Step 2. Getting started with stakeholders

Working with stakeholders: engage with a range of stakeholder interests and expertise in order to foster creative solutions to complex natural resource management issues.

**Tips for working with stakeholders**
- Identify those with have ownership
- Focus on getting quality information Consider timing.

**Building trust:** lay the groundwork for closer cooperation with stakeholders by creating an environment of mutual respect, open and clear communication, and productive partnerships.

**Tips for building stakeholder trust**
- Believe in your mission
- Value your stakeholders
- Be reliable and consistent
- Be a proactive planner
- Socialize
- Document everything.

**Identifying common ground:** find common interests and concerns among stakeholder groups and the management of protected area, and on this basis, define a vision for the future that can serve as an early milestone and bring a sense of accomplishment to working together.

**Tips for identifying common ground**
- Agree on desired outcomes
- Develop a clear description
- Align with the local values and culture
- Revisit the protected area vision.

Step 3. Participatory problem-solving

**Problem identification:** use a collaborative learning process that recognizes the different interests of stakeholder groups, yet focuses on identifying common and agreed-upon problems that then become the focus of this creative solution-finding process.

**Tips for working with stakeholders**
- Neutralize power and influence
- Use a facilitator
- Develop an implementation plan.

**Creative problem solving:** draw on the range of tools, techniques, ideas and approaches provided by a wide range of participating stakeholder groups, in order to work towards creative solutions that all participating stakeholders find acceptable and supportable.
**Guidelines for engaging stakeholders in managing protected areas**

**Tips for identifying common ground**
- Neutralize power and influence
- Use a facilitator
- Develop an implementation plan.

**Finding common solutions:** help each stakeholder group move towards a common point of agreement which is supportive of a specific management approach that best addresses the resource management issue under consideration, while meeting the management objectives of the protected area.

**Tips for building stakeholder trust**
- Ensure appropriate use of consensus
- Ensure participation by all
- Allow for opposing viewpoints.

**Step 4. Stakeholders as advisors**

*Advisor councils:* establish a formal multi-stakeholder advisory body that collaboratively and collectively builds innovative and well-supported approaches to complex resource management issues, and uses them as a basis for making recommendations on management solutions to the protected area manager.

**Tips for working with stakeholders**
- Connect stakeholders
- Select effective council members.

**Step 5. Co-management arrangements**

*Co-management:* establish a formally recognized cooperative management relationship between the protected area authority and the targeted stakeholder group or community, in order to make day-to-day and long-term decisions about protected area management of natural and other significant resources.

**Tips for working with stakeholders**
- Acknowledge the cultural context
- Identify benefits
- Recognize non-economic benefits
- Stress positive outcomes
- Ensure transparency
- Learn from mistakes.
It is important to apply a systematic approach to the process of establishing and planning protected areas. This will include measures for the development of a national system for protected areas and the methods and tools for use in the management process. Table 19 and Table 20 show the stages, tools and levels of stakeholder participation necessary to establish and plan a protected area.

### 6.1 Recommendations for stakeholder participation at the establishment stage of a protected area

#### Table 19. Recommendations for stakeholders, tools and levels of participation in the process of establishing a protected area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Participation tool</th>
<th>Participation level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National authorities</td>
<td>Beginning stage</td>
<td>Analysis of protected area regulations</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Informing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of institutional system connected to the protected area</td>
<td>Field studies Workshop</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Determination of the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking and selection of area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Determination of priority areas for protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Recommendation of area</td>
<td>Offer of proposed area to state institution</td>
<td>Letter Reporting Meeting Field studies</td>
<td>Informing Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer of proposed area to state institution</td>
<td>Letter Reporting Meeting</td>
<td>Informing Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer of proposed area to state institution</td>
<td>Letter Reporting Meeting Field studies</td>
<td>Informing Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offer of proposed area to state institution</td>
<td>Letter Reporting Meeting</td>
<td>Informing Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in meetings</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Informing Consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
### Choosing the correct protection category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Participation tool</th>
<th>Participation level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units in GDNCNP area</strong></td>
<td>Initial identification and management stages</td>
<td>Review and examination of recommended area Presentation of candidate areas Organization of meetings and field studies Cooperation with key groups of interest</td>
<td>Reporting Field studies</td>
<td>Deciding together Taking action together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhtars</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Joint meetings and field studies</td>
<td>Meeting Field studies</td>
<td>Informing Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of local residents (imams, teachers, trusted men and women)</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Participation in meetings and field studies</td>
<td>Meeting Field studies</td>
<td>Informing Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDNCNP</td>
<td>Definition and declaration stages</td>
<td>Preparation of nomination dossier to establishment of the protected area</td>
<td>Reporting Field studies Official correspondence</td>
<td>Deciding together Taking action together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Determination of protected area/announcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder group</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Participation tool</th>
<th>Participation level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National authorities</td>
<td>Declaration stage</td>
<td>Decision about establishment</td>
<td>Reporting Approval Announcement (Online)</td>
<td>Deciding together (only by a decision-maker group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidency</td>
<td>Declaration stage</td>
<td>Decision about establishment</td>
<td>Approval Announcement (Online)</td>
<td>Deciding together (only by a decision-maker group)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 20. Recommendations for stakeholders, tools and levels of participation during the planning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key stakeholders</th>
<th>Recommended participation tools</th>
<th>Level of participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Management and staff of protected area (local level)** | · Official correspondence  
· Focus groups  
· Committee, council and work groups | · Participation by providing information  
· Consultation  
· Interactive participation  
· Participation through independent initiatives |
| **Management and staff of protected area (central level)** | · Workshops  
· Meetings  
· Conferences | · Participation by providing information  
· Consultation  
· Intensive participation |
| **Local residents (Muhtars and local representatives)** | · Questionnaires  
· In-depth interview  
· Workshops  
· Meetings  
· Rapid rural appraisal | · Functional participation and interactive participation by providing information  
· Providing information about ideas |
| **Government institutions** | · Focus group meetings  
· Committee, council and work groups | · Functional participation and interactive participation by providing information  
· Providing information about ideas |
| **Users of natural resources (fishermen and women farmers, shepherds, hunters)** | · Usage of participation tools (drawings, problem trees, brainstorming)  
· Rapid rural appraisal | · Functional participation and interactive participation by providing information  
· Providing information about ideas |
| **Decision-makers connected to protected area and its management** | · Questionnaires  
· In-depth interviews | · Participation by providing information  
· Consultation |
| **Local administrations** | · Questionnaires  
· In-depth interviews | · Functional participation and interactive participation by providing information |
| **Associations and co-ops** | · Usage of participation tools (drawings, problem trees, brainstorming)  
· Rapid rural appraisal | · Functional participation and interactive participation by providing information  
· Providing information about ideas |
| **Local NGOs** | · E-mail, telephone, websites, TV | · Functional participation and interactive participation by providing information  
· Providing information about ideas |
| **Universities (local and regional)** | · Participatory rural evaluation  
· Rapid rural appraisal  
· Questionnaires  
· E-mail, telephone, websites, TV  
· In-depth interviews | · Participation by providing information  
· Consultation  
· Functional participation |
### Evaluation

#### Step 4: Evaluation of data

#### Step 5: Identification of constraints, opportunities and threats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key stakeholders</th>
<th>Recommended participation tools</th>
<th>Level of participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and staff of protected area (local level)</td>
<td>· Group work</td>
<td>· Participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and staff of protected area (central level)</td>
<td>· Group work</td>
<td>· Participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government institutions (level of area)</td>
<td>· Group work</td>
<td>· Functional participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td>· Providing information about ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local administrations (municipalities, governorships)</td>
<td>· Group work</td>
<td>· Functional participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td>· Providing information about ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents (Muhtars and local representatives)</td>
<td>· Group work</td>
<td>· Functional participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td>· Providing information about ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGOs</td>
<td>· Group work</td>
<td>· Functional participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td>· Providing information about ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities (local and regional)</td>
<td>· Group work</td>
<td>· Functional participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td>· Providing information about ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation and creation of the plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Step 7: Planning of programmes and actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT OF THE PROTECTED AREA (LOCAL LEVEL)</td>
<td><strong>Step 8: Defining zones</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Step 9: Preparation of the draft management plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Step 10: Gathering public opinion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Step 11: Preparing the final plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Step 12: Approval of the plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of protected area (local level)</td>
<td>· Questionnaires</td>
<td>· Participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· In-depth interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff of the protected area (central level)</td>
<td>· Questionnaires</td>
<td>· Participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· In-depth interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government institutions (local level)</td>
<td>· Questionnaires</td>
<td>· Functional and interactive participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· In-depth interview</td>
<td>· Providing information about ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local administrations (municipalities, governorships)</td>
<td>· Questionnaires</td>
<td>· Functional and interactive participation by providing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· In-depth interviews</td>
<td>· Providing information about ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Conferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Methods and Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Local residents (Muhtars and local representatives)** | - Questionnaires  
- In-depth interviews  
- Workshops  
- Meetings  
- Drawings  
- Functional and interactive participation by providing information  
- Providing information about ideas. |
| **Local NGOs** | - Questionnaires  
- In-depth interviews  
- Workshops  
- Meetings  
- Conferences  
- Functional and interactive participation by providing information  
- Providing information about ideas. |
| **Universities (local and regional)** | - Questionnaires  
- In-depth interviews  
- Workshops  
- Meetings  
- Conferences  
- Functional and interactive participation by providing information. |
| **Implementation and monitoring** | **Step 13: Step-by-step implementation of actions**  
**Step 14: Monitoring and evaluation**  
**Step 15: Reviewing and updating management plan** |
| **Management and staff of protected area (local level)** | - In-depth interviews  
- Official letters  
- Implementation plans and programmes  
- Participation by providing information  
- Consultation  
- Interactive participation  
- Participation through independent initiatives. |
| **Management and staff of protected area (central level)** | - Official appointments  
- Interview  
- Meeting  
- Implementation programme  
- Participation by providing information  
- Consultation  
- Intensive participation. |
| **Government institutions (local level)** | - Focus group meetings  
- Committees, councils and work groups  
- Official correspondence  
- Protocols  
- Functional and interactive participation by providing information  
- Providing information about ideas. |
| **Local administrations (municipalities, governorships)** | - Local festivals  
- Work trips  
- Learning by participating in common activities  
- Functional and interactive participation by providing information  
- Providing information about ideas. |
| **Local residents (Muhtars and local representatives)** | - Local festivals  
- Incentives  
- Promotional materials  
- Volunteer activities  
- Functional and interactive participation by providing information  
- Providing information about ideas. |
| **Local NGOs** | - Local festivals  
- Educational activities  
- Protocols  
- Volunteer activities  
- Functional and interactive participation by providing information  
- Providing information about ideas. |
| **Universities (local and regional)** | - Educational activities  
- Protocols  
- Research and investigation trips  
- Master’s and PhD programmes for scientific research  
- Research and investigations on the topic  
- Volunteer activities  
- Participation by providing information  
- Consultation  
- Interactive participation. |
| **Law Enforcement and Turkish Armed Forces** | - Committees, councils and work groups  
- Official correspondence  
- Protocols  
- Participation by providing information  
- Consultation  
- Passive participation. |

Source: Developed by the authors of the guidelines, 2020.
6.3 Recommendations for stakeholder engagement at the management stage of a protected area

An examination of theory and practice in recent years shows that the contemporary understanding of natural resource management, including protected areas, is increasingly influenced by ideas such as “co-governance” or “adaptive governance” (Dovers et al., 2015).

The terms “cooperative management” or “co-management” relate to a partnership where some or all of the related stakeholders participate in the management of the natural resources of a protected area and form part of the protected area’s management authority.

“Co-management” refers to the participation of stakeholder groups at different levels of protected area management. This term implies a broad measure of flexibility allowing for different levels of participation, as such partnerships generally change over time. However, protected areas are steadily adopting the concept of “partner management”, which usually indicates a legally recognized partnership between protected area management and other groups, (e.g. an NGO or tourism agency).

“Co-management” is a diverse and fluid process. Necessary regulations and the degree of participation changes in accordance with area and content. It develops over time reflecting the changing needs of partners and the communication among them. It is a process which values trust, democratization, and the needs and concerns of all participants. Agreements among partners may be formal or informal. The scope of development of a “partner management” type of partnership is dictated by policy and laws, the socio-economic environment, history and culture, institutions and rules, all of which create the social context.

The purpose of “cooperative management” or “co-management” is to develop a legitimate partnership management relationship between the target interest group and the protected area management, with a view to making day-to-day and long-term decisions about the management of natural and other key resources (Walton, Gomei and Di Carlo, 2013).

The main principles of co-management partnerships are set out in Box 9.
Evaluating feasibility

- Evaluate the weak and strong aspects of the current management system.
- Assess the authority of the current management and the official or legal capacity to participate in co-management.
- Investigate related political issues and the institutional context, and the economic advantages and opportunities of participating in co-management.
- Compare the socio-economic needs and expectations as well as the protection offered by potential co-management partners.

Planning a co-management partnership

- Establish a planning team to develop the co-management framework for a protected area.
- Determine appropriate partners for co-management and evaluate their capacities and strengths.

Process and protocols of decision-making

- Establish participation, process and protocol rules for decision-making.
- Identify administrative and support systems for implementation of the co-management partnership.
- Determine areas of responsibility for the implementation of co-management agreements and actions.

Monitoring co-management development

- Design monitoring and evaluation programmes to determine whether the co-management agreement and actions reached their goals.
- Evaluate results and document lessons learned, and communicate them to partners and groups of interest.
- Be transparent about successes and failures, and adapt management approaches and actions to provide monitoring results.

Box 9. Main principles of co-management partnerships

Despite the lack of legal support to ensure stakeholders participate in management processes, managers and staff of protected areas may seek to involve stakeholders, especially during implementation of the management plan.

The evolution of natural resource management towards adaptive governance – and participatory protected area management – is a difficult process that demands continuity from an administrative, organizational and professional perspective. The purpose here is to create comprehensive processes where stakeholders are involved as well as to achieve tangible results. Traditional legal and administrative regulations instituted by government institutions are not generally able to facilitate long-term, cooperative, experimental and flexible management processes (Dovers et al., 2015).

Working with more than one stakeholder group requires forwarding different requests and needs to management and responsible institutions (e.g. management units of national parks) – a process that requires time and skills on the part of the personnel involved.
When establishing a management system for a protected area, it is important to consider the diverse institutions and individuals that play certain roles and have interests/benefits relating to management. These groups include:

- **local people** who live in the protected area, or those whose livelihoods depend on the resources of the protected area;
- **other government institutions connected to the area or natural resource management and their personnel** (e.g. forestry, environmental protection, river management departments at the same level or commissions linked to water or, in cases of coastal-marine protection, marine and fishery units, transportation, tourism and mining);
- **other government institutions at the same level, in cases when access to protected area or cooperation with these areas is needed** (e.g. emergency management, military, police or suppliers for infrastructural or transformational objectives);
- **government organizations, except for those responsible for protected areas** (at local, regional, provincial and national level);
- **neighbours of the protected area** (e.g. owners or tenants of houses, agricultural land under special protection and the private sector);
- **special groups and city residents around the protected areas** (e.g. nomadic people or those permanently/temporarily living around the protected area, and residents of nearby cities);
- **politicians, political parties or movements** that (positively or negatively) affect the policies and management of a protected area;
- **NGOs** contributing to nature conservation and supporting the establishment or management of a protected area, linked to institutions providing partner management, and technical and financial support, including environmental groups;
- **tourists and users of recreational areas**, domestic and foreign visitors, individuals or organized groups that visit regularly or occasionally;
- **local or regional private firms** such as tour guide firms or accommodation operators;
- **companies with large trade interests or benefits**, including at the scale of large international companies (permanent or temporary existence);
- **research institutions** whose operations are based on access to protected areas, or whose work informs the management of protected areas (Dovers *et al.*, 2015).
The decision regarding who to partner with in management of a protected area is as important as stakeholder participation. Other matters of importance include the responsibilities assumed by participants and when and how often participation should take place. As protected area management will be supported by more than one group of interest, and joint decision and management approach will be applied, there will be a need for precise legal regulations and endorsed management policies to underpin participation mechanisms and a co-management model.
Chapter 7
Case studies on stakeholder participation
CASE STUDY 1.

Sultan Sazlığı
National Park

Sultan Sazlığı is one of the most important and famous of the wetland complexes of Central Anatolia. It is located in the middle of the Develi Closed Basin, and is surrounded by three districts: Develi, Yeşilhisar and Yahyalı. Erciyes Mountain (3,917 m), the highest mountain in the Central Anatolia region, is located at the northern end of Sultan Sazlığı.

The importance of Sultan Sazlığı is based on the wetland’s high biodiversity of fresh and saltwater ecosystems, as well as its location at the intersection of two main bird migration routes between Africa and Europe.

Due to its national and international importance, the site was declared a Ramsar Area in 1994 under the Ramsar Convention and declared a national park in 2006.

Sultan Sazlığı (National Park and Ramsar Area) was also selected as one of four pilot areas for the Biological Diversity and Natural Resource Management Project conducted by the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry.

The Biological Diversity and Natural Resource Management Project was undertaken to develop participatory management plans in four pilot areas and to introduce, develop, integrate and institutionalize national and international best practices in protected area planning and management, with a view to disseminating practices in other priority areas.

6- This case study was drafted as a PowerPoint presentation and presented by Orhan Ceylan, the project manager of Sultan Sazlığı National Park under the GEF-II Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management Project, implemented between 2000 and 2007 by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. Karadeniz et al. submitted a paper entitled “Participation of Stakeholders in Protected Areas Management: A Case Study of Sultan Sazlığı National Park” to the 1st International Turkey & Japan Environment and Forestry Symposium, 4–6 November 2010. The case study was adapted and reorganized by Nihan Yenilmez Arpa based on the above-mentioned documents and her PhD thesis.
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Challenges facing Sultan Sazlığı National Park and Ramsar Area

Since 1971, Sultan Sazlığı has existed under a protection regime consisting of various laws, regulations and international conventions, but this protection status has not been sufficient to sustain the ecosystems in the area.

The negative impacts of policies targeting different sectors outside the area have had a direct impact on the territory within the boundaries of the protected area. For instance, the sustainability of the wetland ecosystem has been adversely affected by different priorities regarding the use of water, unplanned grazing, agricultural activities, pollution, wind erosion, and unplanned construction and tourism development.

In order to protect the biological diversity and wetland ecosystem complex in Sultan Sazlığı, and ensure the sustainable use of natural resources in the area, the Sultan Sazlığı Nature Protection Area Master Plan was devised in 1993 by the General Directorate of National Parks and Wildlife. However, implementation of the master plan proved impossible because the legal protection status of the area did not match the existing land use situation in the area.

In 2003, in order to find a permanent solution with stakeholders in the area, the border of the area was expanded from 17,200 hectares to 24,523 hectares; then in 2006, the status of the area was changed to a national park. This project was carried out within the framework of the Biological Diversity and Natural Resource Management Project.
Due to the fact that the majority of problems experienced within the boundaries of the area originated from the decisions and practices of other ministries, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry decided to develop a management plan through a participatory approach, in order to maintain the integrity of the ecosystems of the national park and the sustainable use of natural resources in the area.

The basic principles adopted in the planning process were as follows:

- respect for biodiversity and the right to life of all living things;
- full respect for the rights of all interested parties to express their views freely and in a participatory environment, in particular the local population;
- clarity, sincerity and transparency in activities;
- effective and honest work;
- the use of scientific methods;
- respect for cultural differences and legal rights;
The main purpose of the participatory strategy adopted for the development of the Sultan Sazlığı management plan was to ensure the active participation of local residents at every stage of the planning process. Other key objectives of the participatory process included:

- achieving a common vision with interest groups;
- working together to ensure and strengthen cooperation;
- sharing responsibilities among different groups;
- ensuring the participation of all interest groups, especially local residents, when analysing problems and developing solutions;
- ensuring the efficient and effective use of resources.
The participation of interest groups in the process of preparing the management plan started with the inventorying stage. All steps involved in this stage including data analysis, identification of problems, elaboration of a vision, sharing plans and negotiation were realized through a participatory approach. Participatory rural appraisal (field visits, in-depth interviews, etc.) and participatory learning and action methodologies (brainstorming, mind mapping, etc.) were also used during this process. Local residents participated in the preparation of the management plan through:

- **Direct participation** – a process that involves face-to-face interviews with individuals or individuals to express their own opinions and opinions on the behalf of local residents;

- **Indirect participation** – a process that involves face-to-face interviews with people, groups or friends and relatives representing the local residents;

- **Representative participation** – a process that involves local community representation through unions, non-governmental organizations, political parties or government agencies.

Examples of a meeting held during the preparation of the participatory management plan.
Evaluation of the participatory process

Yenilmez Arpa (2011) measured the impact of the participatory process and the participation ratio of the process implemented in Sultan Sazlığı National Park. A total of 110 indicators were defined during the initial stage, then re-grouping was performed in order to obtain 30 measurable, comprehensible, clear and focused indicators.

The six dimensions of participation (social, functional, decision power, direction, motivation and satisfaction) were evaluated in relation to two different target groups in Sultan Sazlığı National Park, and the effects of participation were measured.

The first target group consisted of the technical personnel responsible for carrying out the activities within the scope of the project. The second group comprised the interest groups involved in the activities.

The total participation rate was determined to be 60.2 percent. The percentages for the six dimensions of participation in the overall participation rate were as follows:

- Social (11.31 percent)
- Functional (13.13 percent)
- Decision (9.18 percent)
- Direction (4.49 percent)
- Motivation (10.23 percent)
- Satisfaction (11.85 percent)
CASE STUDY 2. 
Köprülü Canyon National Park

On the basis of its unique natural and cultural assets, rare and rich biological diversity, and the striking examples of ruins of the ancient city of Selge, founded in the fifth century, Köprülü Canyon was declared a national park on 12 December 1973, under Article 25 of Forest Law No. 6831.

In 1971, with the technical support and expert contributions of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the United States National Park Service (USNPS), a development plan was prepared prior to designation as a national park. This collaboration constituted a rarity for national protected areas in Turkey.

7- This case study was drafted by Ilhan Tas, the project manager of Köprülü Canyon National Park under GEF-II Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management Project, implemented between 2000 and 2007 by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. The case study was adapted and reorganized by Nihan Yenilmız Arpa based on his presentation and GEF-II Project references.
Köprüşü Canyon National Park is located within the borders of the Manavgat district of Antalya province in the Mediterranean region. The geological structure of the region consists of clay, sandstone, conglomerate and limestone rocks leading to karstic formations. The river valley between Bolasan village and Beşkonak is the longest canyon in Turkey, stretching 14 km with walls exceeding 100 m.

The national park is characterized by red pine (Pinus brutia), cypress (Cupressus sempervirens), cedar (Cedrus libani) and many leafy tree species, covering the valley base to the peaks of the mountains, supported by a rich collection of maki vegetation. The largest pure cypress (Cupressus sempervirens) forest of the Mediterranean Sea, extending over 400 hectares, is the most important and prominent floral characteristic of the national park.

In addition to natural assets, the national park includes a variety of rich cultural assets including the Selge ancient city theatre and agora, the temples of Zeus and Artemis, cisterns, an aqueduct, the Oluk and Büğrüm bridges on the Köprü Çayı and Kocaçaçay River, and a historical stone-paved road that connects Selge to the coastal city of Pamphylia.
The ancient Selge agricultural terraces, which cover an area of approximately 350 hectares, were built for the purpose of developing agricultural fields. The stone terraced walls compensate for the inclination of the land and lack of agricultural land. The ancient terraces are still used today and are protected as a rare component of the landscape in the national park.

Eleven villages exist within the boundaries of the national park, and are inhabited by around 7,500 people who live and earn their livelihoods from livestock breeding, rainfed agriculture, tourism (rafting based), beekeeping, non-wood forest products such as thyme and chestnuts, goat horn collecting and tourism activities.
Challenges facing Köprülü Canyon National Park

Following its declaration as national park, the institutional structure and capacity of Köprülü Canyon did not develop sufficiently to manage the park’s resources. In addition to national park status, the area also has historical and archaeological site status, which has brought many constraints for the implementation of management decisions.

Limitations on income-generating activities for community within the boundaries of the national park, and prohibitions linked to its legal status, have created new challenges in the area, resulting in some inhabitants living low quality.

Forests cover 78 percent of the national park area. Since the land is also mountainous, agricultural areas are very limited. With the exception of Beşkonak, Çaltepe and Hasdümen villages, only very narrow areas can be used for rainfed agriculture. The resulting products are used for subsistence, making it difficult to earn an income.

The national park area is suitable for beekeeping activities, but geographical restrictions limit widespread and efficient production. The character of the landscape makes goat grazing the most suitable form of animal husbandry, however uncontrolled and excessive grazing has damaged the local vegetation and biodiversity, and has been restricted accordingly.

However, restrictions have not been applied to rafting, which is considered the main income-generating activity in the area. Rafting activities are organized mainly by outside companies as a mass tourism activity. Local residents have benefited from this activity to a limited degree, although the income from rafting has not been evaluated in the area.
Problems concerning cadastral surveys and ownership of properties in cultural asset/heritages within the national park, have remained unresolved due to the implementation of Article 2/B of Forest Law No. 6831. In particular, three laws governing national park management – the National Park Law (No. 287), Forest Law (No. 6831) and the Preservation of Cultural Assets Law (No. 2863) – have led to serious confusion over authority during the implementation of management activities.

Additionally, institutions related to national park management have focused on punishing local residents for infringements rather than exploring “peace-making” solutions. Furthermore, lack of cooperation among these bodies has reduced confidence among local inhabitants in governmental institutions.

The National Park Management Plan, prepared in 1972, did not adequately reflect the socio-economic and socio-cultural values of the local population. As a consequence, property problems in the area have remained unresolved since the designation of the National Park in 1973.

All these problems have led to serious conflicts between local residents and the National Park Administration. As a result, local residents have demanded that the national park status be rescinded or that the national park area boundaries be narrowed. Intensive and irregular tourism development has negatively affected the natural and cultural resources of the national park due to the lack of a sustainable tourism plan and the notable absence of a rafting development plan.

The GEF-II Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management Project was initiated to address these problems in the national park, by identifying and supporting alternative income opportunities, increasing public awareness, and supporting the planning and management of resources through a participatory approach.
The project has been carried out in four important pilot areas representing important biogeographical regions of Turkey rich in biological diversity. With the support of the World Bank, the project seeks to establish effective and sustainable protected area management, in order to maintain biodiversity and establish a mechanism that will disseminate successful experiences from these pilot sites. The project represents an opportunity for the region, and especially for inhabitants with low income levels, by providing new opportunities and initiatives to increase awareness of the region's biodiversity among all interest groups.
As an initial step, the project examined in detail recognized problems and issues, and efforts were made to understand the underlying causes and identify the parties involved. With the support of the project team and experts, the characteristics of the conflict and the parties involved were set out, and an intensive and participatory conflict resolution process was initiated.

As a methodology, the training and capacity-building programmes were implemented to increase the knowledge and awareness of both the project team and interest groups. Many awareness-raising activities have been carried out for school students, teachers, women, youth and representatives of public institutions, with the volunteering mechanism proving particularly effectively.

Planning activities for the conservation, sustainable management and utilization of natural resources in the area have been initiated, with extensive use made of facilitation and negotiation techniques and reconciliation methods.

In addition to the preparation of micro-plans for more effective use of natural resources, local residents have augmented their experience in fields of production, packaging and marketing through field visits.
In order to remedy the lack of coordination and inadequate cooperation opportunities, both of which contributed to the ongoing conflicts, several committees and working groups representing each village and interest groups were formed and decisions were taken to ensure that future activities in the national park would be carried out on the basis of joint negotiation.

A biodiversity and natural resource inventory for the region was conducted by experts and the results were shared with interest groups.

In order to support income-generating activities in the area and guide new initiatives in line with the conservation objectives of the national park, a range of different projects – home-lodging, handicrafts, camping, apiculture, local home cooking, weaving and promotional activities – were implemented through the project’s Small Grant Programme.

In order to sustain all the initiatives in the area, dialogue with public institutions and organizations was strengthened through protocols and cooperation agreements. In particular, a governance structure was established to encourage the involvement of all interested parties in processes to maintain the resource assets of the area and ensure their sustainable development.

However, since the project was terminated, inadequate staffing and equipment, weaknesses in management and termination of all activities initiated during the project process, have reduced the influence of the participatory process, which was an effective part of the project process.
CASE STUDY 3.
Yıldız Mountains Biosphere Project

The Yıldız Mountains are located in north-western Turkey, an area commonly referred to as European Turkey, Trakya or Eastern Thrace. The highest peak of the Yıldız/Strandja Mountains is Mahya Mountain (1,031 m).

There mountain area encompasses a variety of rare and sensitive ecosystems including forest, coastal, sand dunes, mountains, marine, lakes and rivers.

One of the sensitive and rare ecosystem types is the Longoz Forest, recognized for its important resource value in terms of ecological structure and size.

The proposed biosphere encompasses two protected areas designated under National Parks Law No. 2873, managed by the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (GDNCNP), within the Ministry of Environment and Forestry.

They two areas are İğneada Longoz Forest National Park, which was established on 13 November 2007 and covers an area of 3155 ha, and Kasatura Bay Nature Reserve, which was established on 18 April 198 and covers an area of 329 ha.

---

8- This case study was drafted by Nihan Yenilmez Arpa, the project manager of the Yıldız Mountains Biosphere Project, which was implemented between 2009 and 2010 by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. Yenilmez Arpa et al submitted a paper entitled “A Model of Proposed Governance; The Case of the Yıldız Mountains Biosphere in Turkey” to the 1st International Turkey & Japan Environment and Forestry Symposium, 4–6 November, 2010. The case study was adapted and reorganized by Nihan Yenilmez Arpa based on the above-mentioned documents.
The Yıldız Mountains Biosphere Project is the abbreviated name for the project Protection and Sustainable Development of Natural Resources and Biodiversity in the Yıldız Mountains in Turkey, implemented between December 2008 and November 2009 by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in the Yıldız Mountains, Kırklareli Province.

The project was managed by means of a participatory process. However, efforts to engage all stakeholders in the process and introduce the project were overrated, in spite of the fact that experts conducted field studies with inventories, and implemented field studies in close cooperation with related institutions, government bodies and others. An intensive participatory process was established and implemented for management planning projects with a view to improving stakeholder engagement.

The participatory process implemented for the planning phase.
An intensive participatory process was established for management planning with stakeholders, including 31 settlements inside or peripheral to the project area. The process involved the following steps:

**Phase 1:**

- Identifying and analysing stakeholders;
- Establishing a team of facilitators and elaborating a process to engage stakeholders in planning a sustainable future for the Yıldız Mountains.
Phase 2:

- Establishing a dialogue with stakeholder groups based on exchanging information about the project and their visions and aspirations for the Yıldız Mountains;

- Developing a community-based approach to managing natural resources within the Yıldız Mountains, based on existing management systems such as cooperatives and hunting associations.
Phase 3:

- Establishing a “Management Planning Group (MPG)”, with representatives from Ankara and Kirklareli (15 group members), and a “Stakeholder Working Group (SWG)”, with representatives of villages, government agencies, NGOs and Muhtars representing local residents, women and youth (45 group members).

Following this process, a governance mechanism was established for management of the proposed biosphere site and integrated into the management plan.

The existing situation was researched and models were evaluated using a brainstorming technique coordinated by a facilitator, prior to identification of a suitable governance structure for the Yıldız Mountains Biosphere.
Guidelines for engaging stakeholders in managing protected areas

Results

If the Yıldız Mountains Biosphere is to be successful, its management and operational structure must reflect its objectives, incorporate the views and ensure the participation of local stakeholders, and meet the needs of the province and the state.

The governance structure that was identified and adapted is based on detailed discussions with the relevant authorities in Turkey.

It was therefore agreed that management of the biosphere should be carried out by two committees: a Management Committee responsible for overseeing the planning and implementation of the management plan, including its initial development from a preliminary plan to a full management plan; and an Advisory Committee in which a wider range of stakeholders will contribute to the decision-making process. Additionally, a Biosphere Support Unit will support coordination between the two committees, and prepare official correspondence between the two committees and outside agencies. The proposed governance structure for the Yıldız Mountains is shown here.
Committees

Management Committee

The Management Committee will be responsible for overseeing the planning and management of the Yıldız Mountain Biosphere. This will consist of representatives of the main government departments, supported by representatives of municipalities and the chairperson of the Advisory Committee, to ensure that all stakeholders are able to influence the decision-making process. While it may be appropriate for membership of the Management Committee to change over time, the initial structure will have a membership of 15, including representatives of the Kırklareli Governorship (chair), the Regional Directorate of Forestry (vice chair), the Provincial Directorate of Environment and Forestry, the Directorates of Forestry Enterprise (Kırklareli, Demirköy and Vize), the Kırklareli Province Special Administration, the General Directorate of Nature Conservation and Natural Parks, the General Directorate of Forestry, the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture, the Provincial Directorate of Tourism and Culture, representatives of municipality mayors, independent representatives (maximum of two), and the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee.
The purpose of the biosphere is to conserve the biodiversity and important natural resources of the Yıldız Mountains, and to encourage the sustainable development of the area. The central and provincial governments will play an important role in providing logistical support, but the main contributors and beneficiaries of the biosphere will be the people who live and work in the area. The Advisory Committee will function as the forum for their voices to be heard and their contributions to policy and management to be made.

The Advisory Committee should initially build on the existing Stakeholder Working Group, with representatives of villages, cooperatives and unions, municipalities, non-governmental and private sector organizations, hunters, the military, young people and women. The Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson will be elected by the members of the Advisory Committee for an initial term of two years.

The Advisory Committee will meet prior to the meetings of the Management Committee and will share a similar agenda. The Chairperson of the Advisory Committee will attend the Management Committee and will be responsible for presenting the views of the local people on the items under discussion.
The proposed biosphere is intended to utilize existing resources to conserve ecologically important areas and to encourage and support sustainable development. The expected benefits will be obtained by improving liaison and cooperation between the activities of the various agencies and the local population, by establishing partnerships based on shared aims and, if appropriate, seeking additional funding for identified projects. The Management Committee will be responsible for obtaining these benefits.

To support this process, a Biosphere Support Unit will be established within the Provincial Directorate of Environment and Forestry. The purpose of this unit is to initiate activities to assist the Management Committee in its efforts to achieve the objectives of the management plan. The unit should also be responsible for preparing official letters, disseminating information in a timely manner and setting up a communication network. The unit need not be larger than three persons initially and will be staffed by personnel from different agencies already working in the area. The Biosphere Support Unit will operate within the Provincial Directorate of Environment and Forestry.
The designation of a biosphere reserve implies important changes for an area. For example, the area in question is required to develop appropriate mechanisms for the formation of a committee for planning and the coordination of activities.

Although the meetings conducted and decisions made with related parties during the implementation period (2009-2010) for the Yıldız Mountains Biosphere Project were feasible, the continuity of the successful participatory process followed due to the implementation of the proposal model could not be achieved. First of all, the biosphere that received a proposal could not be declared as a reserve. Certain negative perceptions, reactions and unwillingness on the part of local residents in the Camili Forests Biosphere Area – a unique biosphere area in Turkey – have led to some concern within institutions, with biosphere reserves being viewed with suspicion. In addition, the term “reserve” has not been adopted by institutions and is even seen as a form of constraint.

At the global level, there is a strong focus on integrated and ecosystem-based conservation; however, in Turkey there has been no recorded progress on biosphere reserves. The negative process experienced here also negatively affected Yıldız Mountains.
Chapter 8

Glossary and references
Guidelines for engaging stakeholders in managing protected areas
Glossary

**Key stakeholder.** A subset of stakeholders whose input is crucial to the success of the project, and who has the power to prevent, (https://mosaicprojects.com.au/Mag_Articles/N008_Key_Stakeholders.pdf. 2019).

**Protected Area.** A clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed through legal or other effective means to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural assets (IUCN, 1994).

**Public.** The general population. The public as it relates to protected areas includes: individuals, local residents, protected area visitors, private companies or individuals whose business relates to or could be impacted by protected area management, local and national community groups, local governments and any group or individual that expresses an interest, (Anonymous, 2002).

**Public participation.** The process by which public opinions, needs and values play a role in governmental and corporate decision-making. The process consists of two-way communication and interaction, with the overall goal of making better decisions that are supported by the public (Creighton, 2005).

**Stakeholder, interest group, actor.** Stakeholders are persons, groups or institutions with an interest in the project or the ability to influence project outcomes, either positively or negatively. Stakeholders may be directly or indirectly affected by the project. The range of potential stakeholders is diverse and may include target beneficiary groups, locally affected communities or individuals, national and local government authorities, the academic community, civil society actors including non-governmental organizations (NGOs), politicians, religious leaders, private sector entities, worker organizations and other special interest groups. Importantly, stakeholders may include groups opposed to proposed interventions. The “stake” that each of these different groups has in the project will vary (UNDP, 2017). Stakeholders; frequently defined as the individuals, groups, and organizations that are involved in or affected directly or indirectly by a policy or action. With respect to PA management, this definition includes locals, environmental NGOs, agencies, and other decision-makers. In practice, however, the term “stakeholders” tends to be used primarily for non-agency, non-governmental people, especially locals, (Brumbaugh, 2017).

**Stakeholder dialogue:** A process by which a structured exchange of stakeholder opinions, concerns and values occurs, (Stoll-Kleemann and Welp, 2006).

**SWOT Analysis:** S: Strengths; W: Weaknesses; O: Opportunities; T: Threats
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LINKS

https://www.unece.org, Aarhus Convention,
www.unece.org/env/pp/aarhus/map.html,
http://web.worldbank.org/archive/website01028/WEB/IMAGES/PARTICIP.PDF.
https://www.iucn.org


http://web.worldbank.org/archive/website01028/WEB/IMAGES/PARTICIP.PDF


www.milliparklar.gov.tr
www.tvkgm.gov.tr.
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General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks (in Turkish)

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (in Turkish)

Ministry of Environment and Urban Planning (in Turkish)

UNESCO-MAB Ecological Sciences for Sustainable Development

www.tarimorman.gov.tr/


2873 number of National Parks Law No. 2873- www.milliparklar.gov.tr

Terrestrial Hunting Law No. 4915- www.milliparklar.gov.tr
Guidelines for engaging stakeholders in managing protected areas

Sets of guidelines developed to provide standards and recommendations for the sustainable management and conservation of the country’s natural assets within the framework of the project:

FAO Subregional Office for Central Asia
fao-tr@fao.org
www.fao.org/turkey

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Ankara, Turkey

Republic of Turkey Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
General Directorate of Nature Conservation and National Parks
https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/DKMP
General Directorate of Plant Production
https://www.tarimorman.gov.tr/BUGEM
General Directorate of Forestry
https://www.ogm.gov.tr