

COMMON PARTICIPATORY PROCESSES TO MAP ASSETS AND ASSESS CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS

Sustainable Heritage Areas: Partnerships for Ecotourism
Deliverable DT2.1.2

Ragnhildur Sigurðardóttir (Snæfellsnes Regional Park, Iceland), Rosalind Bryce,
Diana Valero and Martin Price (University of the Highlands and Islands, Scotland)

October 2017

Acronyms

SHA Sustainable Heritage Area

1. Introduction

One objective of the SHAPE project is to establish enduring stakeholder partnerships that maintain and develop cultural and natural heritage assets in SHAs through ecotourism initiatives that contribute to the sustainable growth of local communities, and transnationally share the experience gained.

One of the first steps to achieve this objective is to 1) identify the natural and cultural assets existing in the SHAs through participatory stakeholder processes and 2) assess the challenges that need to be addressed in order to capitalise on the identified assets. In some cases, this may mean the first attempt in a very long time to map assets in the area; in others, it may involve managing and overcoming a lack of motivation – or even conflict – among individuals and organisations.

The cultural and natural heritage of the SHAs is fundamental to local people's sense of identity and, at the same time, represents key assets for developing ecotourism. By bringing the diverse stakeholders together to identify these assets, agree on common goals and work together on ecotourism initiatives, SHAPE will create virtuous circles that support economically robust communities as well as maintaining their cultural/natural heritage. The collaborative input of diverse stakeholders will be crucial to establishing a full understanding of the natural and cultural assets in each SHA and to developing new products/services.

The purpose of this document is to provide common methods and guidelines for the development of participatory processes in SHAs to i) map natural and cultural heritage assets and infrastructure ii) identify gaps in provision and assets for ecotourism products or the creation of experiences in each SHA, and iii) consider potential climate change impacts and mitigation measures.

The guidelines proposed here are based on an academic literature review (SHAPE Deliverable DT2.1.1) and the discussions among the project team during the SHAPE partner meeting held in Snaefellness in October 2017. In each partner SHA, the first regional stakeholder workshop(s) will include participatory processes to map natural and cultural heritage assets and assess climate change impacts. The effectiveness of the processes will be evaluated after each workshop to inform the best practice guidelines included in the SHAPE e-service.

An aim of SHAPE is to employ a common approach to certain aspects of asset mapping and assessment of climate change impacts, while ensuring that partners have flexibility in applying them in the context of different SHAs. The common approaches presented here provide a clear starting point and set of guidelines for developing the asset mapping processes. Applying common methods will also allow us to learn how the participatory mapping processes work across a range of contexts, to inform the best practice implementation of these methods in other SHAs and other regions.

2. Common participatory processes for mapping natural and cultural heritage, and existing and desirable infrastructure, and assess potential climate change impact.

2.1. The participatory processes for mapping assets in SHAPE

As stated in SHAPE Deliverable DT2.1.1 “*participatory asset mapping is the collective gathering of information from community members to compile a map of local assets*” (Ferguson, 2017). The participatory mapping of natural and cultural heritage assets is a key stage within SHAPE as it fulfills two purposes. First, the process will collect fundamental information required for subsequent SHAPE activities by identifying assets that offer valuable potential for the development of sustainable ecotourism initiatives. Second, the mapping process constitutes one of the first activities of the regional stakeholder partnerships. Developing successful mapping processes is important to ensure continuing successful stakeholder engagement during SHAPE. As such, these participatory processes align with the common methods for regional stakeholder meetings developed as SHAPE Deliverable DT1.1.2.

Deliverable DT2.1.1 (Ferguson, 2017) details a list of participatory asset mapping methods – from traditional surveys and interviews to community-engaged mapping based on focus groups and geo-crowdsourcing techniques – that the partner in each SHA can implement according to their particular needs and resources. Each of these methods has different strengths and weaknesses (see Table 1) that must be taken into account when designing the participatory mapping processes to be implemented in the SHAs.

Methods	Strengths	Weaknesses
Community-Engaged Mapping/Focus Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusive of multiple groups • Conducted in a single session • Promotes active discussion • Can uncover diverse range of assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires large space • Difficult to coordinate • Can conceal heterogeneity of community • Some voices may be lost in the crowd
Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be distributed in large numbers • Quick and simple to do • Participants can contribute at convenient time • Can reach remote participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Typically low response rate • No discussion between participants to develop ideas • Valuable information can get missed if questions don't direct to it • Open to misinterpretation
Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High level of detail • New direction of enquiry can be instigated • Individual stories can be uncovered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time-consuming • No discussion between participants to develop ideas
Geo-Crowdsourcing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remotely accessed • Participants can contribute at a convenient time • Gathers multiple viewpoints • Requires few resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of representation of some groups • Typically low response rate • Accessibility may be an issue • Potential data quality issues

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time efficient • User-friendly platforms available • Anonymity and privacy • Existing data can be utilised • Potentially vast resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mistakes and intentional falsehoods by participants • No discussion between participants to develop ideas
--	--	--

Table 1: Strengths and weaknesses of different participatory methods (Ferguson, 2017, DT2.1.1) .

2.2. Tailored processes acknowledging the unique situation of each SHA

Every SHA is unique in terms of both its natural and cultural heritage and infrastructure development, and the spatial location of their assets. Furthermore, each SHA faces different stakeholder engagement challenges. For example, in some SHAs, work with stakeholders is at a relatively early stage (e.g. Kujalleq, Greenland) while in others, partnerships are more established (DT1.1.1, DT1.1.2). Therefore, acknowledging the position of each SHA in terms of needs and resources for the development of the participatory mapping processes must be an early step.

An asset mapping audit was designed for completion by the partner associated with each SHA. This was based on the findings of the asset mapping literature review (DT2.1.1) and provided an understanding of previous asset mapping work done in each area and perceived gaps in information (see appendix 1). The results of the audit were presented and discussed in the 2nd partner meeting in Iceland which helped partners to define required next steps in each SHA.

The audit revealed methods used in SHAs (e.g. focus groups, surveys and interviews, data mining). The process also highlighted the existence of shared gaps that constitute common challenges for mapping assets. Common challenges included the development of maps of intangible assets, e.g. mapping of narratives or storytelling; ways of reviewing and updating asset maps, improvement of links between assets and services, and incorporating the use of online mapping tools.

2.3. Guidelines for asset mapping

Discussion between partners at the 2nd partner meeting led to agreement on the following guidelines for participatory asset mapping:

- Use paper maps in a focus group setting: this may either be in single regional workshop or with several small stakeholder groups if it is not practical to gather all relevant stakeholder interested at the same time.
- The participatory mapping processes should include both place-based and thematic mapping and categorise different types of assets including: tangible assets, intangible assets (e.g. links between stories and the landscape), moveable assets (e.g. tour companies), and infrastructural assets.
- Regional stakeholders should also be recognised as important assets (e.g. existing and potential partnerships, social capital).
- The mapping process should produce outputs that become available for participating stakeholders and that can be used as a resource in the SHA. Where appropriate, maps or material produced during the sessions should be digitised afterwards. However, there needs

to be a process of agreement and consent for what information should be gathered and made widely available. For example, there may be sensitive assets (natural or cultural) that are susceptible to damage or disturbance that should not be specifically and spatially identified.

- The final mapping products should be available, if possible, as a printed version, an online version, and downloadable pdf documents. There should be a strategy in place for continuous data management and updating of the maps in each area. This should include a means by which stakeholders, e.g. local businesses, can update their own information (including hyperlinks to their websites).
- Partners should consider the potential for using the asset mapping process as an opportunity to raise awareness and build capacity in SHAs. For example, opportunities should be explored to build links with schools, colleges, and universities. University students might be engaged through internships and contribute to stakeholder training on asset mapping.

2.4. Guidelines for considering challenges (including climate change impacts) and solutions in each SHA

The draft asset maps developed with stakeholders can be used to facilitate further discussion about the existing and potential challenges to maintaining natural and cultural heritage and developing sustainable ecotourism. This should include some consideration of climate change impacts. As stated in SHAPE Deliverable DT.2.1.1, climate change requires SHAs to build on their adaptive capacity by taking action to protect assets, and identifying and improving areas that are most favourable, to take advantage of climate change opportunities (Ferguson, 2017). There should also be an opportunity for stakeholders to suggest potential solutions to challenges, or new or enhanced initiatives that will protect and enhance assets and contribute to sustainable ecotourism. Participatory processes with stakeholders will draw on the common methods for stakeholder engagement developed in SHAPE Deliverable DT.1.1.2 (SWOT analysis, ranking/priorisation exercises, etc). It is important that these discussions are facilitated in ways that convey the importance of sustainability underpinning of SHAPE ecotourism initiatives.

2.5. Common outputs of the participatory processes

The outputs derived from the asset mapping processes described above will vary between SHAs depending on their geographical context, stakeholder engagement strategy, and where they are starting from in terms of establishing ecotourism initiatives. However, each SHA will work towards meeting the following criteria for asset mapping outputs:

- Active engagement of stakeholders in asset mapping: This should include identifying existing and potential stakeholder partnerships (see DT.1.1.2, DT1.1.3)
- Provide evidence of different and collective views on SHA assets among stakeholders
- Produce a heritage and infrastructure map of each SHA (to form part of DT2.2.1)
- Provide a report on innovations, potentials and gaps (to form part of DT2.2.2)
- Provide a climate change evaluation (to form part of DT2.2.3)

In addition, each partner should provide documentation about asset mapping. This should include information about workshops, focus groups and other events such as agendas and promotional

material (e.g. leaflets, posters etc. and social media (e.g. blog posts, facebook posts, tweets, etc.); information about the participants (e.g. list of stakeholders, sign-in sheets); materials used (e.g. maps, flipcharts, posters, questionnaires, etc.); and evidence of the discussions during the workshop. If audio, video, or photography are to be used, this should be explained to participants in advance and informed consent obtained using appropriate institutional ethics procedures.

These outputs may vary in form depending on the participatory mapping methods and stakeholder engagement methods chosen by the partners in each SHA according to local needs and characteristics. However, all of them shall meet common minimum criteria concerning materials, content, and stakeholder engagement.

The workshops are meant to create material that allows the analysis and further development of the work done during the sessions. These materials include: information about the workshop such as the agenda and any promotional material for the workshop including both traditional media (e.g. leaflets, event posters) and social media.

3. Summary of guidelines for developing the mapping participatory processes

- Complete audit of mapping in the SHA in terms of existing data/material, resources, and select the methods that are best aligned with the results.
- Using mapping focus groups with paper maps with existing data is a good starting point.
- Consider both place-based mapping and thematic mapping.
- Categorise different types of natural and cultural heritage, including tangible, intangible and movable assets.
- Make the outputs available for the participants (depending on sensitivity of information) and establish a mechanism for updating information involving stakeholders if possible.
- Contribute to mapping capacity-building in the SHA.
- Discuss with the stakeholders during the mapping workshops the challenges to sustainable ecotourism in the area in general and in relation to the assets identified.
- Provide an opportunity for stakeholders to contribute ideas related to solutions and sustainable ecotourism initiatives.
- Ensure that information is collected in a standardised format and obtain participant consent.
- Fully engage the stakeholders in the process and build on existing potential stakeholder partnerships.

Acknowledgments

This deliverable has been based on the discussions among partners in the SHAPE project during the workshop held in Snaefellness on asset mapping on the 11th of October 2017. This project has received funding from the European Union's Northern Periphery and Arctic Programme.

References

Ferguson, L., 2017. Mapping and managing natural and cultural assets. SHAPE Report. Deliverable 2.1.1, Sustainable Heritage Areas: Partnerships for Ecotourism (SHAPE). pp. 106

Bryce, R. and Valero, D., 2017. Common methods for regional stakeholder meetings. Deliverable 1.1.2, Sustainable Heritage Areas: Partnerships for Ecotourism (SHAPE). pp. 6

Bryce, R., 2017. Common methods to identify stakeholder groups and interactions. Deliverable 1.1.1, Sustainable Heritage Areas: Partnerships for Ecotourism (SHAPE). pp. 11

Appendix 1: Mapping Audit Template

Action	Yes	No	Partly
Asset mapping of some form has been undertaken			
Tangible assets have been mapped			
Intangible assets have been mapped			
Participatory asset mapping has been undertaken			
If yes, do you consider the participatory mapping to have been successful?			
<u>We have engaged in the following participatory styles:</u>			
(i) Focus groups			
(ii) Surveys and/or interviews			
(iii) Geo-crowdsourcing (web-based data gathering)			
(iv) Data-mining – using existing online data			
<u>The following stakeholders were involved in participatory mapping:</u>			
(i) National government			
(ii) Local government			
(iii) Tourism businesses			
(iv) Tourism organisations			
(v) Conservation organisations			
(vi) Local communities			
(vii) Visitors/tourists			
(viii) Other (please state below)			
We have established approaches to mapping that are varied and capture a range of assets			
<u>We have mapped using the following approaches:</u>			
(i) Whole assets approach (everything of value)			
(ii) Heritage or community values (e.g. history, sense of place)			
(iii) Storytelling mapping			

Action	Yes	No	Partly
(iv) Asset clustering (mapping the spatial distribution of assets, e.g. composition/density)			
(v) Mapping by theme			
(vi) Mapping by season			
(vii) Transport and services mapping			
(viii) Route mapping for traveling by vehicle			
(ix) Walking, cycle or horse riding route mapping			
(x) Other (please state below)			
<u>We have used the following mapping tools:</u>			
(i) Paper map			
(ii) Online mapping applications			
(iii) Non-spatial mapping (e.g. spider diagrams)			
(iv) Database			
(v) Geographic Information Systems (GIS)			
(vi) Other (please state below)			
We are familiar with the concept of integrated management of natural and cultural assets for ecotourism			
We practice integrated management of assets			
Over-visitation is an issue and/or visitor management is required			
We need to improve links between assets and services			
Traffic management is required			
Our assets map is periodically reviewed and updated			
We have identified potential risks and opportunities resulting from climate change			
We understand where to find information about potential climate change impacts			
We have a confirmed management approach to climate change			

Are there any gaps you have identified in the mapping and management of assets in your area that you would like to discuss in the workshop?	
---	--