

INTERREG EUROPE DIALOG Project Dialog for Innovation and LOcal Growth



SURVEY REPORT TEMPLATE

BY Lower saxon ministry

INDEX

1. Iı	ntroduction	3
2. T	he PROJECT PARTNER questionnaire	3
	2.1. Section A - Profiles of the interviewed persons	
	2.2. Section B - Stakeholders identification	
2	2.3. Section C - The participatory process	4
2	.4. Section D - Methods and Tools for the participatory process	6
3. T	he STAKEHOLDER survey	9
	3.1. Section A - Profile of the interviewed person	
	.2. Section B - The participatory process	
	8.3. Section C - Methods and Tools for the participatory process	

1 INTRODUCTION

The DIALOG project foresees, in this phase of the project, a field survey among stakeholders and project partners. This is aimed at identifying instruments and methods that stakeholders perceive as efficient for their involvement in policies and/or projects activation. Furthermore, the survey will facilitate the Action plan implementation by each partner, as planned in the second Dialog project phase. This template intends to facilitate the systematization and processing of the data collected by each project partner through the administration of questionnaires.

2 THE STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

3 Section A - Profile of the interviewed person

The survey involved **15** individuals, mostly **women** (table below).

Gender	Absolute value	Percentage value (%)*
Male	5	33,33
Female	10	66.67
I don't want to say	0	6.25
Total	15	100

*= enter n.1 decimal value

The following table shows the age groups of respondents.

Age group	Absolute value	Percentage value (%)*
18-24 yrs	0	6.25
25-34 yrs	1	6,25
35-44 yrs	7	43,75
45-64 yrs	7	43,75
over 65 yrs	0	0
Total	15	100

*= enter n.1 decimal value

Add any comments you deem useful on the strenght of the data collected in the previous tables.

The following table shows the education of respondents.

Education	Absolute value	Percentage value (%)*
None/elementary	0	0
Middle school	0	0

Secondary school	1	6,67
University	14	93,33
Post university	0	0
Total	15	100

Add any comments you deem useful on the strenght of the data collected in the previous tables.

The next table shows the role of respondents.

Education		Absolute value	Percentage value (%)*
Administrative representative		15	100
Local body representative		0	0
Employers' representative		0	0
Association/trade union representative		0	0
Research centre representative		0	0
Representative of a civil society organization		0	0
Representative third sector organization		0	0
Expert		0	0
Citizen		0	0
International network (EEN, Europe direct, etc.)		0	0
Other		0	0
	Total	15	100

*= enter n.1 decimal value

All stakeholders are working in a ministry.

The following table indicates the work sector to which the interviewees belong.

Education	Absolute value	Percentage value (%)*
Industry	0	0
Construction	0	0
Commerce	0	0
Tourism	0	0
Transport	0	0
Business services	0	0
Health	0	0
Education/Training	0	0

Public Administration	0	0
Other	15	100
Total	15	100

The main sector is Regional developemt and European Affairs.

The following table shows how many, among the interviewees, have ever had any experiences participatory processes.

Interviewees	Absolute value	Percentage (%)*
Previous experiences in participatory processes	16	100
Total	Total number of interviewees (b)	-

*= enter n.1 decimal value

On the strenght of the data collected in question n.7 of the questionnaires, insert some additional information about the experiences stakeholders have had. All the partcipants are employees of the ministry that are involved in organizing participatory processes.

4 Section **B** - The participatory process

The table below shows the interviewees' opinion regarding the adoption of a multi-stakeholder collaboration strategy in order to identify possible solutions for economic, social and environmental problems.

Opinions	Absolute value	Percentage value (%)*
Very useful	1	6,25
Fairly useful	13	81,25
Not very useful	2	12,5
Not useful	0	0
Total	16	100

*= enter n.1 decimal value

The following table indicates, according to the interviewees' opinion, in which process phase stakeholerds should be mostly involved. *Insert the number of times each process phase has been selected.*

Process phases	Absolute value	Percentage (%)*
Project design	10	62,5
Operational planning	10	62,5
Implementation/monitoring	13	81,25
Assessment	12	75

		Total	15	-
--	--	-------	----	---

The next table shows the interviewees' opinion about what is the most suitable level of stakeholder involvement considering the 4 following forms (inform, consult, involve, collaborate).

Insert, for each level of stakeholder involvement, the number of times each values (from 1 to 4) has been selected.

		Level of stakeholder involvement (Absolute value)																
Process phases		inform				con	sult			inv	olve		collaborate					
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
Project design	0	1	5	8	2	1	3	8	5	2	3	4	6	3	3	2		
Operational planning	0	0	5	9	1	5	2	6	4	1	5	4	4	6	3	1		
Implementation/monitoring	0	2	4	8	1	3	5	5	1	5	4	4	3	5	4	2		
Assessment	0	1	4	9	0	1	8	5	1	4	7	2	3	5	3	3		

Most interviewees were puzzled to answer the question. They mostly stated that the level of stakeholder involvement depends on the project.

The following table indicates, according to the interviewees' point of view, the level of relevance of criteria used in stakeholder selection that an administration responsible for a program/project should consider.

Enter in the table the number of times each score (from 1 to 5) has been indicated for each element (e.g. a=number of times score 1 has been selected for each element in the list)

$f=a/(\sum a-e)^*100$ $g=b/(\sum a-e)^*100$ $h=c/(\sum a-e)^*100$ $i=d/(\sum a-e)^*100$ $l=e/(\sum a-e)^*100$

Elements		Sco	ores (abs	olute va	lue)			Scores	(percen	tage val	ue %)*	
(full description in questionnaire)	1	2	3	4	5	Tot	1	2	3	4	5	Tot
Stakeholder ability to involve other stakeholders	4	4	2	2	3	15	26,67	26,67	13,33	13,33	20	100
Representative level in relation with the category belonging	1	0	3	7	4	15	6,67	0	20	46,67	26,67	100
Capacity to start and boost changes	2	0	4	9	0	15	13,33	0	26,67	60	0	100
Stakeholder 'recognition' level from the targeted population []	1	1	4	6	3	15	6,67	6,67	26,67	40	20	100
Capacity to influence the labour market	4	4	3	2	2	15	26,67	26,67	20	13,33	13,33	100
Capacity to influence the resources allocation	3	3	5	2	1	15	20	20	33,33	13,33	6,67	100
Capacity to provide with an in-kind support	9	2	2	2	0	15	60	13,33	13,33	13,33	0	100
Specialist knowledge and competences	0	0	5	7	3	15	0	0	33,33	46,67	20	100
Capacity to maintain discussion and public dialogue	0	2	4	7	2	15	0	13,33	26,67	46,67	13,33	100
Participation experience in other similar experiences	3	2	10	0	0	15	20	13,33	66,67	0	0	100

Elements		Sco	ores (abs	olute va	lue)		Scores (percentage value %)*								
(full description in questionnaire)	1	2	3	4	5	Tot	1	2	3	4	5	Tot			
Capacity to communicate through a wide media variety												100			
Level of interest and interest of being involved	0	0	4	6	5	15	0	0	26,67	40	33,33	100			
Recognition and trust level by the administration responsible []	2	1	5	5	2	15	13,33	6,67	33,33	33,33	13,33	100			
Capacity to influence the public opinion	0	4	9	2	0	15	0	26,67	60	13,33	0	100			
The capacity of stakeholder to affect the project activities []	0	1	4	10	0	15	0	6,67	26,67	66,67	0	100			
Participation in previous networks and projects	1	5	6	3	0	15	6,67	33,33	40	20	0	100			
The negative effect of a stakeholder non participation []	4	0	6	3	2	15	26,67	0	40	20	33,33	100			

Additionally some stakeholders mentioned

Some respondents (3) additionaly mentioned the importance of including marginalsed groups and people who are facing discrimination such as people with handicaps, women, people with a migration background etc. Another difficulty seems to be the fact that some important groups of the citizens are not organized under an umbrella organization. Therefore these groups are difficult to approach and to include in participatory processes. Others (1) mentioned groups of stakeholders that need to be included by law.

5 Section C - Methods and Tools for the participatory process

The following tables show the interviewees' opinion about the potential effectiveness of a series of methods, tools and techniques, differentiated by phase. *Insert, for each element, the number of times each values (from 1 to 5) has been selected for each level of stakeholder involvement.*

Project design , methods, techniques							Level	of stak	eholde	er invo	lveme	nt (Ab	solute	value)								
Project design: methods, techniques			inforn	า				consul	t				involv	е			collaborate						
and tools	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5			
Production booklets posters	2	1	2	6	2	5	2	5	1	0	8	3	2	0	0	10	1	2	0	0			
[] specific interests of the interest parts	1	1	1	3	5	1	0	5	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	3			
Publication of agendas []	1	0	0	8	3	2	2	4	3	1	3	2	3	3	1	3	3	2	3	1			
Web site	0	1	2	5	5	3	2	4	2	1	5	4	1	1	1	6	3	1	1	1			
Dedicated platform/Apps	0	2	0	6	3	1	1	2	4	3	2	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	2	0			
Mailing list	0	0	1	6	6	1	0	2	7	3	1	1	4	7	0	2	2	2	7	0			
Newletter	1	0	1	5	3	2	1	4	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	3	3	2	1	1			
Social media	0	0	3	7	1	1	1	6	3	0	2	6	2	1	0	3	6	1	1	0			
Events/seminars	0	1	1	7	5	0	3	1	5	5	0	2	2	5	5	3	1	2	4	4			
Methods in presence []	1	2	2	5	3	0	3	2	4	4	0	1	2	6	4	2	1	2	3	5			
Methods online []	1	2	2	5	3	0	3	2	5	3	0	1	4	5	3	2	1	3	3	4			
Auditive methods group []	1	3	4	1	1	0	0	5	3	2	0	0	2	5	3	1	1	2	3	2			

Project design , methods, techniques							Level o	of stak	eholde	er invo	lveme	nt (Ab	solute	value)							
Project design: methods, techniques	inform							consul	t		involve						collaborate					
and tools	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5		
EASW	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0		
Auditive methods interw []	3	4	0	3	0	0	2	2	0	5	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	2	0		
Research-Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Group techniques []	5	2	1	0	4	4	2	4	0	0	2	3	3	2	0	4	3	3	0	0		
Negotiation techniques []	3	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0		
Techniques for conflict []	4	2	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	1	1	1	3	1		
Set up multi-stakeholder []	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	2	4	1	1	0	2	4	0		
Participatory budgeting	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0		
Other																						

Insert, for each element, the number of times each values (from 1 to 5) has been selected for each level of stakeholder involvement.

In a low out at the second second second							Level o	of stak	eholde	er invo	lveme	nt (Ab	solute	value)					
Implementation phase: methods,			inforn	า				consul	t				involv	e			со	llabor	ate	
techniques and tools	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Production booklets posters	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
[] specific interests of the interest parts	2	1	2	6	2	5	2	5	1	0	8	3	2	0	0	10	1	2	0	0
Publication of agendas []	1	1	1	3	5	1	0	5	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	3
Web site	1	0	0	8	3	2	2	4	3	1	3	2	3	3	1	3	3	2	З	1
Dedicated platform/Apps	0	1	2	5	5	3	2	4	2	1	5	4	1	1	1	6	3	1	1	1
Mailing list	0	2	0	6	3	1	1	2	4	3	2	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	2	0
Newletter	0	0	1	6	6	1	0	2	7	3	1	1	4	7	0	2	2	2	7	0
Social media	1	0	1	5	3	2	1	4	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	3	3	2	1	1
Events/seminars	0	0	3	7	1	1	1	6	3	0	2	6	2	1	0	3	6	1	1	0
Methods in presence []	0	1	1	7	5	0	3	1	5	5	0	2	2	5	5	3	1	2	4	4
Methods online []	1	2	2	5	3	0	3	2	4	4	0	1	2	6	4	2	1	2	3	5
Auditive methods group []	1	2	2	5	3	0	3	2	5	3	0	1	4	5	3	2	1	3	3	4
Auditive methods survey []	1	3	4	1	1	0	0	5	3	2	0	0	2	5	3	1	1	2	3	2
Auditive methods interw []	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
Research-Action	3	4	0	3	0	0	2	2	0	5	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	2	0
Group techniques []	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Implementation phases methods							Level	of stak	eholde	er invo	lveme	nt (Ab	solute	value)						
Implementation phase: methods,			inforn	า				consul	t				involv	е		collaborate					
techniques and tools	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Negotiation techniques []	5	2	1	0	4	4	2	4	0	0	2	3	3	2	0	4	3	3	0	0	
Techniques for conflict []	3	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	
Set up multi-stakeholder []	4	2	0	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	1	1	1	3	1	
Participatory budgeting	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	2	4	1	1	0	2	4	0	
Other	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	

Towards the end of the lists, the stakeholder lacked the knowledge about the listed methods in order to evaluate them.

The final table shows the interviewees' opinion about the importance of communication in involving stakeholders.

Stakeholders can be actively involved, if communication is	Absolute value	Percentage (%)*
a constant flow of information and exchanges	13	92.86
an established flow of information and exchanges	7	50
other (specify)	6	42,86
Total	Total (a+b+c)	100

Add any comments you deem useful on the strenght of the data collected in the previous tables.

