

Stakeholder Assessment of

# AVIATION

in the UK

an evaluation by Icarus Collective, April 2008



## Contents

	<b>Summary of key learning points</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Scope and purpose of the evaluation</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>The evaluation process</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>The structure of the report</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Findings</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	<b>The stakeholder dialogue process</b>	<b>9</b>
	<b>Process design</b>	
	▪ Stakeholder mapping	
	▪ Focus of the discussion	
	▪ Structure	
	<b>Facilitation</b>	
	▪ Impartiality and independence	
	▪ Quality and overall approach to facilitation	
	▪ Individual tasks	
	<b>Clarity of purpose</b>	
	▪ An understanding of what the process tried to achieve and how the findings of the two days will be used.	
	<b>Attendance</b>	
	▪ Consistency	

<b>4.2</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Purposes achieved</b>	
	<b>Value to participants</b>	
	▪ Value for the time invested	
	<b>Ability to express views, be understood, new perspectives and shift position</b>	
	▪ Expressing views	
	▪ Being understood	
	▪ New perspectives and information	
	▪ Changed views	
	<b>Impact for SDC</b>	
	▪ Advice from a broader base	
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Next steps</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>Taking the issue forward</b>	
	▪ Future dialogue management	
	▪ Data management	
	▪ The role of SDC/IPPR	
	▪ Possible ways forward	
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>Evaluation framework</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>About Icarus</b>	<b>34</b>

## Summary of key learning points

### Process design

The preparatory time invested was essential in building confidence in the process, developing relationships, understanding positions and ensuring key stakeholders were on board. It would have helped the process design to produce a formal conflict analysis report reflecting on the findings of this preparatory period. It would have also supported the process design if the facilitation team had been appointed earlier. In any future dialogue on aviation local / regional issues should be divided out from strategic issues. The session design may have also benefited from a bolder approach in terms of the focus and exercises in the first stakeholder session.

### Facilitation

The impartiality, independence and skill of the facilitation was considered very important due to the complexity and scope of the subject matter. The interactive style, incorporating mixed-stakeholder small group work encouraged participation and enabled different perspectives to be heard. Groups for the carousel exercise needed to be smaller and/or have additional facilitation input. To maximise the benefit of small group work, especially when working with technical subjects, it may have been better to match stakeholder knowledge / interest to the subject area. An 'open space' style methodology where participants are given the choice of which topic to go to, with certain conditions re. mixture of sectors represented and group size, might have been a better option than random assignment to a topic group.

### Clarity of purpose

Given the nature of the process and the role of SDC in relation to government, a degree of uncertainty about the overall outcome is inevitable. Nevertheless clarity about the type and style of reporting can build confidence in the process. The process may lose the momentum if stakeholders are not kept engaged in the loop of information and the next stage of the dialogue is delayed.

### Attendance

For this type of 'cumulative' discursive process it is helpful if there is consistency of personnel throughout the process. There remains some significant barriers to participation for some organisations. A neutral party working with these organisations before the event may have had more success in overcoming barriers to participation.

### Value to participants

Relationship building is a valuable implicit objective and outcome of this work. The value of developing a conducive

atmosphere of mutual trust and ability to communicate difficult opinions should not be underestimated. When designing a process of this type there is a balance to be struck between developing mature deliberative relationships and delivering tangible outcomes in the eyes of the participants. It may even be worthwhile in making this aspect of the process more explicit, thereby moderating participant expectations for concrete outcomes, e.g. direct influence of government policy. In this way it could be demonstrated that trust building is a legitimate and essential prerequisite for a longer-term progress.

### **Ability to express views, be understood, new perspectives and shift position**

The process enabled the exchange of views yet some doubt remains about the extent to which this resulted in a deeper understanding between stakeholders. There were a small number of participants who reported new learning and a shifting of positions and perspectives. A large number of participants claimed that they had not heard anything that they did not know already or changed their position.

### **Impact for SDC**

For SDC it has been an extremely valuable process and has directly informed their programme development and advice to government. The real test of success will be the impact on government. The success of the process in this respect needs to be evaluated in due course.

### **Taking the issue forward**

There is broad agreement that some form of future multi stakeholder dialogue would be useful. There is a need to keep everyone in the loop of information as the process moves forward. A series of more focussed dialogues on specific sub issues may be the best way forward. Decisions need to be made about whether the future process aims to be fully inclusive of all positions and stakeholders or it is better to first consolidate the middle ground. A decision also needs to be made about how ambitious the process aims to be and whether it needs to focus on easy wins, possible breakthrough areas or longer term, more in depth analysis and solutions. A media strategy will be necessary. The 'honest broker' role that SDC undertook was widely appreciated by participants and it was felt they carried out this role very well. Discussion now needs to take place to decide whether this role is the most appropriate. There also needs to be an appraisal of the best way to interface with government's policy development agenda and timetable and how SDC can best use the findings of this process to influence instruments such as the Air Transport White Paper. There appears to be a strong mandate for SDC to be involved in helping to create the political space for continued dialogue around the topic. There could also be a role for SDC in enabling government to work in a joined up way on aviation if it was involved in helping to facilitate dialogue between departments. There was broad agreement that widely accepted metrics and data re. aviation is an important enabler of a mature dialogue. There

also needs to be a strategy established for data management in which a wide cross section of stakeholders can have confidence. SDC needs to consider its role in terms of facilitating this process.

## 1. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

This report sets out the findings of the evaluation of the stakeholder dialogue on aviation that has been instigated by the Sustainable Development Commission (SDC) in collaboration with the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR). The findings relate to the two facilitated stakeholder meetings held on 30<sup>th</sup> January and 28<sup>th</sup> February 2008 in the New Connaught Rooms in London.

These dialogue sessions were attended by a cross section of representatives from government, NGOs, community based groups, industry and academia, all of whom have an interest in the future of aviation. An independent team from Dialogue by Design facilitated the days.

The purposes of the overall project were as follows.

- To inform the future work programmes of SDC and IPPR on aviation and transport, including the design of longer term projects that will form the basis of SDC's advice to government.
- To inform stakeholder's own thinking and decisions, and clarify the potential next steps.

The purposes of 30<sup>th</sup> January event.

- To map the main areas of agreement and disagreement around aviation.
- To explore the needs of future dialogue on aviation.

The purposes of 28<sup>th</sup> February event.

- To create shared and contrasting visions of 'aviation within a low carbon, sustainable society'.
- To generate ideas and materials to inform the advice SDC/IPPR offers to government.
- To clarify the potential next steps, including the potential for ongoing dialogue.

The remit for the evaluation was to comment on the achievement of the above purposes and the following measures of success.

- The range of stakeholders who participate reflect the breadth of the criteria listed under 'Participants'.
- Participants rate highly the integrity and transparency of the methodology.

- Participants feel that they have established sufficient understanding of each other's needs, wants and opinions in relation aviation and sustainable development for their time to have been well spent. They also have a sense of what next steps would be useful in terms of information gaps, policy levers or measures.
- Participants feel that they could broadly map out the boundaries and territory in relation aviation and sustainable development from each other's perspective.
- The information gained will assist the SDC in its task of providing advice to government.

## 2. The evaluation process

A framework setting out measures of success, stakeholders, methods and questions informed the design of the methodology (see appendix 1). The specific information gathering tools used were as follows.

- Structured observation of the two dialogue sessions on 30<sup>th</sup> January and 28<sup>th</sup> February 2008.
- Analysis of feedback questionnaires completed by participants at the end of each session.
- In depth semi-structured phone interviews with nine participants to the process, one representative of the facilitation team, one member of SDC's core team and one representative of an NGO who declined the invitation to attend. These took place during March and April 2008.
- Desk review of the minutes of a meeting between representatives of an NGO and community based organisations who declined the invitation to attend the event, setting out the reasons why they felt they could not attend.
- Desk review of a paper produced by the facilitation team outlining challenges and possible next steps for the process.

## 3. The structure of the report

The findings are divided into three broad themes; '**The stakeholder dialogue process**', '**Impact**' and '**Next steps**'. Each of these themes is further divided into a number of more specific '**evaluation topics**'. Within each of the evaluation topic areas the report sets out an analysis of the '**evidence**' and from this analysis draws out as series of '**key learning points**'.

## 4. Findings

Evaluation topic	Evidence	Key learning points
<b>4.1 The stakeholder dialogue process</b>		
<p><b>Process design</b></p>	<p><b>Stakeholder mapping</b>            SDC undertook twelve months of pre process work to develop stakeholder relationships across sectors and maximise the possibility of a broad based attendance. This was resource intensive but largely successful and helped build more trusting relationships with government and industry in particular.</p> <p><i>"We had at least 40 one to one meetings with 3 site visits, 6 events in total, 1500 emails in my aviation inbox. Given it was one of the first dialogues and we had to reposition SDC as an honest broker it took a long time" (SDC comment)."</i></p> <p>The facilitation team felt that the preparation time was valuable in bringing government departments on board, getting them to address the issues of conflict and showing them that it is possible to have a civilised conversation about these issues.</p> <p>The potential of this pre process work, to inform the design of the engagement, would have been even greater had it been formally recorded. This could have offered a more robust analysis of stakeholder positions, interests, barriers to participation, motivations, positions and so on.</p> <p>The appointment of the facilitation team six months prior to the sessions could have enhanced this stakeholder mapping and conflict analysis process.</p> <p><b>Focus of the discussion</b>            The facilitation team considers there was a weakness in having local /</p>	<p><b>Learning points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The preparatory time invested was essential in building confidence in the process, developing relationships, understanding positions and ensuring key stakeholders were on board. Time and resources need to be budgeted for this.</li> <li>B. It would have helped the process design to produce a formal conflict analysis report.</li> <li>C. If resources were available the process design would have been helped by the earlier appointment of the facilitation team.</li> <li>D. Local / regional issues should be divided out from strategic issues in any future dialogue on aviation.</li> <li>E. The session design may have benefited from a bolder approach in terms of the focus and exercises in the first stakeholder session.</li> </ul>

	<p>regional issues in the same dialogue as strategic carbon reduction issues and feels these should be divided out if the dialogue moves forward. Although the issues are linked it was felt that the concerns of local activists over local issues could curtail the breadth of strategic discussions.</p> <p><b>Structure</b> With the benefit of hindsight the facilitation team felt it might have been better to have started with the visioning exercise that took place at the start of the second stakeholder event. This exercise was perceived by the facilitators and other stakeholders to have worked very well. At the design stage however it was thought to be too risky to ask participants to take part in an exercise that was too challenging to their usual way of working.</p>	
<p><b>Facilitation</b></p>	<p><b>Impartiality and independence</b> There was very positive feedback across all sectors regarding the impartiality and independence of the facilitation. Participants were particularly appreciative of this because of the diversity of views and positions that were present at the events.</p> <p><b>Quality / overall approach to facilitation</b> Positive feedback was received about the effectiveness of the facilitation from all sectors.</p> <p><i>"Very impressed with the facilitators. In particular they had a good judgement and they didn't try to claim knowledge that they didn't have."</i></p> <p><i>"The efforts of getting the right people in the right groups and the mix of small groups and then bringing it together worked well."</i></p> <p>A number of comments related to the complexity and scope of the topic and the fact that there were many divergent views on the topic.</p>	<p><b>Learning points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The impartiality and independence of the facilitation was seen as very important.</li> <li>B. Skilful facilitation was required because of the complexity and scope of the subject matter.</li> <li>C. There was value in scoping the different challenges across government.</li> <li>D. The interactive style, incorporating mixed-stakeholder small group work encouraged participation and enabled different perspectives to be heard.</li> <li>E. It is important to maximise opportunities for participation and</li> </ul>

	<p><i>"Facilitation was quite good but scope of the event was very wide and so difficult for the facilitators to draw things together to achieve a common view, but somehow they did seem to manage that."</i></p> <p>A few comments suggested that the facilitators could have asked more of the participants, either in undertaking more of the data analysis within groups or to move a little further into the detail of the contested issues.</p> <p><i>"There might have been a bit more of a challenge from the facilitators. I can understand that it's important to get people round the table to look at commonality and to gently tackle some of the taboo subjects but I thought at times we were perhaps not pushing things quite hard enough."</i></p> <p><i>"Maybe we should have been forced more to do the organisation and analysis ourselves. A lot of this was facilitator led."</i></p> <p>SDC were pleased with the facilitation and felt the team approached the planning with an open mind and dealt with them as clients well. In particular the scoping exercise with commissioning partners was felt to have worked very well as it demonstrated the mixture of different challenges across government in relation to aviation.</p> <p><b>Individual tasks</b></p> <p>The interactive style, incorporating mixed stakeholder small group work was generally popular. An advantage commonly cited was that it enabled people to be heard, hear different perspectives and to participate, although there was some suggestion that the group sizes may have been too large at times. Observing the carousel groups at the 30th January event the large groups size appeared to limit full participation and there was a comment that facilitators could have drawn out quiet people a little more.</p> <p>A further observed difficulty of the small groups sessions on the afternoon</p>	<p>deliberation in group work. Groups for the carousel exercise needed to be smaller and/or have additional facilitation input. The lay out of chairs and the noise interference from one group to another did not assist participation.</p> <p>F. To maximise the benefit of small group work, especially when working with technical subjects, it's valuable to match stakeholder knowledge / interest to the subject area. An 'open space' style methodology where participants are given the choice of which topic to go to, with certain conditions re. mixture of sectors represented and group size, might have been a better option than random assignment to a topic group.</p> <p>G. Posting up results/comments on wall fosters an open and democratic climate.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>of the 28<sup>th</sup> February session related to the ability to participate and the balance of expertise within groups.</p> <p><i>"We were broken down into small groups looking at very specific topics. I wondered if that was the best use of people's expertise. We looked at technology and because some of the people there were more or less experts some were out of their depth and some were just holding forth. Only one person in our group really knew about it so we couldn't have a very balanced discussion."</i></p> <p>Participants liked the fact that opinion and findings were posted on the walls for all to see, giving an open, democratic feel to proceedings.</p>	
<p><b>Clarity of purpose</b></p>	<p><b>An understanding of what the process tried to achieve and how the findings of the two days will be used.</b></p> <p>Feedback relating to the purpose of the overall process was very mixed across all the represented sectors. This perhaps originated in the framing of the issue and the positioning of aviation within it. The facilitation team fed back:</p> <p><i>"There was a whole discussion about whether we were looking at what a low carbon economy looks like and why are we putting aviation at the centre of that. Or are we talking about the role of aviation in a low carbon economy – which is what we probably were talking about."</i></p> <p>Stakeholder feedback suggests a good level of understanding about the objectives of the events but a lack of clarity about how the findings will be ultimately used.</p> <p>Although the 'next steps' were not clear for the majority of participants there were very few suggestions that SDC/IPPR were holding any</p>	<p><b>Learning points:</b></p> <p>A. Given the nature of the process and the role of SDC in relation to government a degree of uncertainty about the overall outcome is inevitable. Nevertheless clarity about the type and style of reporting can build confidence in the process.</p> <p>B. The process may lose the momentum if stakeholders are not kept engaged in the loop of information and the next stage of the dialogue is delayed.</p>

information back or had hidden agendas. There was a general optimism that SDC would use the findings to help construct its advice to government. SDC themselves recognise that they could have been clearer about the type of document that would be produced after the events, however they genuinely did not know exactly what the next steps would be until the process was complete and they could talk to the Department for Transport, in particular, about the room for manoeuvre and the best way forward. Participants appeared to appreciate that this uncertainty about the next steps was due to the complexity of the issue and its polarised and politicised nature.

*"There's a degree of uncertainty but that's inevitable."*

*"They were not hiding anything and were clear that they were using the process to explore what to do"*

*"I'm not entirely clear, under the impression that this is still work in progress for SDC"*

There was a strong indication from participants that they want to be kept informed about the next steps, how the findings influence advice to government and other related activities of SDC/ IPPR around aviation. A couple of participants fed back through the more in depth evaluative interviews that although the process objectives had not been that ambitious this should be just the start of a process of dialogue around this topic.

*"Would like to see a clear plan emerging of next steps"*

*"It's not an end in itself, it's a beginning. Now we have to be quite careful how it is taken forward"*

These points echo the facilitation teams concerns that, if there is a time lag between this and subsequent engagement on the issue, the impetus might

	be lost.	
<b>Attendance</b>	<p><b>Consistency</b> Although 71 people attended the first dialogue event in January and 53 in February only 24 people attended both days, with organisations sending substitute delegates or deputies on the second day. A number of participants highlighted this as a concern.</p> <p><i>"That's a bit of an issue in terms of continuity of attendance and I don't know how SDC get over that one. People at the second one don't necessarily take ownership of what was agreed at the first one."</i></p> <p><b>Non participating organisations</b> Despite the twelve-months of preparatory work there was difficulty in persuading those organisations to attend that only deal with aviation as part of their role, such as tourism and international development organisations. Also, a number of environmental NGOs chose not to participate in the process for more focussed political reasons. SDC respects absolutely their reticence and hopes that they will still look at the findings of the process and give their advice. A number of other stakeholders fed back that if the process proceeds, and can be demonstrated to be <i>"genuinely independent and robust"</i>, then there may be opportunities to bring them on board.</p> <p>A separate meeting was held with the NGO's and community-based organisations, who chose not to attend the events to discuss their barriers to participation. The evaluation process also included one interview with a transport focussed campaigning organisation who decided not to attend. The main barriers and positions in relation to participation can be summarised as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The time is not right for a dialogue of this sort as the Department for</li> </ul>	<p><b>Learning points:</b></p> <p>A. For this type of 'cumulative' discursive process it is helpful if there is consistency of personnel throughout the process.</p> <p>B. Despite the investment of time and resources in pre process negotiation and explanation there remains some significant barriers to participation for some organisations. A neutral party working with these organisations before the event may have had more success in overcoming barriers to participation although this is by no means certain.</p>

	<p>Transport (DfT) and the aviation industry would only be willing to enter into dialogue if it was seen to be to their advantage. There is no indication that they are willing to change their position (that aviation growth is a given).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The DfT are using the process as a PR exercise so that they can say they have negotiated with groups across the board but in fact are establishing a consensus around their own position. This position needs to be defeated before any dialogue can take place.</li> <li>▪ Some campaign groups are coming from a fundamentally different position to the DfT and the aviation industry at the moment and feel that the <i>"gulf is enormous and unbridgeable"</i>. They feel that the strategy needs to be one of putting the DfT under pressure through lobbying and campaigning to 'win' a change of course.</li> <li>▪ No intermediary is needed, campaigning groups can talk directly to government.</li> <li>▪ Dialogue is not completely ruled out but if policy is going in <i>"completely the opposite direction then dialogue won't work"</i>.</li> </ul>	
<b>4.2 Impact</b>		
<p><b>Purposes achieved</b></p>	<p><b>Purposes achieved</b></p> <p>There was general feedback that the session on 30<sup>th</sup> January had been successful in mapping out the main areas of agreement and disagreement around aviation but less successful in exploring the needs of future dialogue. Participant comments consistently reflected that the morning session, which focussed on the first objective, worked well while the afternoon session didn't manage to address the second objective so well.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"Not sure the afternoon achieved its objective. Discussions were less familiar with project development and scoping"</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>"Mapping good, less clear on where the areas of agreement and disagreement went overall."</i></p>	

	<p><i>"The first session worked very well, in the second session there seemed to be a little less clarity about how to take it forward although a point of agreement was reached".</i></p> <p>There was less direct feedback from participants about the achievement of purposes for the 28<sup>th</sup> February session. The majority gave a middling score on the feedback sheets and a couple of comments suggested that the final objective, of clarifying the next steps and the potential for ongoing dialogue, had not been achieved. This reflects other feedback received that suggests that people are not clear how the overall findings will be used.</p>	
<p><b>Value to participants</b></p>	<p><b>Value for the time invested</b></p> <p>There was a mixture of feedback from participants however certain aspects of the sessions were highlighted as being positive.</p> <p>Networking was cited many times as a positive outcome; people talked to and made connections with people and organisations that they had not come across before as well as re-establishing relationships with those that they had previously encountered. Linked to this was the value of bringing so many different organisations together and hearing different points of view and different perspectives.</p> <p><i>"It was good to hear the views of people who you wouldn't normally hear and hear them so directly. There were some organisations that I'd not come across before."</i></p> <p><i>"The pay back was worth it in terms of getting different people's perspectives."</i></p> <p><i>"The process was secondary the attendees were of principle importance"</i></p>	<p><b>Learning points:</b></p> <p>A. It is worth acknowledging that relationship building is a valuable implicit objective and outcome of this work particularly where there is multi sector participation and positions are very polarised. The value of developing a conducive atmosphere of mutual trust and ability to communicate difficult opinions should not be underestimated. When designing a process of this type there is a balance to be struck between developing mature deliberative relationships and delivering tangible outcomes in the eyes of the participants. It may even be worthwhile in making this aspect of the process more explicit, thereby moderating participant expectations</p>

	<p>An unstated objective, although one clear to the facilitator team, was the benefit of just bringing people together from different sectors and allowing them to talk and get to know each other in a safe environment.</p> <p><i>"It always surprises me that people are surprised by the results of working in small groups, doing mapping exercises etc. People could see there were lots of differences but also lots of similarities. It did, to some extent give people a sense of common purpose."</i></p> <p>The opportunity to influence government policy was seen as positive by a number of participants and although some feedback commented on how little had been achieved there was a feeling by several delegates that it was an achievement in itself to get so many sectors and organisations represented in a broadly positive discussion.</p> <p><i>"I got some insight and a reaffirmation that even where people disagree quite strongly you can create a structure within which you can have a positive discussion"</i></p>	<p>for concrete outcomes, e.g. direct influence of government policy. In this way it could be demonstrated that trust building is a legitimate and essential prerequisite for a longer-term progress.</p>
<p><b>Ability to express views, be understood, new perspectives and shift position</b></p>	<p><b>Expressing views</b></p> <p>The majority of feedback indicated that participants generally felt there was little constraint to them expressing their views, that others were listening to what they were saying and that they were listening to others.</p> <p><i>"I felt listened to and understood but was aware that others were rather challenging"</i></p> <p><i>I think I got a few of my points across, it didn't come across as an adversarial debate particularly"</i></p> <p><b>Being understood</b></p> <p>Although the majority could express their views freely and felt others were</p>	<p><b>Learning points:</b></p> <p>A. The process enabled the exchange of views yet some doubt remains about the extent to which this resulted in a deeper understanding between stakeholders.</p> <p>B. There were a small number of participants who reported new learning and a shifting of positions and perspectives.</p> <p>C. A large number of participants</p>

listening there was some ambivalence and uncertainty about whether they were genuinely communicating and being understood.

*"The discussion was not actually a discussion. It was an opportunity for various people to say things about aviation. This wasn't from any agreed starting point or with any agreed objective or purpose in mind. As such, it is extremely difficult to air views which others would understand or to develop a dialogue or progress thought on aviation and emissions."*

*"It varied as to whether I was listened to, people were happy to have it written down but whether they took it on board is hard to say. It's the beginning of a long journey so that can't be expected really."*

*"Some better appreciation of perceptions of others. Still a long way to go before views / opinions fully shared"*

The short time available and the limited time spent in small groups with people from different sectors was also cited as a limiting factor.

### **New perspectives and information**

Given that many of the participants are already very involved in the aviation field and debate there was a lot of feedback that indicated that people had heard nothing new and that they were familiar with the positions of different groups and sectors. Overall, when put into the context of other feedback, these comments didn't feel particularly dismissive of the process but acknowledged that positions were fairly well known and the difficulty was not in understanding them but in enabling people and organisations to prioritise issues and construct ways forward.

*"Much of the views expressed were fairly predictable and I did not gain much new insight"*

claimed that they had not heard anything that they did not know already or changed their position however this could reflect the polarised and entrenched views, the immature nature of stakeholder relationships and the early stage of the process.

*"We already have many opportunities like this – nothing new from the whole process"*

*"Some new views but mostly opinion entrenched – including mine"*

*"Some level of information and understanding of other's point of view but think as well I was aware of quite a few viewpoints to start with and didn't work with many people on the day who I wouldn't have worked with normally."*

*"There wasn't anything that came out of it where I said, wow, I hadn't thought about that but it was good to hear people saying things in their own words and the way people interacted with each other. Seeing that process was quite informative so quite positive without being able to put my fingers on why."*

Although these views were in the majority there were some participants who gained new perspectives and information that they found useful.

*"Getting more insight from the wider industry view was quite useful. I've now a better handle on how technological innovation is going to contribute to solving this issue."*

*"I was certainly more aware of some of the technology issues and the trade off between environment goals, technology and different government objectives. E.g. issue of noise and fuel use was an area where there was a necessary trade off."*

*"Yes, picked up new insights. Especially, that even environmental interests don't agree on certain things which just adds to the complexity. It's not a case of industry / government versus the environmental groups, you have tensions and complexity even"*

*within that relationship."*

### **Changed views**

As a number of participants pointed out the purposes of the sessions were not focussed on changing views but to identify areas for debate, compare visions and suggest next steps. In this way it was not so much a dialogue but, as the facilitator team pointed out, *"talks about a dialogue"*. Having said that, there were indications that the discussions had started the process of reflection for a number of participants. Certainly the immediate evaluation feedback indicated that there had been some shifting in views, not necessarily about the way forward but certainly about the positions and pressures on the different sectors.

*"interesting views of the NGO reps reminds me of the complexity of the issues"*

*"Slightly made me realise that aviation sees itself as a persecuted industry"*

*"Not changed really rather provided me with food for thought"*

A range of feedback indicated that people thought that this had been a useful prelude to the debate but that real progress would be made when it's possible to get down to the discussion of the detail.

*"I know the background well. I would need more detailed debate with those with contrary views."*

*"The next stages will highlight differences and show how different things we meant by those statements. These top level statements were easier to achieve than the detail of where to go next"*

<p><b>Impact for SDC</b></p>	<p><b>Advice from a broader base</b></p> <p>For SDC the process has had a substantial impact on its future thinking for this area of work. The principle objective for SDC was to be able to construct its advice to government from a fully informed position. It feels the process has enabled it to do this.</p> <p><i>"The work programme we now have signed off is going to be completely informed by what came out of the events, we've had a complete rethink as a result of it. It wasn't some parallel process that happened, it has created the foundations for what we are doing. It will directly inform the advice we give to government."</i></p> <p><b>Success judged by results</b></p> <p>SDC feel it is too early to assess the true impact of the process and the development of new relationships with different sectors. The key indicator of success for commissioners will be the impact its advice makes on government and in particular the DfT. The shift to a role as an <i>'honest broker'</i> for this exercise can only be evaluated in this light.</p>	<p><b>Learning points:</b></p> <p>A. For SDC it has been an extremely valuable process and has directly informed their programme development and advice to government.</p> <p>B. The real test of success will be the impact on government. The success of the process in this respect needs to be evaluated in due course.</p>
<p><b>4.3 Next steps</b></p>		
<p><b>Taking the issue forward.</b></p>	<p><b>Future dialogue management</b></p> <p>There was broad agreement that further dialogue would be helpful and desirable to build on the momentum created. Participants considered that multi stakeholder deliberation was necessary to tackle such a complex issue and that other methods, that didn't bring people together, would be less successful.</p> <p>There was a lot of support however for a change in the scale and focus to future dialogue. Many of the stakeholders interviewed suggested a period of focussing in on specific issues with smaller, cross-sectoral stakeholder groups. It was felt that after the general mapping of the territory, achieved through the initial two sessions, it would be worthwhile to try to make</p>	<p><b>Learning points:</b></p> <p>A. There is broad agreement that some form of future multi stakeholder dialogue would be useful.</p> <p>B. There is a need to keep everyone in the loop of information as the process moves forward.</p> <p>C. There is a need to consider a change of scale and focus to future</p>

	<p>some substantive progress around specific issues. This would help develop a common language and build relationships. Specific recommendations / <i>"products"</i> could be developed by the smaller working groups and then taken back to a broader stakeholder forum.</p> <p>The detail about what should be dealt with and who should participate was less clear. Some respondents wanted the process to be more ambitious while others felt it should go for easy wins. Topic areas suggested included; public attitudes to flying, transport alternatives and modal shifts; air traffic control reform, rationalisation of air space and making airports carbon neutral.</p> <p>There was also different perspectives on who should participate with some considering that the middle ground should be consolidated and more <i>"extreme groups"</i> marginalised while others felt it important to <i>"bring the more extreme groups into the dialogue"</i>.</p> <p>One respondent felt that it was important to stop the <i>"constant bickering through the media"</i> and perhaps it would be possible to bring the media on board in some way through the dialogue process.</p> <p>Although there was support from government departments for continued dialogue on aviation there was a need for some caution and awareness of how dialogue interfaced with existing and future policy development. At present the Air Transport White Paper is a long-term strategy with, according to the Department for Transport (DfT), limited opportunity for influence through stakeholder dialogue processes. There is a danger that recommendations emerging from a dialogue process would have nowhere to go. A senior civil servant commented; <i>"If you were to do a long, well resourced dialogue you'd have to have some commitment that the dialogue was going to be decisive and at the moment we're not in a position to be able to offer that"</i>.</p> <p>This issue of the presence or absence of 'political space' for dialogue seems</p>	<p>dialogue. Perhaps a series of more focussed dialogues on specific sub issues.</p> <p>D. Decisions need to be made about whether the future process aims to be fully inclusive of all positions and stakeholders or it is better to first consolidate the middle ground.</p> <p>E. A decision needs to be made about how ambitious the process aims to be. Should the dialogue focus on easy wins, possible breakthrough areas or longer term farther reaching more in depth analysis and solutions.</p> <p>F. A media strategy will be necessary.</p> <p>G. The 'honest broker' role that SDC undertook was widely appreciated by participants and it was felt they carried out this role very well. It enabled a more open and honest debate to take place.</p> <p>H. Quality relationships have been developed between SDC and stakeholders; including government departments.</p> <p>I. The process has directly informed SDC's development of a programme</p>
--	---	--

	<p>critical to the ongoing effectiveness and worth of stakeholder engagement around the issue of aviation. SDC feel it's too early to say whether political space has been opened for future dialogue to take place but points out that the issue is <i>"incredibly complex, public opinion is very inconsistent and they [DfT] are dealing with major conflict"</i>. SDC feel they have been able to show government how engagement and dialogue processes can help develop sustainable solutions to complex and divisive the issues. In the preparatory meetings for the process it became apparent to SDC how split government is on the issue, <i>"not just on climate change versus economic development but also split on many levels"</i>.</p> <p><b>Data management</b></p> <p>There was broad consensus, including the organisations who declined to participate, that information and data in relation to aviation was highly contested, politicised, complex and entwined with issues of commercial confidentiality.</p> <p><i>"I don't think I've ever worked on a project where there is so little agreement about any facts at all.....no one seemed to have a single piece of factual information that others were prepared to believe."</i>(facilitator team)</p> <p>It was also generally agreed that widely accepted data was important for the dialogue process to make progress. <i>"If there's no metrics everything is built on sand"</i>, was one comment that encapsulated the majority of the feedback. This lack of agreed facts was an indicator of an <i>"immature dialogue"</i> according to the facilitation team; but they also pointed out that it would have been <i>"a complete disaster"</i> if SDC/IPPR had tried to present facts to the meeting without there having been a process beforehand to ensure their acceptability by all. What they feel is needed is a <i>"data bank"</i> that everyone can accept as accurate and impartial that will break through the <i>"cycle of adversarial science"</i></p> <p>Echoing the facilitators comments, participants fed back that there needs</p>	<p>and positions around aviation.</p> <p>J. SDC need to decide and negotiate their future role re. this engagement process. Is the role of 'honest broker' the most appropriate?</p> <p>K. There needs to be an appraisal of the best way to interface with government's policy development agenda and timetable and how SDC can best use the findings of this process to influence instruments such as the Air Transport White Paper.</p> <p>L. SDC could support government in enabling future dialogue on the subject. Government don't know all the answers. There appears to be a strong mandate and support for SDC to be involved in helping to create the political space for continued dialogue around the topic.</p> <p>M. There could be a role to play for SDC in enabling government to work in a joined up way on aviation if it was involved in helping to facilitate dialogue between departments.</p>
--	---	--

to be a protocol or strategy developed for data management that would enable a wide cross section of stakeholders to have confidence in the information presented. This can only happen over a longer deliberative process. How this could be done was less clear with a number of suggestions being put forward to enable both existing and future data to be made acceptable. A number of suggestions related to independent verification and peer reviewing mechanisms for existing data, while future research might be jointly commissioned or commissioned by an accepted "*honest broker*" like SDC. This role for SDC, as commissioner and disseminator of credible research, was backed up by one campaigning organisation who declined to participate in the dialogue process. They felt that SDC could interpret good research and give advice to government without a dialogue process.

#### **The role of SDC /IPPR**

There was cross-sectoral positive feedback, among attending stakeholders, about the role of SDC/IPPR in coordinating and commissioning independent facilitators to design and deliver the dialogue process. The experience of co-commissioning was very positive for SDC too and has given them the confidence that future collaborative commissioning could work. A number of respondents felt that SDC has built trust and confidence across different stakeholder groups through their management of the process. Specific comments from the aviation industry and government departments indicated that their respect and confidence in SDC had grown during the process. SDC themselves are pleased with the process and feel better relationships have been built with government departments and the broader stakeholder sector.

Equally a broad range of stakeholders, including government departments, felt SDC/IPPR had successfully been able to play an "*honest broker*" role, which enabled wide participation from many different sectors and created a space where an honest and constructive conversation about aviation could begin. Government departments felt that they could not have facilitated the same type of debate if they had been the commissioning

N. There was broad agreement that widely accepted metrics and data re. aviation is an important enabler of a mature dialogue. There needs to be a strategy established for data management in which a wide cross section of stakeholders can have confidence. SDC needs to consider its role in terms of facilitating this process.

body as participants would have wanted to direct their comments towards government rather than having a conversation between each other and focussing on the problems, issues and ways forward.

*"I think the fact that SDC has transformed itself into this honest broker trying to bring everyone together has been a very courageous but a very welcome move." (industry)*

It was seen as helpful that SDC came to the issue from the more holistic perspective of 'sustainable development' rather than a more narrow economic, environmental or transport focus.

Although most stakeholders were not clear on the precise future of the process or who was going to lead, the majority felt that SDC and possibly IPPR should have some continued role. The clear basis for this was the broadly successful delivery of this short dialogue process on aviation and more specifically the demonstrable "honest broker" role that SDC/IPPR had played. One comment from industry put this argument forcefully.

*"Yes, much better to be run by SDC than the DfT. DfT has many different arms, it runs the road system, it is involved in passenger rail franchising, its got various tentacles into the airports industry, it's directly involved in consulting the public over future expansion of Heathrow. In the minds of some at least its impartiality as far as airports and aviation is concerned is a little bit tainted so I think SDC is better placed to be that honest broker than government. SDC would be a good body to continue hosting the process."*

#### **Possible ways forward**

SDC themselves are still unclear about their precise role in future dialogue around aviation. This needs to be negotiated with government. The process has enabled SDC to have a programme on aviation and a relationship with government around the issue; this wouldn't have been possible without the dialogue process. SDC's recommendations to

government will be informed directly by the process findings and, after checking with key stakeholders, will be taken to Ruth Kelly. This advice, informed by the dialogue, has been a key achievement. SDC feel that they have taken an important step forward in that these recommendations are not just their voice but also make sense to the stakeholders involved in the process.

SDC however see a tension between playing the role of an honest broker and having an opinion.

*"I don't think we could ever say we're impartial. I don't think we could lead the next steps. We could just initiate it and say to government – this issue is one of conflict, this is how we think you need to deal with it and help them move in that direction."*(SDC core team comment)

The organisation is still working out its role in relation to aviation; which elements should SDC lead on; should it's role be that of 'honest broker', advice giver or watchdog (or all of these). How should stakeholders be engaged is an important question and the balance of responsibility for dialogue between SDC and government. A reassessment of the contested evidence base, broad stakeholder dialogue, a cross governmental approach and leadership from the top are likely to be elements of SDC's recommendations to government. Stakeholder feedback suggested however that government does need to take ownership of the issue.

*"The SDC can facilitate it but people won't take it seriously unless the DfT are fully brought in."*(facilitator team)

The facilitator team were asked to frame some key prerequisites that should inform any extended dialogue around engagement. In addition to the issues mentioned they felt that the sectoral clusters of stakeholders needed first to consolidate their positions and goals a little more. This included the different positions and goals across government. Having got a

	<p>sense of the broad strategic governmental goals the job of the dialogue process is then supporting the stakeholders to think creatively about options for achieving them. The team also considered it important to have clear leadership and commitment by a body that can be perceived by all to be independent of sectoral interests with sufficient authority and expertise to act as convenor and facilitator.</p> <p>Certainly SDC could potentially be a good resource to government whatever the balance of roles that is agreed. SDC have now established good working relationships with a wide range of stakeholders across all sectors, know the subject and the positional landscape and have increased their credibility as an 'honest broker'.</p>	
--	---	--

## Appendix 1.

### Evaluation framework – Evaluation of Aviation in the UK – stakeholder assessment

Broad evaluation areas	1. CONTEXT	2. INPUTS	3. PROCESS DESIGN AND DELIVERY	4. OUTPUTS	5. OUTCOMES
Key success indicators	Emotions, views, values, existing positions re aviation of key stakeholders is taken into account.	<p>Degree to which the range of stakeholders who participate reflect the breadth of the criteria outlined in the tender document.</p> <p>Establish why invited stakeholders chose not to attend</p> <p>Resources sufficient to undertake process (funds, equipment, support, time, information etc.)</p> <p>Desired outputs and outcomes are clear and agreed.</p> <p>Parameters to the scope of the process are stated, understood and agreed by all. (e.g. what can and can't be discussed, limitations on delivery</p>	<p>High rating by participants of the impartiality, integrity and transparency of the process</p> <p>High rating by participants of the independence of facilitation</p> <p>Relative influence / power of stakeholders and access to information taken into account in process design</p> <p>Process enables stakeholders to engage in quality deliberation about the relevant issues.</p> <p>Appropriate engagement methods selected and used.</p> <p>Ways of working are agreed by all.</p> <p>Practicalities have been</p>	<p>Degree to which process has succeeded in sharing understanding on each others' needs, wants and opinions in relation to what a sustainable, low carbon society might look like and the role of aviation within this.</p> <p>Participants can broadly describe the boundaries and territory in relation to aviation and sustainable development from each other's perspective.</p> <p>Participants can explain what next steps would be useful in terms of information gaps, policy leavers / measures.</p> <p>Degree of influence on stakeholder's own decisions and thinking re. Aviation and the value of</p>	<p>The findings have UK wide relevance and will assist the SDC in the task of providing advice to government.</p> <p>Participants consider that they have made contacts / improved working relationships through participation in the process.</p> <p>There is clarity re. how the findings will be used and what impact they have had.</p> <p>There is a clear understanding re. how the deliberative process will continue (if it is necessary), who will be involved and how information will be communicated.</p>

		<p>etc.)</p> <p>The level of participation in the deliberative process is agreed and understood by all.</p> <p>All levels of the commissioning organisation understand the implications of the outcomes of the process.</p>	<p>addressed to provide conducive environment for deliberation, e.g. venues, catering, equipment, support.</p> <p>Administrative capacity is sufficient to cope with anticipated data.</p> <p>Language and access needs of different stakeholders are taken into account.</p> <p>Venue, catering administration on the day is appropriate and a high standard.</p>	<p>this.</p> <p>Degree to which participants feel they were heard and understood.</p> <p>That participants feel that the event has been good value for their time invested.</p> <p>Findings make sense to government, business and NGO's</p> <p>Degree to which</p> <p>The extent to which unanticipated outputs have been achieved and the value of these.</p>	<p>There is access to the evaluation of the process by all stakeholders which analyses the success of the process and lessons learnt.</p> <p>The extent to which unanticipated outcomes have been achieved and the value of these.</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--

## Draft Evaluation questions and methods

<b>Stakeholders</b>	All participants at the two events	Sample of attendees	Sample of non attendees	Facilitator team	Core team interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Devolved administration interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation methods</b>	End of day feedback form	Structured phone interview after 2 <sup>nd</sup> event.	Structured phone interview after 2 <sup>nd</sup> event.	Observation at first event  Structured phone interview after 2 <sup>nd</sup> event.	Structured phone interview after 2 <sup>nd</sup> event.	Structured phone interview after 2 <sup>nd</sup> event.
<b>Draft questions</b>	<p><b>Feedback form</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent do you feel that the day was facilitated impartially and independently?</li> <li>To what extent have you had an opportunity to share your feelings, views and values regarding aviation?</li> <li>To what extent do you understand what the process is trying to achieve and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Telephone interviews</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent do you feel that the day was facilitated impartially and independently?</li> <li>To what extent have you had an opportunity to share your feelings, views and values regarding aviation?</li> <li>To what extent do you understand what the process is trying to achieve and how the findings of the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Telephone interviews</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why did you choose not to attend the events?</li> <li>Is there anything that would have enabled you to take part?</li> <li>Would you like to receive the findings of the day and be invited to be involved in any next steps that emerge?</li> <li>Was this the right approach (participatory</li> </ul>	<p><b>Telephone interviews</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How have the feelings, views and values of key stakeholders regarding aviation being taken into account in the design of the two sessions?</li> <li>Did the range of stakeholders who participated reflect the breadth of the criteria outlined in the tender document?</li> <li>What have you done to ensure that participants understand what the process is trying to achieve and how the findings of the two days will be used? To what extent was it successful?</li> <li>What have you done to</li> </ul>	<p><b>Telephone interviews</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How have the feelings, views and values of key stakeholders regarding aviation being taken into account in the development of the engagement process?</li> <li>Did the range of stakeholders who participated reflect the breadth of the criteria outlined in the tender document?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Telephone interviews</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent do you feel that the day was facilitated impartially and independently?</li> <li>To what extent have you had an opportunity to share your feelings, views and values regarding aviation?</li> <li>To what extent do you understand what the process is trying to achieve and how the findings of the</li> </ul>

	<p>how the findings of the two days will be used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the event helped you to understand the n needs, wants and opinions of others in relation to aviation</li> <li>• How do you think the information gathered on the information should be used?</li> <li>• Have your views been influenced by what you heard at the events?</li> <li>• Was the event good value for the time you have given it?</li> </ul>	<p>two days will be used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have the events helped you to understand the n needs, wants and opinions of others in relation to what a low carbon society might look like and the role of aviation within this?</li> <li>• To what extent have the events provided an opportunity for you to hear and develop a better understanding of the contribution that participants could make to a low carbon society and the role of aviation within this?</li> <li>• How do you think the information gathered on the</li> </ul>	<p>facilitated dialogue) or could you suggest any alternative way of achieving the purpose?</p>	<p>provide opportunities for participants to hear and develop a better understanding of the contribution that participants could make to a low carbon society and the role of aviation within this? To what extent was it successful?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you feel there was clarity of the overall purpose of the process?</li> <li>• Do you think the process was sufficiently resourced (funds, commitment, support, time, information)?</li> <li>• Did the right people attend? Did it include people that would not normally come together?</li> </ul> <p><b>Observation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The day was facilitated with impartiality and independence (scalar + comments)</li> <li>• Clear explanation of purpose and parameters of the process and next steps</li> <li>• Opportunity for participants to hear each others opinions/positions/constraints</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there clarity across all partners of the project about the purpose and scope of the engagement process?</li> <li>• What have you done to communicate the purposes of the engagement process and the next steps?</li> <li>• To what extent do you feel that participants were better able to understand the needs, wants and opinions of others in relation to aviation</li> <li>• How do you plan to use the information gathered from the events? Do you think that the findings will assist you in</li> </ul>	<p>two days will be used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have the events helped you to understand the n needs, wants and opinions of others in relation to what a low carbon society might look like and the role of aviation within this?</li> <li>• To what extent have the events provided an opportunity for you to hear and develop a better understanding of the contribution that participants could make to a low carbon society and the role of aviation within this?</li> <li>• How do you think the information gathered on the</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---	--	---	---

		<p>information should be used? Have you had an opportunity to influence this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have your views been influenced by what you heard at the events?</li> <li>• Was the event good value for the time you have given it?</li> <li>• Did anything come out of the process that you did not expect/anticipate?</li> <li>• Did you gain anything from the process that could benefit your own organisation?</li> <li>• Overall, was this the right approach (participatory facilitated dialogue) or could you suggest any alternative way</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were appropriate engagement methods selected and used to achieve the purpose?</li> <li>• Were the ways of working/groundrules agreed by all?</li> <li>• Was the environment conducive to the task (room, refreshments, administration etc.)?</li> <li>• Language and access needs of different stakeholders taken into account?</li> </ul>	<p>the task of providing advice to government?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have you been influenced by participants ideas and aspirations about the usage of the findings?</li> <li>• Do you think the process was sufficiently resourced (funds, commitment, support, time, information)?</li> <li>• Did anything come out of the process that you did not expect/anticipate?</li> <li>• Did the right people attend? Did it include people that would not normally come together?</li> <li>• Overall, was this the right approach (participatory</li> </ul>	<p>information should be used? Have you had an opportunity to influence this?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have your views been influenced by what you heard at the events?</li> <li>• Was the event good value for the time you have given it?</li> <li>• Did anything come out of the process that you did not expect/anticipate?</li> <li>• Did the process address issues that you would have as representatives of a devolved issues? How could it be done better?</li> <li>• Did you gain anything from the process that could benefit your own organisation?</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

		of achieving the purpose?			facilitated dialogue) or could you suggest any alternative way of achieving the purpose?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, was this the right approach (participatory facilitated dialogue) or could you suggest any alternative way of achieving the purpose?</li> </ul>
--	--	---------------------------	--	--	--	--

## Appendix 2.

### About Icarus.

Icarus specialises in **planning, doing** and **evaluating** stakeholder engagement. We make sure that everyone who needs to be involved in a decision, issue, strategy or plan will have their voice heard and can actively participate in the process. We also undertake **training** to pass on our expertise.

Icarus gets people talking.

Report author: Steve Smith, Icarus Collective.

[www.icarus.uk.net](http://www.icarus.uk.net)

0845 017 5516