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1. Introduction

In August, 2005 Hurricane Katrina wreaked havoc along the Gulf Coast and New Orleans. In January, 2005, a tsunami destroyed many coastal villages in Indonesia, particularly in Banda Aceh, and in March, 2011 another tsunami became one of the worst natural disasters in Japan’s history. Parts of Africa and the South Western United States are experiencing droughts that have caused lakes to disappear and irreparably damaged agriculture. AIDS and other infectious diseases continue to spread throughout the world. In an effort to stabilize and reconstruct post-conflict countries and fragile states, the United Nations and the European Union are currently involved in 29 peace operations in communities throughout the world.1

The communities impacted by disasters, both manmade and natural, or by the growing range of threats to peace, security, and development, require assistance from domestic and international organizations. Donor agencies and academic observers have addressed the importance of partnering with stakeholders in local communities in order to provide aid most effectively for the best possible outcome. However, to date there has not been any systematic analysis of stakeholder engagement and approaches taken by donor agencies to promote stakeholder engagement have been inconsistent at best. The purpose of this paper is to review existing literature on stakeholder engagement and develop a conceptual model for how to effectively engage local communities in the delivery of technical assistance through governmental and nongovernmental channels and how to sustain that engagement.

1.1 Why Engage?

Many of the issues facing development today cannot be tackled by one agency or organization alone. They are complex and require multiple actors such as donors who finance projects, recipient governments who have authority over the area where the projects are taking place, and national and local actors who best understand the local interests and can assist in empowering local communities to be informed and participate, or who, absent effective integration, may spoil the project and its success. Consequently, any successful development project must seek to engage national and local stakeholders. Engagement in this context means the ability to identify key local stakeholders, recruit them, involve them in project-related activities, and sustain their participation for the project duration and often beyond.

Engagement with stakeholders supports project objectives. Congruency among recipient government, local community and donor agency priorities means building partnerships that target sustainable development and effective response to risks, threats, and challenges more generally. Further, community members will be more likely to support development initiatives if their government creates an enabling environment where local voices are heard and civil society is actively engaged (Blackburn, Chambers & Gaventa 2002; Disch 1999; International Finance Corporation (IFC) 2007). Failure to coordinate and involve stakeholders may put at risk the entire project.

---

1.2 About this Research

The purpose of this research is to provide a comprehensive overview over the methods used by donor agencies as well as those recommended by academic experts to engage stakeholders in development projects. Documents produced by the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the United Nations, USAID, and the German Technical Corporation (GTZ), supplemented by scholarly as well as private sector analyses of specific case studies provided the most comprehensive framework and practical guidelines for this research. As a result of this approach, we develop a conceptual model for systematically identifying and recruiting local stakeholders and for effectively engaging them in the sustained delivery of technical assistance and development aid (IRES model).

This paper begins with definitions of key concepts, followed by an analysis of approaches taken to Identify, Recruit, Engage, and Sustain key stakeholders (IRES model). The first section explores how to effectively identify key stakeholders and their positions during the various project stages using a range of methods including impact assessment, zoning, and interest and perception analyses. The next section illustrates specific methods used to recruit stakeholders. The third section examines levels of engagement based on stakeholder representation and levels of intensity. The final section offers some preliminary recommendations with specific focus on ownership, government support, local capacity building and skills development through transparent communication, formal and informal training and pro-active conflict prevention and resolution approaches.

2. Defining Key Concepts

2.1 Stakeholders

Both academic and policy communities define stakeholders as individuals, groups and organizations that have an interest or stake in the particular issue at hand. This includes “providers, partners, customers (beneficiaries), and any other interested parties” (USAID 2011, p. 1). The UN (2001) defines stakeholders as “any group or organisation which may affect or be affected by the issue under consideration” (p. 26). These may be found both within and outside of the government and may include organizations, institutions, groups of people or individuals, and “can be at any level or position in society, from the international to the national, regional, household or intra-household level. Stakeholders include all those who affect and are affected by policies, decisions or actions within a particular system” (Hawkins n.d., p.1).

Donor agencies stress that collaboration with stakeholders is necessary for the success of a project. The UN (2001) specifies three ways in which the best possible outcomes rely on the involvement of stakeholders:

1. Raised awareness among the community of the project and its purpose,
2. Increased support for projects within communities, and
3. Capacity building within organizations and communities.
Since 1986, the German Technical Corporation (GTZ)\(^2\), in conjunction with the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation (BMZ) has based its project implementation on elements of a Zielorientierte Programmplanung (ZOPP, or Goal Oriented Project Planning). ZOPP is supposed to ensure “a consistent train of thought and procedure and uniform understanding of the terms used,” and as such facilitates “communication and cooperation between all parties involved” (GTZ 1988, p. 1). The GTZ (1988, p. 1) specifies:

ZOPP is based on a few very simple underlying principles:\(^3\)

1. Cooperation between the project staff and the partner organizations is smoother and more productive if all involved have jointly agreed their objectives and expressed them clearly.

2. In development cooperation we try to solve or alleviate problems by tackling them at their roots—their cause. We therefore analyze the problems and their causes and effects. We then deduce feasible and expedient objectives from them.

3. Problems and their causes do not exist in isolation, but are intimately linked with people, groups or organizations. Therefore we can only talk about problems if we have a comprehensive picture of and insight into the interest groups, individuals and institutions involved.

Cooperation among stakeholders is necessary for reducing redundancy in the project, efficient use of time and skills, and fostering a positive work environment. Hawkins (n.d.) describes donor and agency collaboration with stakeholders as “linkages,” meaning that “the interactions between organisations… allow the exchange or transfer of information, resources or power” (p. 4). These linkages may be created via structural mechanisms such as liaisons and committees’ operational mechanisms in the form of training events, partnerships, publications, and other “joint activities” (p. 4). He recommends management of these linkages through assessing and improving stakeholder knowledge of other stakeholders involved, the accessibility and quality of communication between stakeholders, and the relevance of services performed by stakeholders.

Specific stakeholders oftentimes singled out in the literature include:

### 2.1.1 Development Actors

A development actor is “an individual or an organisation/institution that plays an active role in the process of socio-economic change at the local, regional, national or international level” (Fino 2009, p. 1). Development actors include donor countries, civil society organizations (CSO) and the private sector and are characterized by their interest in the welfare of the community within which they live,

---

\(^2\) On January 1, 2011, the GTZ, the Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst (DED), and Inwent—Capacity Building International were merged into the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). See [http://www.gtz.de/en/index2.htm](http://www.gtz.de/en/index2.htm), accessed 01/15/12.

\(^3\) ZOPP is considered a planning matrix or logical project framework that “summarizes and structures the main elements of a project and highlights logical linkages between intended inputs, planned activities and expected results. The ZOPP approach is used for essentially all German funded projects and is a prerequisite for funding approval.” See [http://web.mit.edu/urbanupgrading/upgrading/issues-tools/tools/ZOPP.html](http://web.mit.edu/urbanupgrading/upgrading/issues-tools/tools/ZOPP.html), accessed 01/15/12.
placing the interest of the public before their own interests and operating with the objective of bringing a change to society at large (Fino 2009; OECD 2008).

### 2.1.2 Partners and Partnership

A partnership is “a process through which primary stakeholders influence and share control of their development initiatives, decisions, and resources” (Blackwell et al. 2002, p. 1). Partnership is more than a simple relationship between stakeholders, donor agencies, and recipient countries; it is an institutionalized or mainstreamed process that incorporates primary stakeholders in both project inception and policy making. For Unwin (2005) effective partnerships are characterized by seven elements:

1. **Trust**: Linkages and personal relationships between people involved in projects.
2. **Clear focus**: Clearly defined objectives and outputs that balance donor and local needs with desired project outcomes.
3. **Enthusiastic leadership**: Competent, experienced and charismatic leaders maintain the focus of those involved on delivering the partnership’s objectives.
4. **Sustainability**: Long term viability of the project through focusing on beneficiaries in the planning and implementation stages, addressing the demands of the local communities, and effectively build local capacity.
5. **Balance between supply and demand**: Implementing initiatives that benefit the community by considering local needs during the project design and service delivery phases.
6. **Communication**: Regular information sharing through consistent communication and continuous updates on activities.
7. **Transparency and sound ethical practices**: Fostering openness and good faith in terms of outcomes, ethical standards and behavior and shared accountability (HLF-4 2011).

### 2.1.3 Interest Group

Most generally, an interest group consists of individuals who share a common interest Hawkins, n.d.). For Theuri et al. (2008) “individuals and/or groups associated with interests in given issues, brought together by virtue of being widely associated with the subject,” are known as “enthusiasts” (p. 2). One key challenge for donor agencies is to involve as many diverse stakeholders as possible to reflect the interests of a representative range of interest groups within the targeted range of the project. Of importance is a transparent selection process of stakeholders and equal representation of interest groups whose interests are central to the project. In order for an interest group to participate as a stakeholder, the group must be “representative of and accountable to the community interests they claim to support and represent” (IFC 2007, p. 24).

### 2.2 Transparency and Accountability

Transparency and accountability are essential to promote and sustain stakeholder participation. Transparency refers to the idea that agencies are forthcoming with information which is shared in advance of decision making, thereby fostering informed decisions (IFC 2007). For instance, the GTZ conducts
interactive community planning workshops, where participants are sequestered in “distant locales to enforce unhindered focus on the activities…. Participants are selected to represent all interest groups, project technical staff as well as high-level authorities, and community leaders.”

Accountability can be defined as “the processes through which an organisation makes a commitment to respond to and balance the needs of stakeholders in its decision-making processes and activities, and delivers against this commitment” (Blagescu, de Las Casas & Lloyd 2005, p. 20). Donors can demonstrate accountability through:

- Transparency, providing information on what they are doing where and how and how they are performing.
- Participation, engaging stakeholders through participatory approaches to decision-making at the operational, the policy and/or the strategic levels. An organization committed to accountability seeks stakeholder input into broader organizational policies and strategies and does not confine engagement merely to operational issues.
- Evaluation, demonstrating to stakeholders their achievements and being accountable to stakeholders for delivering on their promises.
- Complaint and response mechanisms, including appealing decisions, actions or policies and adjudicating grievances (Blagescu et al. 2005, pp. 22-23).

These mechanisms for transparency and accountability need to be built into every stage of stakeholder engagement (GTZ 1988; 2005; IFC 2007; Unwin 2005).

According to the World Bank, partnership accountability can be achieved, if:

The partners jointly clarify and set: (i) goals and responsibilities; (ii) performance expectations that are balanced by commensurate resources of each party; (iii) credible reporting mechanisms to demonstrate performance achieved and what has been learned; and (iv) reasonable review and adjustment systems to ensure that feedback on the performance achieved and difficulties encountered can be recognized and corrected as necessary (World Bank 1999, p. 28).

Accountability is crucial for both the donor agencies and the stakeholders as “it increases credibility and legitimacy, it strengthens governance structures, and leads to learning and innovation” for the agency and ensures that the needs of the stakeholders “are addressed in organisational policies and practices” (Blagescu et al. 2005, p. 8). Through transparency and clearly defined accountability standards, stakeholders can help ensure that aid is being used efficiently and for the intended purposes (OECD 2005, p. 6). Stakeholders involved in government oversight committees, NGOs, and CSOs can contribute information for how to prioritize aid allocation for a wide range of projects. Transparency and accountability help to generate the necessary trust between all parties involved, which will support a positive working environment and cooperation.

---

4 Ibid.
3. Social Capital in Development

Social capital describes the norms, values, networks and understandings that enable collective action or cooperation. Social capital constitutes the personal and institutional relationships and customs within a community that determine the quality and quantity of social interactions and has been shown to influence collective trust, cooperation and social cohesion (Fukuyama 2002; OECD 2001; Woolcock 1998; World Bank 2011). In other words, social capital is the “subjective dispositions and attitudes of individuals and groups, as well as sanctions and rules governing behaviour, which are widely shared” (OECD 2001, p. 41). Networks resulting from and generating social capital can both be informal—“social support networks, family relationships and informal sociability”—or formal—civil society activities or “membership of residents’ associations, sporting, cultural, religious or special interest groups” (Healy 2002, p. 2). Any institution or social organization, both public and private, to be effective must be built on trust among the members and within the larger community (Coleman 1998; Fukuyama 2002; OECD 2001; Putnam 2000).

In terms of development cooperation between donors, recipient governments, and stakeholders, the building of social capital is promoted when stakeholders and community members are allowed to pursue their collective needs and interests through active engagement in the project (Fukuyama 2002). This will improve project “effectiveness and sustainability by building the community’s capacity to work together to address their common needs” (World Bank 2011, n.p.). The World Bank (2011) identifies five key dimensions of social capital in development:

1. Groups and networks—collections of individuals that promote and protect personal relationships, thereby improving welfare;
2. Trust and Solidarity—elements of interpersonal behavior that foster greater cohesion and more robust collective action;
3. Collective Action and Cooperation—ability of people to work together toward resolving communal issues;
4. Social Cohesion and Inclusion—mitigating the risk of conflict and promoting equitable access to benefits of development by enhancing participation of marginalized groups and communities;
5. Information and Communication—promoting transparency and trust by improving access to information.

Consistent with this understanding of social capital, capacity “lives between actors and in the ways that they deal with each other to solve problems or to realize their ambitions. In doing so, they build up relational competencies and generate trust” (Woodhill 2010, p. 28). Developing optimal capacity in a multi stakeholder process means:

- Dealing with a defined ‘problem situation’ or development opportunity (the boundary and focus may expand or contract during the process).
- Involving stakeholders affected by this ‘problem situation’ or development opportunity
- Working, as necessary, across different sectors and scales.
- Following an agreed yet dynamic process and timeframe.
- Involving stakeholders in setting ‘rules’ for constructive engagement.
- Recognizing and addressing the power differences and conflicts between different groups and interests.
- Engaging stakeholders in learning and questioning their beliefs, assumptions and previous positions.
- Balancing bottom-up and top-down approaches.

Alternatively, Woodhill (2010) suggests looser and less formal arrangements may create a deeper level of collaboration over time. The theory of social capital explains how this happens through shared values and norms on a cultural level, e.g., societies in which cooperation is a cultural norm tend to build stronger institutions (Fukuyama 2002). Fukuyama (2002) emphasizes how culture provides the building blocks for social capital, asserting that culture “plays a very important functional role in any society, being the means by which groups of individuals communicate and cooperate in a wide variety of activities” (p. 27). Moreover, some culturally established norms and values foster economic growth through the creation of networks and institutions. Fukuyama (2002) sees that social capital is a necessary condition for effective institution building resulting ideally in greater “efficiency, transparency, and professionalism” (p. 25).

Social capital on a micro level exists within the relationships between people at the local level and the social structure of their relationships (Coleman 1988). Thus, as donor agencies work with communities over time, trust is built through regular interactions, transparent decision-processes, and a shared interest in and accountability for the success and sustainability of the project.

### 3.1 Buy In

Engaging stakeholders is an ongoing process promoting the development of social capital. Therefore, engagement that is centered on network building, creating trust, and fostering shared values will foster stakeholder buy in. As a result, engagement with the community from the inception of the project on should be bottom up, driven by the community to stimulate social capital development, maximize local ownership and induce stakeholder participation.

### 3.2 The Local Context

Any successful promotion of social capital development and community buy-in will depend on how familiar the implementing agency is with local context. Familiarity with the local context can be enhanced by fostering donor contact with local technical experts, local academics and by conducting open, participatory meetings with the community at large. Meetings with members of the community through town hall gatherings and focus groups offer an important avenue for implementing agencies to
identify local stakeholders. Moreover, focused consultations with area experts and academics will provide useful information concerning the local context (African Development Bank (ADB) 2001). Frequent consultations and meetings are important not only for information gathering purposes, but also for identifying key stakeholders and their interest.

4. Stakeholder Engagement: The IRES Model

Our systematic review of the literature suggests that the effective and sustained engagement of stakeholders requires their active involvement in the implementation process at every stage in such a way that decisions are derived through a bottom up approach that emphasizes transparency and accountability. The IRES model developed here presents an attempt to synthesize information and best practices obtained through a systematic review of academic and policy literature. The following sections examine more closely the processes involved in identifying, recruiting, and engaging stakeholders and sustaining their support for the duration of the project and beyond.

4.1 Identifying Potential Stakeholders

Potential stakeholders in development projects include governmental organizations, civil society organizations (CSOs), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), businesses, communities, academia, and religious organizations, all of whom have different levels of influence on and importance to the design, implementation and effective delivery of the project. Stakeholder influence is perhaps the key determinant for selecting key stakeholders and for situating them in the project. The GTZ (2005) states that distinctions among and accommodations for the stakeholders can be made based on the following factors:

- Knowledge and education (language, technical and procedural understanding) with more knowledgeable stakeholders exercising the most influence. Less knowledgeable stakeholders might be disadvantaged by this and may require additional training.

- Financial and logistical resources. Less well-resourced stakeholders will be at a disadvantage and donors ought to make accommodations to ensure broad-based participation.

- Conceptual distance (center vs. periphery) from the issue or project. Stakeholders with strong and focused interests will likely seek more influence than those with more dispersed interests.

- Information flow. Stakeholders with better access to and control of information will carry more influence. Informational meetings, workshops and the continual and transparent exchange of information can solicit and help sustain the support of peripheral stakeholders.

Accounting for these factors, the GTZ (1988, p. 3) advocates a systematic participation analysis based on the following procedures:

1. Write down unsystematically the names of all interest groups, institutions, projects etc. which are located in the region, hold an influential position or may be affected by the problems. Indicate all external influences and interests of all parties involved.

2. Scan the groups and persons listed as to whether they consist of homogeneous units or whether sub-groups, sections or sub-units with specific problems or interests can be identified and listed separately.
3. The planning team decides on the criteria for analysis of all groups, institutions etc.

4. When classifying into interest groups, participants etc. always proceed in steps, in the following order: (a) collect; (b) classify; (c) describe; (d) analyze; and (e) evaluate.

Finally, the GTZ suggests dividing the interest groups and institutions into participants and non-participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Interest Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expedient, participant groups can also be divided according to the following diagram (GTZ 1988, p. 3):

**Figure 1. Classification of Participant Groups**

![Classification of Participant Groups Diagram]

Similarly, the UN (2001) lists three strategies for a stakeholder impact-target analysis (see also Table 1):^5

1. Listing out anyone who will be directly impacted by the project.
2. Listing those who might be indirectly affected.
3. Identifying those who potentially have an interest or feel affected.

---

Table 1. Stakeholder Impact-Target Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Priority of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IFC (2007, pp. 16-17) recommends developing a ranking system based on the following questions:

- What type of stakeholder engagement is mandated by law or other formalized requirements?
- Who will be adversely affected by potential environmental and social impacts in the project’s area of influence?
- Who are the most vulnerable among the potentially impacted, and are special engagement efforts necessary?
- At which stage of project development will stakeholders be most affected (e.g., procurement, construction, operations, decommissioning)?
- What are the various interests of project stakeholders and what influence might this have on the project?
- Which stakeholders might help to enhance the project design or reduce project costs?
- Which stakeholders can best assist with the early scoping of issues and impacts?
- Who strongly supports or opposes the changes that the project will bring and why?
- Whose opposition could be detrimental to the success of the project?
- Who is it critical to engage with first, and why?
- What is the optimal sequence of engagement?

Strategies based on this kind of ranking can also identify disadvantaged and vulnerable populations whose interests may be underrepresented otherwise, including indigenous peoples with distinct identities based on “gender, age, ethnicity, culture, literacy, sickness, physical or mental disability, poverty or economic disadvantage, and dependence on unique natural resources” (IFC 2012, p. 4).

Advocating for vulnerable groups, the IFC (2012) suggests considering feasible alternative project designs in order “to avoid or minimize physical and/or economic displacement, while balancing environmental, social, and financial costs and benefits, paying particular attention to impacts on the poor
and vulnerable” (p. 3). Furthermore, the “risks that a project could exacerbate an already sensitive local situation and stress scarce local resources should not be overlooked as it may lead to further conflict” (IFC 2012, p. 1). The importance of identifying vulnerable groups and considering local and underrepresented interests cannot be overstated for sustained development success. How can this be accomplished?

4.1.1 Interest Analysis and Perception Assessments

An interest analysis aims at classifying stakeholders in terms of their real and perceived interests in relation to the project goals and objectives. Specifically, an effective interest analysis outlines:

1. Stakeholder wants and positions
2. Stakeholder needs and interests
3. The nature and extent of stakeholder project involvement

In essence, this type of analysis focuses largely on stakeholder and community perceptions, a crucial, yet often overlooked, component of successful project implementation. Perception Assessment is particularly important in order to determine the extent to which stakeholder interests relate to the purpose of the project and how they envision their own engagement in and contribution to the project.

For instance, in A Cultural Theory of Risk, Douglas and Wildavsky (1982) assert that structures of social organization endow individuals with perceptions that correspond to a specific social structure and a particular outlook on risk. These social structures constrain and circumscribe individuals in their social role and their interests and perceptions based on very subjective feelings of belonging or solidarity. The greater those community/group bonds, the less individual choices may be subject to personal control or objective decision-criteria.

As a result, projects may impact stakeholders in ways that are both real and perceived, including threats to the community through associated risks. Though the sources of risk may be natural (flooding), the result of human activity (displacement of people), or associated with other risks (impact on local environment due to community relocation) (Holzmann, Sherburne-Benz & Tesliuc 2003), project planning should incorporate how the community perceives the benefits and risks associated with the project. Since vulnerable populations—including orphans, the elderly (the “life-time poor”) and the disabled (Holzmann et al. 2003, p. 17)—are especially susceptible to risks, planning must anticipate all possible scenarios to account for how projects will impact those populations.

Although social impact assessments will help agencies determine who will be affected how (IFC 2007), these analyses regularly fall short in identifying community perceptions of benefits and risks. One way to address these shortcomings is to conduct a community/stakeholder perception analysis based on the “Self-Anchoring Striving Scale” (SASS) developed by Hedley Cantril (1965, see also Braungart & Braungart 1992 for a later application). The SASS explores the unique reality worlds of individuals as expressed in their own terms. With this technique respondents are asked to define on the basis of their own assumptions, perceptions, goals, and values the two extremes or anchoring points of a continuum measuring subjective standards for satisfaction or frustration. First, respondents are asked to write two
short paragraphs describing their “best wishes and hopes for their personal (or community) future” (top anchoring point) and their “worst fears and worries about their personal (or community) future” (Bottom anchoring point). Next, respondents are asked to rank themselves on a 10-step non-verbal ladder device in terms of where they “stand today,” “stood five years ago,” and where they think they “will stand in five years from now” (see Appendix A for a copy of the instrument). In cases when a full-fledged community perception analysis is too resource or time consuming, it might be possible to administer the SASS to key stakeholders during the problem analysis part of the project preparation phase (see GTZ 1988).

An instrument like the Cantril scale, designed to systematically assess fears, concerns, hopes and expected benefits related to a given project shows concern for local needs, promotes transparency, boosts recruitment efforts, helps sustain stakeholder and community engagement and may encourage the development of specific strategies to address community concerns and alleviate fears. The results of a systematic perception analysis may help donor agencies identify sensitive and vulnerable populations and target development aid to those most in need, most influential and, ultimately, to win over those possibly most opposed to the project.

4.1.2 Impact Assessment and Zoning

One way to determine the most relevant stakeholders to a project is to complete a social impact assessment or zoning map. A social impact assessment includes the “processes of analysing, monitoring and managing the intended and unintended social consequences, both positive and negative, of planned interventions (policies, programs, plans, projects) and any social change processes invoked by those interventions” (Vanclay 2003, p. 6). The social impact assessment can identify individuals and organizations impacted by the project (see Appendix B for example questions).

Similar to the impact assessment, a zoning map contains the following steps (IFC 2007):

1. Sketch the key design components of the project, both on and off site, with potential local environmental of social impacts (e.g., the project site; ancillary infrastructure such as roads, power lines, and canals; sources of air, water, and land pollution).

2. Identify the broad impact zones for each component (e.g., the area of land take, air and water pollution receptors, etc.)

3. Identify and map broad stakeholder groups and superimpose them on the impact zones.

4. Through consultation with relevant stakeholder representatives, verify which groups are potentially affected by which impacts and to what extent (p. 15).

Impact assessments and zoning maps can help determine the key stakeholders in a project and develop strategies for recruiting them based on the correlation between stakeholder interest and project impact outlined above. However, impact zoning requires a well-developed project plan and anticipated outcomes in order to overlay stakeholder interests with project areas or issues. For instance, the analysis phase of the GTZ’s (1988) ZOPP approach includes four steps:  

6 See also http://web.mit.edu/urbanupgrading/upgrading/issues-tools/tools/ZOPP.html, accessed 01/15/12.
1. Participation analysis: an overview of persons, groups, organizations connected to a project and their interests, motives, attitudes and implications for project planning.

2. Problems analysis: major problems grouped into a problem-tree with cause and effect and identification of the core problem.

3. Objectives analysis: a restatement of the problems into realistically achievable goals, oftentimes accomplished by rewriting the problems into outcome statements.

4. Alternatives analysis: identification of objectives and assessment of alternatives according to resources, probability of achieving objectives, political feasibility, cost-benefit ratio, social risks, time horizon, sustainability, and others factors.

By assessing the real and perceived impacts of the project within the community, donor agencies begin to identify when and where to incorporate stakeholders. The first step in this process is to identify the types of stakeholders.

### 4.1.3 Types of Stakeholders

USAID’s Stakeholder Analysis (2001) presents a comprehensive plan for identifying and categorizing stakeholders in terms of supporters, opponents, or neutral parties; an evaluation of the resources they command to support or oppose the policy, and of their willingness to commit those resources; and a prioritization of the stakeholders in terms of which groups are the most important ones … to seek to influence (p. 11).

Alternatively, the World Bank’s Communication for Governance and Accountability Program (CommGap) (2009 p. 1) distinguishes among four types of stakeholders:

1. **Core Stakeholders**: people or organizations who are “essential to the organization or process.” Failure to engage these stakeholders will be to the detriment of the project.

2. **Customers**: people or organizations “who receive the product or service (community members, interest groups).”

3. **Controllers**: people or organizations “who define, regulate, and influence the organization or process (legislators, regulators, providers of capital, government services, media, trustees).”

4. **Partners**: people or organizations “through whom part or all of the service is provided (suppliers, temporary staff, distributors, agents, consultants).”

Similarly, Hawkins (n.d., p. 2) distinguishes between:

1. **Key stakeholders** are those actors who are considered to have significant influence on the success of a project.

2. **Primary stakeholders** are the intended beneficiaries of the project.

3. **Secondary stakeholders** are those who perform as intermediaries within a project.
4. Active stakeholders are those who affect or determine a decision or action in the system or project.

5. Passive stakeholders are those who are affected by decisions or actions of others.

Classifying stakeholders early in the project will enable the donor agency to engage them at the appropriate time and stage of the project. Additionally, stakeholders can solicit the participation of other stakeholders that may not be engaged otherwise, thereby creating an interconnected, dynamic environment in which various stakeholders can build lasting relationships at every project stage.

4.1.4 Project Stages

Development projects typically commence through multiple stages in which different stakeholders may be engaged and involved (Aycrigg 1998; UN 2001; USAID 2001; DFID 2007). These include:

1. Planning the project and setting priorities and objectives.
2. Designing the project, including conducting impact analyses and perception assessments.
3. Implementation of the project, including targeting funding allocations, e.g., to the most vulnerable groups or the most important local interests.
4. Monitoring and evaluation.

Table 2 identifies stakeholders by their levels of engagement and influence. Active stakeholders have a significant level of influence in the community and at the project level, make decisions that directly impact others, and are essential for recruiting other stakeholders. By contrast, passive stakeholders are impacted by the decisions made by others. Primary stakeholders are active decision makers who have significant influence in and on the community and the project, and can participate at most or all project stages. Secondary stakeholders are largely passive, carrying out decisions made by others, having only limited influence and involved primarily during the implementation phase.

As Table 2 illustrates, sustaining stakeholder participation through the duration of the project requires the careful consideration of project stage and stakeholder interests and influence. The Stakeholder Participation Matrix shows that the planning and design stages involve fewer stakeholders (usually only the gatekeeper, key or primary stakeholders) for the shortest duration. The implementation stage involves the key and gatekeeper stakeholders as well as the primary stakeholders and has a longer duration. The monitoring and evaluation stage ought to include all individuals and groups who participated in the prior stages and also includes the tertiary and consumer stakeholders in an effort to gauge the long-term effects of the project. Generally, ensuring that stakeholders feel valued and respected and that their feedback is taken into consideration early in the process encourages their active contribution for the duration of present and for future projects (IFC 2007; Stiglitz 1998).
Table 2. Stakeholder Participation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Active</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Consumers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of influence</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Gatekeepers, essential For access and identification and recruitment of stakeholders</td>
<td>Controllers, who define, regulate, and influence the organization or process</td>
<td>Tertiary or intermediaries, who provide part or all of the service</td>
<td>Intended beneficiaries who receive products and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of involvement</td>
<td>Planning, project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Implementation, monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though stakeholder engagement should not be fixed or rigid, identifying where and how to incorporate stakeholders is imperative particularly in multi-stakeholder projects as it is not feasible or practical to incorporate all stakeholders intensively at every stage of the project. While not all stakeholders wield the same power and influence, analysts agree that it is crucial to identify early on the key or primary stakeholders who wield the most influence and are most important to the effective and efficient project completion (CommGap 2009; Hawkins n.d.).

Overall, the relationship between interest and influence can be illustrated in a matrix shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Stakeholder Interest and Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weak Influence</th>
<th>Strong Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong Interest</td>
<td>A1 Advocates helpful if they become project supporters; opponents ought to be recognized</td>
<td>B1 Advocates and opponents must be accommodated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Interest</td>
<td>C1 Advocates/opponents have little or no effect on the project.</td>
<td>D1 Advocates ought to be accommodated as they may become supportive or spoilers depending on their connections and interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Placing stakeholders in this matrix enables donor agencies to assess which stakeholders to engage, when and how. Key and primary stakeholders in Cell B must be engaged early on and their involvement ought to be sustained for the project duration and likely beyond. Failure to effectively
engage strong interest/strong influence stakeholders may turn them into opponents and possibly dangerous spoilers of the project, seeking actively to obstruct or undermine project implementation through a variety of means, including, at the extreme end, violence (Newman and Richmond 2006). Secondary stakeholders will either fall in Cells A or D. Support from these stakeholders is helpful, but one ought to bear in mind that especially stakeholders in Cell D may deter or spoil the project if they are not successfully engaged. Stakeholders whose interests- and influence are considered weak (Cell C) do not need to be actively engaged in the project as they will have little impact. Instead, greater emphasis is placed on soliciting the support of weak interest/strong influence stakeholders (D), as neglecting them may lead to opponents with a strong interest vying for their support, again fueling the propensity to spoil the project.

Especially opponents who can levy strong influence (Cells B and D) may stall or spoil the project. USAID (2008) found that opposition is particularly likely to occur when members of organizations see their jobs or positions threatened. Consequently, clear and transparent communication, education, and training need to assure potential opponents that the project poses no threat to their positions.

Since local stakeholders of all types may already have established relationships with one another, it is important for any donor or implementing agency to establish and maintain trust between the partners and within the community (IFC 2007; Unwin 2005; see also Fukuyama 2002). Trust at all levels can be fostered by:

1. Engaging stakeholders early in the process
2. Ensuring transparency of the project
3. Identifying conflicts of interest
4. Developing effective methods for addressing conflicts of interest
5. Implementing policies based on mutual understanding and respect
6. Assessing the impact of policies through stakeholder and community feedback

By following these steps, agencies may identify and engage also those stakeholders who might oppose the project. If unaddressed, opponents can become spoilers to a project, both internal—i.e., those who agree to participate but fail to fulfill their obligations—and external—i.e., those who are not part of the process and may use any means necessary to spoil the project (Stedman 1997).

In case not all potential spoilers become project supporters, donor agencies should attempt to minimize their potentially disruptive impact by inducing them to join the process by listening to their grievances and making arrangements to address at least some of their demands. Agencies can also socialize the behavior of internal spoilers by creating a set of norms and values against which to adjudicate their demands and behavior. Donor agencies may also coerce spoilers by pushing the project forward despite criticism and by threatening to withdraw support for the overall project (Stedman 1997). In case donor agencies are not able or willing to meet opponents’ demands, they may attempt to co-opt
them or, if co-optation fails, marginalize or sideline them by building stakeholder coalitions around them (Collette 2011).

4.2 Recruiting Stakeholders

Recruiting stakeholders is an ongoing process and new stakeholders may participate in project activities at different stages. Although by necessity often less or informal, soliciting stakeholder participation and input formally may occur through snowball recruiting, systematic impact assessment, perception analysis, and donor knowledge of the local and regional context. Effective stakeholder recruitment involves (UN 2001, p. 13):

1. Clearly stating the mission and the objectives of the project.
2. Identifying and understanding the interests and perceptions of key stakeholders.
3. Establishing effective methods of communication between stakeholders, donors and governments.
4. Ensuring a commitment to open communication and information sharing among all parties.

Stakeholders are also invaluable in the identification of other stakeholders. Hawkins (n.d.) states that “[i]dentifying stakeholders is an iterative process. New stakeholders are often identified by existing ones” (p. 3). We term this process snowball recruiting.

In addition to relying on the assistance and support of key stakeholders, donors often conduct public stakeholder meetings or workshops in local communities to solicit broad-based public support and recruit potential additional primary and secondary stakeholders (IFC 2007; GTZ 1988).

An alternative way of recruiting stakeholders is through cross-agency resource pooling (Disch 1999) where agencies with prior experience in the country may be able to assist in identifying and recruiting stakeholders they engaged with before or can refer the donor agency to those stakeholders with the strongest interest and/or influence (snowball recruiting).

4.3 Engaging Stakeholders

Engaging stakeholders involves establishing partnerships within the local community and society at large (Stiglitz 1998; Woodhill 2010). Upon identification of relevant stakeholder organizations, representatives who can speak on behalf of their organization will have to be selected (CommGap 2009; IFC 2007; UN 2001). This process should be stakeholder-driven and the most effective representatives will be trusted by their communities and the donor agencies alike. Donors ought not to get too involved in this part of the process (UN 2001).

Generally, project planners seek stakeholder engagement in:

1. Identifying key problems, challenges, and potential impacts
2. Developing effective response strategies
3. Gaining broad based public support and assistance

4. Implementing policies based on this support

5. Assessing real impacts and deriving lessons learned and best practices that can strengthen systematic and comprehensive delivery of technical assistance.

Incorporating local knowledge into project planning and service delivery requires the assistance of key stakeholders offering insider knowledge on project and stakeholder impact. These gatekeepers will also be instrumental in recruiting additional stakeholders to the project (snowball recruiting).

Early stakeholder involvement will not only help embrace local interests early on, but also generate a broad spectrum of ideas and minimize likely opposition to the project (IFC 2007). Furthermore, “early engagement may provide valuable opportunities to align the employment, training, infrastructure, and service demands of the project with the related plans and priorities of government agencies and local communities” (IFC 2007, p. 112). The benefits of early engagement may also offset many of the risks and unintended consequences identified in the impact analysis. Moreover, a systematic and comprehensive actors mapping may provide clarity in terms of interests, influence and impact and, subsequently, desired level of engagement (see also Figure 1 and Table 3).

Once the interests, problems, and impacts have been identified, responses are incorporated in the project design and can be implemented through preliminary research, policy formation, and technical assistance (Gyapong et al. 2011; World Bank 1996). Local capacity building through technical assistance enables the recruitment and sustainable participation of stakeholders in current and future projects by encouraging them to develop indigenous solutions through strong local institutions (Unwin 2005). Weak local institutions are at the very heart of problems with development because they “hamper the capacity of poor countries to effectively absorb or even spend the very aid monies designed to reinforce human and institutional capacity and speed economic growth” (Arndt 2000, p. 155). Clear, measurable, and non-controversial outputs, identified and agreed-upon in early stakeholder meetings, are critical to successful project implementation (Arndt 2000).

Participation by stakeholders in continuous monitoring and evaluation entail data collection for quality assurance purposes, keeping the project on track, and developing lessons learned with the potential for improving performance, service delivery and local capacity (UN 2001; USAID 2011). Establishing stakeholder engagement in this process promotes local ownership of both the process and the outcome and helps sustain stakeholder participation (USAID 2011). Monitoring and evaluations also provide institutional credibility and learning opportunities for donors and implementing agencies (Axelrod 2001). Paffenholtz (2011) suggests that participants and stakeholders may monitor and evaluate themselves in a guided process, allowing them to identify their own capacity to participate. Following the self-evaluation, however, should be an external evaluation providing “a learning opportunity that gives the involved stakeholders a chance to take time to reflect upon their work both through self-reflection as well as through feedback from and exchange with the external evaluation team” (p. 82). Moreover, it provides an additional opportunity to compare real with perceived achievements.
The GTZ distinguishes between projects that provide services “directly to primary stakeholders or supporting these in their self-determined change processes” and projects that support “institutional development, sector or policy reform at higher institutional levels which shall—in the end—also bring about improvements in living conditions and well-being of primary stakeholders,” (Forster 1998, p. 3). Though the project objectives may be the same, understanding these distinctions can shape how donor agencies frame stakeholder engagement, either as direct beneficiaries or as partners in strengthening institutions. This determination ought to be made based on the results of the stakeholder interest analysis outlined above.

4.3.1 Level of Intensity

The UN (2001) distinguishes among four levels of intensity of stakeholder engagement:

1. Information gathering, including the collection and analysis of data “on economic, social and cultural information affecting key stakeholder groups.”

2. Dissemination, including the “provision of information relating to a policy initiative to all interested parties.”

3. Consultation, through “listening to the views of stakeholders in order to improve policy questions, or make necessary changes during implementation.”

4. Participation, as an “extension of consultation where stakeholders become joint partners in the development and implementation of policy” (p. 25).

Figure 2. Level of Intensity
The exact level of intensity of stakeholder engagement varies by project stage (Forester 1998):

1. The **project identification stage** has limited stakeholder involvement as the applications are submitted by prospective recipient governments.

2. The **project planning stage** incorporates primary stakeholder involvement through consultation and sharing information about the project, though stakeholders themselves may have limited decision making abilities.

3. The **first implementation stage** in which primary stakeholders begin to have decision making abilities. Incorporating stakeholder priorities at this stage is risky, because budget and planning decisions have already been made. Based on stakeholder feedback, donor agencies may need to renegotiate the project which may cause delays.

4. The **monitoring and assessment stage** entails more or less detailed stakeholder assessments and feedback—ideally including impact assessment and perception analysis—of the project.

A detailed assessment of real and perceived risks and threats\(^7\), challenges and potential benefits ought to occur at a minimum during stages 2 and 4 (see also Table 2).

### 5. Recommendations for Engaging Stakeholders

Donor agencies and academic observers have stressed the importance of involving stakeholders in the effective delivery of development and technical assistance services, especially in post-conflict contexts and humanitarian emergency settings. However, to date there has not been a systematic analysis of stakeholder engagement. The purpose of this paper was to review common methods employed by donor agencies as well as those recommended by academic experts for involving stakeholders in development projects. The following are some preliminary recommendations for how to effectively identify, recruit, and engage stakeholders and, ideally, how to sustain their engagement:

1. **Solicit Opinions, Concerns and Priorities**

   In order to gain a better understanding of the local context and the potential obstacles and challenges for project planning and implementation, it is imperative to discover the specific concerns and priorities of each local community and of key stakeholders in particular (GTZ 2005; 1988). Engaging a wide range of stakeholders already early on in the project planning phase provides opportunities for assessing needs, critically reflecting on assumptions, exploring competing explanations, and developing consensus on the goals and objectives of the project and its successful completion. Taking differing views into account can help to create planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes and eventually promote trust and accountability. The first step during the planning phase is to conduct an actor and conflict mapping in order to identify the individuals and groups that should be included. Importantly, even project opponents and spoilers ought to be engaged and be given legitimacy and responsibility in the process.

\(^7\) Refer to Impact and perception analysis under *Identify*.  

---

**Note:** This document is a part of the IHSS project, focusing on stakeholder engagement strategies in various project stages. The content examines the varying levels of stakeholder involvement and provides recommendations for effective engagement. The text highlights the importance of stakeholder feedback throughout the project lifecycle, from initial applications to final assessments, emphasizing the need for comprehensive consideration of local perspectives and potential obstacles.
2. **Analyze Interests and Perceptions**

Any interest analysis begins with recording who will be (directly and indirectly) impacted by the project and who has an interest in or will feel affected by its service delivery. Any such analysis must consider stakeholder wants and needs and the nature and desire of their involvement. As such, any interest analysis must take into account stakeholder and community perceptions of project associated benefits and risks. Effective project implementation is facilitated by understanding community hopes and fears and the contextual and cognitive processes by which benefits and risks are amplified or attenuated (Holzmann et al. 2003; Douglas and Widlavski 1982; Cantril 1968).

3. **Foster Local Ownership**

Ownership means that stakeholders themselves are invested in the project and that the project is shaped by their priorities, visions, interests and perceptions (Blackburn et al. 2002; CommGap 2009; Disch 1999; La Voy & Charles 1998). Stakeholder engagement can be solicited and sustained by addressing their greatest concerns—perceived and real—and clearly defining the scope of their engagement to minimize differences in expectations among stakeholders and between stakeholders and donors (Gray 1989).

4. **Build Social Capital**

Consistent and fair engagement with stakeholders is critical to sustaining stakeholder participation in a specific project and beyond (GTZ 2005). By engaging stakeholders, recognizing the diversity of stakeholder perceptions and interests, developing a sense of ownership, and building capacity/social capital, the likelihood of sustained engagement increases. Ownership creates a sense of commitment by reflecting community needs and preferences and incorporating local desires, wants, perceptions, conditions, preferences and circumstances in the design and delivery of the project (Stiglitz 1998). It also promotes the building of social capital and, as a result, strengthens trust, transparency and accountability (Fukuyama 2002; Putnam 2000).

5. **Solicit Government Support**

Government support, especially at the local but also the national level, is critical in sustaining stakeholder engagement. Donor agencies are limited in their ability to initiate, broaden, and sustain participation as project managers must oftentimes first secure government permission to carry out their work in a participatory approach (World Bank 1996). Strategies that can be used to garner government support include assertive community engagement, timing, i.e., waiting for the right moment in which the government decides to support the project, using pilot projects to show the effectiveness of a participatory approach, alliance building with key stakeholders, and educating and persuading government officials that a participatory approach will provide the best outcomes (World Bank 1996).

6. **Conduct Trainings and Workshops**

Key to sustained stakeholder engagement is the relationship between agency staff and key stakeholders. Much of this relationship can be developed, maintained and strengthened through training.
with a focus of staff training on sustaining service provision for the duration of the project and stakeholder training on engagement also beyond project duration to ensure effective capacity building and local ownership in the long run (La Voy & Charles 1998). In addition, offering targeted sessions on how to work together and with the agency staff early on further contributes to sustaining stakeholder engagement. At the same time it is crucial to provide opportunities for stakeholders to voice concerns and provide transparent information and continuous updates on project progress. The World Bank (1996) explains how targeted trainings can sustain stakeholder participation beyond donor agency involvement and funding:

Training community organizations can empower them to better identify and prioritize their needs and develop strategies to meet them, begin microprojects, and sustain their development efforts once outside assistance is withdrawn. Training can be provided by project staff or subcontracted to NGOs or other local firms experienced in community-level programs (p. 155).

Workshops can also help sustain stakeholder participation by involving them in the project planning and implementation stages and in “collaborative decision making” during stakeholder workshops during the project design and development phases (World Bank 1996, see also GTZ 1988). The specific purpose of these workshops is “to begin and sustain stakeholder collaboration” (World Bank 1996, p. 181). USAID’s Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation works with private voluntary organizations (PVO) to offer “training programs, workshops, and consultant services to support institutional strengthening, partnership development, and cross-sectoral alliances for both PVOs and local NGOs” (La Voy & Charles 1998, p. 14).

7. **Address Grievances**

Sustaining project engagement requires room for stakeholder feedback and for mechanisms to address and resolve project-related grievances and stakeholder disputes (World Bank 1996). Strategies include maintaining transparent and continuous communication between the parties and brainstorming solutions during meetings with specified time frames (GTZ 1988; UN 2001). Another way to address discrepancies in perceptions and interests and resolve disputes is through the use of the Delphi technique (Preskill and Jones 2009; UN 2001) which consists of four distinct phases:

1. Send a questionnaire to each stakeholder to assess:
   - The perceived impact of the project.
   - The probability of each type of impact.
2. Analyze questionnaire data and share results with the stakeholders; ask for update on perceived project impact based on the results.
3. Administer second survey, specifically targeting stakeholders with divergent views to ascertain the reasons for their perceived benefits or downsides.
4. Analyze data again and solicit stakeholder feedback once more on project estimates.
While the Delphi technique is resource and time consuming, it provides a clear picture of stakeholder perceptions and does not favor one stakeholder over others. Another way is through the use of dialogue roundtables that address conflicts between community members and donor agencies (IFC 2007). Dialogue is not a fixed discussion or process; however, guiding principles such as “open communication, honest speaking, and genuine listening” can foster dialogue between stakeholders (GTZ 2006, p. 6). An effective model for multi-stakeholder dialogue is called Future Search and has the following components (GTZ 2006):

1. Review of the past: participants discuss past experiences in order to find commonalities.
2. Explore the present: participants identify current events and trends that impact their lives and their community. The group prioritizes these through a vote of most important to least important.
3. Create ideal future scenarios: Participants explain their ideal scenario 20 years from the present, with special attention to barriers they would have to overcome to get to the ideal.
4. Identify common ground: Participants identify common ground, plans and strategies to help them achieve their goal, and disagreements.
5. Make action plans: Participants share ideas for an action plan toward achieving their collective goals.

8. Tailor to Local Conditions

Sustainable stakeholder engagement based on community buy-in and the development of social capital requires incorporating local knowledge into the planning and implementation processes. The IFC (2007) recommends utilizing local NGOs and Community Based Organizations as important sources of local knowledge, and targeting individuals with the right combination of trustworthiness, credentials, and local knowledge (Gibson & O’Faircheallaigh 2010). Obviously, project objectives and the nature and level of stakeholder engagement or opposition may change during the project planning, implementation or monitoring phases and successful project completion requires the continuous tailoring of each IRES step to the fluidity of specific local conditions throughout the project duration. Transparency, continuous communication and information exchange with experts on the ground, embracing opponents and possibly also spoilers in the project feedback loop, and the constant monitoring of the extent to which changing local conditions are taken into account are the cornerstones of sustainable comprehensive stakeholder engagement and social capital building.

The complexities underlying international development and the delivery of humanitarian aid and technical assistance into crisis regions and post-conflict environments require the comprehensive integration and coordination of governmental and non-governmental as well as international, regional, national and local capabilities (Franke and Dorff, forthcoming). The present analysis has illustrated the importance of involving stakeholders at all stages of a given project, from its planning and design to its implementation and evaluation phases. The IRES Model developed here provides a conceptual framework for identifying, recruiting and engaging stakeholders during each project phase and for fostering local ownership and building social capital and community capacity.
The analysis of existing methods used for stakeholder engagement reveals the importance of conducting comprehensive needs and impact assessments based on community and stakeholder interests and perceptions. Current practices focus oftentimes on externally defined stakeholder interests and influence, but commonly overlook the importance of cultural/contextual perceptions. In order to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of stakeholder engagement, project design and implementation ought to consider the wants and needs, concerns and interests and hopes and fears of all project partners as well as the local communities. Stakeholder engagement is a crucial element in gathering the necessary information and sustaining project benefits beyond the implementation phase. Following the recommended steps outlined above ought to promote the efficient achievement of the project goals and foster sustained development through trust and ownership beyond the project duration. The extent to which these steps indeed increase efficiency and effectiveness in project implementation and the delivery of technical assistance in development and humanitarian crises contexts should be tested empirically in the field. The IRES model provides a useful conceptual framework for such a test.
6. IRES Model: Steps to Build a Sustainable Project

**Identify**
- Potential Stakeholders
- Stakeholder Interests
- Stakeholder Types

**Recruit**
- Snowball Recruiting
- Community Meetings
- Cross Agency Resource Pooling

**Engage**
- Planning
- Implementation
- Monitoring and Evaluation

**Sustain**
- Social Capital
- Local Ownership
- Transparency/
- Accountability
- Community
- Capacity
- Best Practices
- Government Support

---

*Recruit* and *Engage* lead to *Sustain*.
## Identify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Stakeholders</th>
<th>Stakeholder Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Systematic Participant Analysis</td>
<td>1. Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Stakeholder Ranking</td>
<td>2. Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Impact-Target Analysis</td>
<td>3. Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stakeholder Interests
- a) Interest Analysis
- b) Perception Analysis
- c) Impact zoning

### Method
- a) Communication Meetings
- b) Focus Groups
- c) Expert Surveys
- d) Workshops and Trainings
- e) Consultant Surveys

## Recruit

### Donor Steps for Successful Recruiting
- a) Clearly stated project mission and objective
- b) Identifying/understanding key stakeholder perceptions and interests
- c) Establishing effective means of communication
- d) Commitment to open communication and information sharing

### Method
- a) Snowball Recruiting
- b) Public Meetings and Workshops
- c) Cross-Agency Resource Pooling

## Engage

### Incorporate Stakeholder Engagement
- a) Identifying key problems, challenges and potential impact
- b) Developing effective responses
- c) Gaining broad based public support and assistance
- d) Implementing policies
- e) Assessing real impacts and deriving lessons learned

### Method
- a) Information gathering and analysis
- b) Dissemination to interested parties
- c) Consultation
- d) Development and implementation of policy
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Appendix A: Sample Cantril Scale Questions for Perception Analysis

The following section asks about your expectations for the future of yourself, your country, and your community. Please answer all the questions.

Self

1. What are your best wishes and hopes for your personal future?

2. What are your worst fears and worries about your personal future?

3. Below is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder (10) represents the best possible life for you and the bottom (1) represents the worst possible life for you. With regard to the hopes and fears you described above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   a. where on the ladder do you feel you stand at the present time? _______

   b. where on the ladder would you say you stood five years ago? _______

   c. where do you think you will be on the ladder five years from now? _______
Community

1. What are your *best wishes* and *hopes* for your community’s future?

2. What are your *worst fears* and *worries* about your community’s future?

3. Below is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder (10) represents the best possible scenario for your community and the bottom (1) represents the worst possible scenario for your community. With regard to the hopes and fears you described above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Write in Step Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a. where on the ladder do you feel you stand at the <em>present</em> time? _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>b. where on the ladder would you say you stood <em>five years ago</em>? _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>c. where do you think you will be on the ladder <em>five years from now</em>? _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Impact Assessment Questions

1. What do we know about where the community is now? For example, how many people fall into age and gender groups most likely to be impacted by the project?

2. What are education, health and housing conditions, and how are these likely to affect, for instance, people’s capacity to take up employment opportunities?

3. What capacity do community organizations have in key areas such as land management, education, and dealing with possible negative social impacts such as substance abuse? What are the elements of culture, society, economy, and the environment our people want to protect the most?

4. What sort of shape are those valued components in, how are they changing, how fast, and why? Valued components are any part of the environment considered important by the people with the communities (or other people involved in the regulatory process).

5. What are our most resilient features, and where are we most vulnerable to change? What do our prior experiences with similar developments and negotiation processes teach us (“lessons learned”)?

6. What do we know about where the community wants to be? Are there existing reports that talk about people’s aspirations? What other work needs to be done to establish community goals and aspirations?

7. What key characteristics are likely to affect the community’s capacity to negotiate and implement an agreement and to take advantage of it once it is signed?

---

8 adopted from the IBA community toolkit (2010, p. 86).