D5.1 METHODS FOR SETTING-UP OF MAPS

SEPTEMBER 2021

D5.1 METHODS FOR SETTING-UP OF MAPS

Project name	**SHERPA: Sustainable Hub to Engage into Rural Policies with Actors**
Project ID	862448
H2020 Type of funding scheme	CSA Coordination and Support Action
H2020 Call ID & Topic	RUR-01-2018-2019–D / Rural society-science-policy hub
Website	www.rural-interfaces.eu
Document Type	Deliverable
File Name	D5.1 Methods for setting-up of MAPs
Status	Final - Resubmitted
Dissemination level	Public
Authors	Elin Slätmo, Sandra Oliveira e Costa, Søren Qvist Eliasen, David Miller, Lisy Piter, Michael Kull and Jorieke Potters. With contributions from SHERPA partners.
Work Package Leader	Nordregio
Project Coordinator	Ecorys

Disclaimer: The content of this document does not reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Responsibility for the information and views expressed therein lies entirely with the author(s).

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In recent years, the understanding of governance in Western societies has been moving away from hierarchical state-based approaches, towards more inclusive market and community-based ones that include private and civil society actors (Hodge, 2007; Kemp *et al.*, 2005; Sattler *et al.*, 2018). This is consistent with the obligations of the European Union to the Aarhus Convention (UNECE, 1998) and in line with other conventions demanding people's right to participate in decision making, such as the Landscape convention of the European Council (2000).

Our societies are facing extremely complex problems connected to global and interlinked processes, such as global warming, poverty, polarisation, inequality, viruses and environmental challenges. These challenges are so-called wicked problems emerging "from the actions of the society which produced it" (Brown, 2008). They cannot be solved by scientists or politicians alone. It will take experts from a range of fields, including ordinary citizens, applying experience-based knowledge, interacting and working together.

To solve the challenges we are facing, interfaces between science, society and policy in multi-actor platforms are seen as one way forward. The overall objective of Sustainable Hub to Engage into Rural Policies with Actors (SHERPA) is to gather relevant knowledge and opinions that contribute to the formulation of recommendations for future policies relevant to rural areas across the EU. These will be derived from a range of different stakeholders who are affected by, or involved in the making of, such policies. The main instrument through which knowledge and opinions will be collected from the stakeholders are Multi-Actor Platforms (MAPs).

MAPs are the forum for ongoing exchanges of ideas for co-learning and co-creation of knowledge at European and regional levels. They are embedded in the broader evolution of the interfaces between science, policy and society within the EU. MAPs pave the way for both cross-disciplinary and cross-sectoral engagement. Within European governance, there is a need for improved science-society-policy interactions (Neßhöver *et al.*, 2014). This is what SHERPA aims to address.

1.1. Purpose of this document and links to other WPs

This document introduces the methodology for setting up MAPs in SHERPA, indicating how these MAPs might be started up, and which common structures they will share. This deliverable also provides a background on how Multi-Actor Platforms function as science-society-policy interfaces, and on what is the practical experience with such structures, including from other current or previous EU-projects. Theoretical assumptions will be synthesised and based on a scientific literature review.

Deliverable 5.1. is complemented by, and synthesises, the work conducted in other Work Packages (WP) and deliverables within SHERPA, and thus makes this work visible beyond the project. Some of the work conducted under other WPs was not published outside of the project and is used here in order to share the findings with people not working in the project and to keep the resource-use at a reasonable level. Work conducted under WP1 and Report D1.2 (confidential to EC and partners), for instance, inspired sub-chapter 3.1 on the Working Principles of Multi-Actor Platforms (Chartier *et al.* 2019; D1.2). Here we explain the remit, roles and responsibilities of MAP facilitators and monitors by spelling out their concrete requirements and rules of SHERPA. The research basis for the stakeholder engagement support tool developed under WP2 (Lo Piparo and Nieto (2020); D2.3), is presented in section 3.5 in this deliverable to provide hands-on guidance concerning methods and tools for stakeholder engagement to be used for starting up and running MAPs. In addition to the four guiding principles, another practical advice for operating SHERPA MAPs is developed in other SHERPA WPs. For example, Deliverable 6.1. (Mazzocchi *et al.* 2020) makes suggestions for the organisation of, and planning for, 20 regional Multi-Actor Platforms (MAPs).

Questions MAP Facilitators and Monitors will face for establishing and running their MAPs include:

- Who should be involved and what criteria to select MAP members?

- What forms does power take to influence decisions?

- What process-based methods for co-learning and co-creation can I use?

Answers to these questions are provided in this deliverable and are based on the review of relevant literature. Finally, some reflections on monitoring and evaluation as well as longevity are provided at the end of this document.

1.2. Who is this document for?

This document is directed towards different potential users. Firstly, the guidelines are designed to help MAP Facilitators and Monitors within SHERPA when starting up MAPs. The document explains the background and the potential contribution of Multi-Actor Platforms and science-society-policy interfaces. The guidelines also include important thinking on the role of power in decision-making processes. These will potentially be useful to facilitators and monitors in their work on MAPs.

Secondly, this deliverable will also be of relevance for participants in MAPs who want additional information on science-society-policy interfaces.

Thirdly, just as SHERPA builds on experiences from previous research projects, so the SHERPA processes will be of use for other research projects. So, this deliverable is also designed for use by researchers and peers in other projects dealing with science-society-policy interfaces and Multi-Actor Platforms.

1.3. Structure of the document

Chapter 2 summarises the findings of a literature review which was conducted for SHERPA. This helps to define what science-society-policy interfaces and Multi-Actor Platforms are, and what potential they have for rural development and democracy. Chapter 2 also presents a number of practical examples of MAPs initiated by both science, policy and societal actors. The chapter ends with a summarised list of motivations for setting up Multi-Actor Platforms.

Chapter 3 highlights aspects that are important when starting MAPs. These include the SHERPA principles for setting up MAPs, which were formulated in Work Package 1 and described in D1.2. (confidential to EC and partners). It provides information on the expectations for activities and outputs from SHERPA MAPs, describes the different societal spheres involved in the MAPs, and discusses issues related to power dynamics that are important to be aware of as a MAP Facilitator and Monitor. Related to this, chapter 3 presents easy-to-use methods to apply in MAPs, aimed at the creation of an inclusive and respectful atmosphere amongst participants. Finally, the chapter introduces the idea of preparing for the continuation of MAPs after the end of SHERPA project. It also provides a concluding note on how to address territorial representativity when setting up MAPs across Europe.

An annex is included, providing details of how the MAPs have initially been supported.

2. Literature review on science-society-policy interfaces

Establishing **science-society-policy interfaces** is central to the SHERPA project. Science-society-policy interfaces are expressions of a changed understanding of governance in the 21st century. The concept of developing such interfaces is used for determining different governance arrangements. The common feature

is that they both include and enable interaction between actors from the spheres of science, society and policy-making.

The literature reviewed for this task within SHERPA suggests that different terms and concepts are being used to describe the phenomenon and process of a science-society-policy interface. The aim of this literature review was to guide the development of MAPs in their early stages, considering issues such as:

- What are science-society-policy interfaces?

- What forms of science-society-policy interface exist across Europe, and elsewhere in the world?

- Why is it important to create science-society-policy interfaces?

When conducting the literature review, four main steps were implemented:

1) a search for "Multi-Actor Platforms" and "science-society-policy interfaces" through ScienceDirect was conducted, followed by an interim analysis of identified literature and

2) a search for "Multi-Actor Platforms", "science-society-policy interfaces" and "rural" at ScienceDirect was conducted

3) adding literature from reference lists in journal articles, and based on suggestions

4) a search for "participatory" was carried out on the CORDIS database

Under step 1) and to identify the most recent research in the respective fields, the search was limited to the period 2010 to 2019. A total of 1,307 results was found. In the next sub-step, the search results in step 1 were limited to review articles. In total, 151 review articles were identified, and their titles and abstracts read. Six articles were found relevant for a more-in-depth analysis presented in this report.

To ensure the rural focus a second search for literature was performed. Under step 2) the search was not limited to review articles. In that sub-step, 332 articles were found from which 17 were considered to be relevant for the purpose of this deliverable and the SHERPA context.

Thus, 23 scientific articles served as the starting point for the in-depth review. They were carefully read and analysed. Under step 3, throughout the process of writing this report, additional literature from the first sample of 23 articles and reports have been added based on both references within the scientific articles and as suggestions by persons within the SHERPA consortium. For instance, literature about (and results from) previous EU-funded research projects.

As a step 4, and to ensure the inclusion of lessons learned from previous EU-funded research, a specific search was carried out on the CORDIS database. CORDIS is the European Commission database for research results from projects funded by the EU's framework programmes for research and innovation (FP1 to Horizon 2020), from 1990 to 2020. The search used the keyword 'participatory'. The search was filtered by 'society' as the domain of application, and 44 results were found. Going through the results, six projects were considered the most suitable for SHERPA to learn from (WeGovNow, netCommons, Civiciti, ENLARGE, ALTERNATIVE, DemoInChange). The results from these projects have been read, noted and included in this deliverable. Additional searches on the keyword 'multi-actor platforms' through the CORDIS database did not add results considered directly relevant for the objectives of this literature review for the SHERPA project (i.e. 94 results on energy saving housing, security, online platforms, AI, media research, etc.).

As presented below the results of the literature review cover different forms of science-society-policy interfaces as social processes, such as knowledge integration and learning, decision support systems, community-based governance. Three specific streams of research have been identified as most relevant to science-society-policy interfaces. These are presented below as 1) research on governance, 2) research on social innovation, and 3) research on transition through niche and socio-technological regimes. Research in these three fields helps us understand in what ways the science-society-policy interfaces can take shape within SHERPA Multi-Actor Platforms.

The literature reviewed suggests that different terms and concepts are used to describe the phenomenon and processes of science-society-policy interfaces and multi-actor platforms. Other topics of relevance are related to democracy, for instance, as well as land use and participatory planning. Research on these topics was not, however, prominent in the search for this literature review and therefore the three streams presented below are to be viewed as the core for this presentation within which the other relevant topics are presented. This does not mean that other research results or projects are non-relevant, it is rather a matter of choice of perspective in the presentation, for instance, 'democracy' is included in the governance sub-chapter below.

2.1. Governance

Describing different types of governance, Janowski *et al.*, (2018) highlight the fact that platform governance is one way to understand how society is governed, and how democracy is performed. This form of governance stems from a change in governing paradigms, starting with the bureaucratic paradigm (in which the public administration exercises regulation over citizens), moving through the consumerist paradigm (in which the administration provides citizens with services) and the participatory paradigm (in which the administration and its citizens share responsibility for policy and service processes), and finally arriving at the platform paradigm – in which the administration empowers citizens to "create public value by themselves" (Janowski *et al.*, 2018). Janowski *et al.* hold that the essence of the platform paradigm is that "*citizens and other non-state actors directly contribute to sustainable development*". The sustainable development referred to is a "*development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*" (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 41).

Platform governance is characterised by five types of relationship:

- empowering relationships – meaning that the administration empowers citizens to set the stage for participation and to take decisions and actions contributing towards sustainable development;

- learning relationships – which allow for individual learning, but also for forms of multi-level governance that are open for learning and adaptation;

- coordinating relationships – which means that the administration (government) coordinates decisions, actions, aims, instruments, stakeholders etc. that promote sustainable development;

- creative relationships – meaning co-creation between the public sector and citizens, for generating public value in sustainable development, and

- collaborative relationships – meaning that citizens work with each other and with the administration (Janowski *et al.*, 2018, p.5).

The 'inclusive market' and 'community-based' approaches to governance have both been met with scepticism. A changed understanding of governance, not least participatory and platform governance, will influence perceptions of leadership and governance in rural communities. Leadership of regional economic development is a collaborative relationship between the public, private and community sectors, which differs from the traditional hierarchical relationships (Beer, 2014). In the platform governance concept as outlined by Janowski *et al.*, the administration delegates defined responsibilities and power to different governance platforms, but maintains the coordinating and decision-making roles. Forms of power are an important and intricate aspect of science-society-policy interfaces (Medema *et al.*, 2014; Zasada *et al.*, 2017, p.65). In relation to the administration, a strong platform might exert greater influence on the final decision of the administration than was originally planned. Or it might exert influence on surrounding issues. When delegating influence or power to a specific platform, the constellations of the groups involved are decisive. How the members of the group act, speak and engage are all influenced by who they are, how they perceive themselves, and how they perceive each other. This means that the actors involved shape the interactions possible in different arrangements. Normativity will unavoidably shape these interactions (Wyborn, 2015).

For SHERPA, it is relevant to reflect on the different governance styles and how they influence and help to understand the MAPs and their operation. In the case of SHERPA, administration/governmental actors originate from both the EU as well as national and sub-national levels of government and in a multi-level governance setting. The MAPs can function as platforms that empower relationships between the administration and citizens. This happens, for instance through dialogue and co-creation of new knowledge by different societal actors, including civil society and businesses. To reflect on the power aspects, it can be important to clarify within the MAP which type of mandate the group have. It is also important to clarify who is participating in particular MAPs, in order to include relevant interests and to avoid excluding interests of central importance. Finally, it is important for the MAP facilitator and monitor to pay close attention to whether all actor groups find sufficient space for sharing their opinions, for deliberation and joint social learning. In a Dutch case study about a multi-actor negotiation platform, van Bommel et al (2009) have shown how a dominant coalition of policy makers and nature conservationists was able impose their views and preferences, and significantly restrict the space for deliberation. The expectations for the platform studied by van Bommel et al was overcoming resistance and creating consensus and commitment, whilst the SHERPA MAPs are expected to discuss rural policy developments in the EU and their national / regional setting and provide recommendations for policy and research agendas. Whilst the purpose of the SHERPA MAPs is different compared to that case, it is a useful learning exercise to have a look at examples that experienced challenges and obstacles.

Finally, in their analysis of eleven case studies carried out as part of the trans-disciplinary RETHINK research programme trying to shed a light on the role of multi-actor governance in aligning farm modernization with sustainable rural development, Koopmans et al (2018) have identified six vital conditions for strategies that serve to (re)connect farm modernisation and sustainable rural development. These "conditions" could also serve as important learning elements for setting up and running SHERPA MAPs: role of informal networks, effective coordination, polycentricity, bottom-up initiatives, agency and trust and transparency. Important for SHERPA, and as the authors conclude, whilst these conditions are well known for the scientific world, "*in practice they are rarely translated into effective policy strategies to support territorial development*" (Koopmans et al. 2018). SHERPA, with the motivation to contribute to informing future rural policy and research agendas, has high potential to fill this gap.

2.2. Social innovation

In 2018 Carlos Moedas, former European Commissioner for Research and Innovation, stated that "*in the European Union, we are going to put more money into social innovation, not because it's trendy, but because we believe that the future of innovation is about social innovation.*" (Roberts, 2018)

The potential significance of social innovation is also reflected by its inclusion in the 5th Mandate of the EC Standing Committee on Agricultural Research (SCAR AKIS), noting that 'Social innovation involves rural communities (including communities of farmers) finding creative solutions to the complex social challenges they face.' It also requires the co-ownership of solutions, across sectors, which is reflected in the Multi-Actor Approach advocated by EU DG Agri as a means of 'generating impact and co-ownership of solutions'.

Pioneering initiatives in this area were taken in the US, Canada and Europe, and these refer to 'maker movements or experiments in social organisation which include government, business and society (Edwards-Schachter and Wallace, 2017, p. 64). They conclude that social innovation treat "three different and interrelated discursive 'areas': processes of social change, sustainable development and the services sector."

In a review of the definitions and applications of the social innovation concept Edwards-Schachter and Wallace (2017) concludes that they all treat "three different and interrelated discursive 'areas': processes of social change, sustainable development and the services sector." Based on the review of 252 articles, the authors state that social innovation is:

"[…] *a collective process of learning involving the distinctive participation of civil society actors aimed to solve a societal need through change in social practices that produce change in social relationships, systems and structures, contributing to large socio-technical change."*

Collective action, in connection with existing local, regional, and/or national networks, has the potential for effective transfer of available experience across the boundaries of innovation emergence, the eventual outcome of which is greater efficiency and quality of the entire implementation (Baker and Mehmood, 2015).

An example of a Horizon 2020 project which brought together policy, practice, civil society in a multi-actor approach to tackle challenges in rural areas was 'Social Innovation in Marginalised Rural Areas' (SIMRA, 2020). It defined social innovation as *"the reconfiguring of social practices, in response to societal challenges, which seeks to enhance outcomes on societal well-being and necessarily includes the engagement of civil society actors"* (Polman *et al.*, 2017). This definition emphasises one perspective on social innovation of the significance of actors in civil society in responding to triggers and driving the reconfiguration of social practices, and in turn the institutional change. It is consistent with transformative Social Innovation theory, i.e. shaping and accelerating development trajectories in social and socio-ecological transition (Haxeltine *et al.,* 2017) and aligns with the empowering and collaborative relationships referred to in Section 2.1.

Beneficial outcomes of the process of social innovation include increased social relations, enhanced self-organisation and resilience of communities, and improved skills (Ravazzoli *et al.*, 2021). Findings also suggest that the transdisciplinary multi-actor approach can provide new insights to the challenges faced by rural areas and solutions developed (e.g. recommendation for future policy at EU and national levels; Slee and Mosdale, 2020). However, within social innovations there are different roles of actors (e.g. innovator, follower, core group; Secco *et al.*, 2019) and associated diversity in capabilities and knowledge, and in the responsibilities taken.

A particular relevance to SHERPA of findings of research on social innovation is the emphasis it places on the processes of interactions between public, private and civil society, and the broad range of contexts and outcomes sought from social innovation across Europe, and their role in creating transitions in rural areas. It also highlights that in the formation of the Multi-Actor Platforms, there is a need to recognise the heterogeneity within civil society, and the different contributions to the processes of SHERPA (e.g. co-constructing positions) that each type of actor would have to offer.

Within mainstream EU policy, resources are allocated to social innovation through the European Social Fund (2020) and the European Investment Fund (2020). Article 9 in Chapter II in the European Social Fund regulation promotes social innovation, in particular with the aim of testing, evaluating and scaling up innovative solutions, including at the local or regional level, in order to address social needs in partnership with the relevant partners and, in particular, social partners (European Social Fund, 2013). This implies resources becoming available that could contribute to funding governance structures which could represent Multi-Actor Platforms over the longer-term.

Social innovation can also be helpful to understand the learning process within a MAP and the experimental side of the MAPs to be implemented in SHERPA. However, it is important to recognise that social processes unfold and develop differently, depending on local contexts, and it is not possible to replicate success factors from social innovation in one place directly to another, or to have the same development pathways (Kluvánková *et al.*, 2020). Nonetheless, ideas can be scaled out, good practice can be documented, peer-to-peer learning can be promoted, and networks of interested actors can be created (Slee *et al.*, 2020; Van Dyck and Van der Breck, 2013).

2.3. Transition through niche and socio-technological regimes

The third field of research, here used to describe the phenomenon and processes of science-society-policy interfaces and multi-actor platforms, concerns how new ideas and practices developed in MAPs can be

conveyed to decision-makers at EU and national or regional levels, and influence future rural policy. It considers key issues to learn from transitions through niche and socio-technological regimes.

Ingram describes the terms niche, socio-technical and transition as follows (2018, p.117):

- Niche – "*a space where new ideas and practices can develop*";

- Socio-technical regimes – "*the incumbent system of technologies, practices and institutions*";

- Transition – "*the outcome of interaction between niches and socio-technical regimes*", especially their potential to impact on the wider system.

Rip and Kemp (1998) describe niches as protected 'experimental settings' in which norms and practices are developed which depart from those of a prevailing technological regime. At the outset, niches work outside established structures, cultures and practices, and then challenge socio-technical regimes which may be resistant to change. Ingram (2018) used the case of permaculture in England, UK, and the influence it has on traditional agricultural knowledge systems, to describe efforts in a niche to exert influence on a strong socio-technical regime. Such regimes are one of a set of lock-in mechanisms identified by Geels (2019) which lead to innovations being predominantly incremental and path-dependent, notably:

i) techno-economic (e.g. vested interests against transitional change created due to existing investments; improvements in performance due to learning-by-doing);

ii) social and cognitive (e.g. routines and mind-sets that 'blind' actors to certain developments, social capital developed between social groups, and existing practices and life styles organized around particular technologies);

iii) institutional and political mechanisms (e.g. existing regulations, standards, and policy networks which favour incumbents, or vested interests using access to policy networks to limit change or hinder innovation).

Analysis of cases revealed different ways in which knowledge processes permeate the boundaries between a niche and the dominant socio-technical regime. The intermediaries who transfer knowledge between these systems are the central actors (Kivimaa *et al.*, 2019). Kivimaa *et al.* (2020) expand the consideration of *transition intermediaries* in their roles as actors and platforms who can 'positively influence sustainable transition. *Transition intermediaries* speed up transitions. They can be defined as "actors and platforms that positively influence sustainability transition processes by linking actors and activities, and their related skills and resources, or by connecting transition visions and demands of networks of actors with existing regimes in order to create momentum for socio-technical system change, to create new collaborations within and across niche technologies, ideas and markets, and to disrupt dominant unsustainable socio-technical configurations".

Socio-technical perspectives, operating across levels, will also operate across policy sectors, and involve different types of actors (government agencies, institutions and policy networks) (Smith and Stirling, 2010). Although a state actor may be the facilitating agent, transition initiatives will primarily be implemented within business communities and civil society (Kemp and Loorbach, 2006). However, actors operate in different contexts contributing different knowledge or experience and may hold competing positions or interests (Smith and Stirling, 2010). Their contexts and remits can also change through time (e.g. agendas, remits, targets) and at different stages in processes of transition, which may have implications for whether or how practices or technologies evolve, including links to systems of planning (e.g. Isaksson and Heikkinen, 2018).

This set of concepts informs SHERPA to the degree that we regard each MAP, and the actors within that MAP, as a 'niche', and as making efforts to influence an established socio-technical regime (the EU). The intermediaries would, in this case, be the Facilitator and Monitor, and the intermediate relations established in the SHERPA projects through Position and Discussion Papers, the EU MAP and the annual conference, where MAP/niche positions can be communicated.

2.4. Multi-Actor Platforms

The scientific literature suggests that a **Multi-Actor Platform** is an arrangement that facilitates a science-society-policy interface. Multi-Actor Platforms or groups based on multi-actor approaches may consist of different types of forums, based on face-to-face meetings or on remote communication (digital communication). Some platforms link two types of actor groups, such as those which fostering exchanges between science and policy, or between science and society. Other platforms focus on communicating local knowledge to relevant public authorities. The strength and uniqueness of SHERPA is the inclusion of all three societal actor groups: science, society and policy.

Throughout Europe and more widely, there are numerous examples of different Multi-Actor Platform constellations, topics and aims. An interesting differentiation is that of who initiates platforms, i.e. were they set up by science, society or policy actors. Overall, there is a trend towards inclusive, community-based approaches to governance. Some examples of Multi-Actor-Platforms follow:

Multi-Actor Platforms initiated by Science:

- In the European research project FP7 VALERIE (Valorising European Research for Innovation in Agriculture and Forestry), collaboration between researchers and practitioners was established for over 10 case studies. The aim was to improve the accessibility and availability of fresh knowledge contributing to innovation in agriculture and forestry. Specifically, knowledge from European research projects was extracted to help meet sustainability challenges within agriculture and forestry. The knowledge and information generated were made accessible through the provision of a search engine. Consulting stakeholders and testing innovations were key to the project (FP7 VALERIE, 2020).

- Participatory Land-Use Planning (PLUP), a village cluster in northern Laos, is a science project initiated by a Multi-Actor Platform. It includes stakeholders in a communication platform which was created to enable participants to explore the consequences of land-use decisions, and to choose between alternative development scenarios. It employs methods such as role-playing games, participatory 3D-modelling, and socio-economic and environmental impact assessments. PLUP responds to the core message of Agenda 21, namely, to involve ordinary citizens in local management decisions and in policy implementation, linking landscape science and citizen involvement. In the example in Laos, participants were from local public authorities and village communities. A group of researchers also participated, acting as mediators (Bourgoin *et al.*, 2011).

Multi-Actor Platforms initiated by Society:

- The Swedish body, Rural Sweden (Hela Sverige ska leva), is a national civil society networking organisation for rural development. It consists of 5,000 local community groups and 40 member organisations, many of which are large, national NGOs. There are 24 county networks, working with information and advisory services at that level. These county councils are formed from local community groups within the county. Rural Sweden now reacts to Governmental bills proposing new legislation, and runs rural innovation projects. Starting as a bottom-up movement in 1989, the organisation has collaborated on rural policy with several governments and has introduced its ways of working to the suburbs of the Swedish capital, Stockholm. Together with 40 other local community organisations in Europe, Rural Sweden helps to organise the European Rural Parliament every second year (Hela Sverige Ska Leva, 2019; European Rural Parliament, 2019).

- The Waikerie District Development Committee in South Australia, started as an initiative by local businessmen concerned with a lack of motivation for change in the community, and by a corresponding lack of support from the District Council. This Multi-Actor Platform was not organised as a formal platform to link the development committee and the local government. Rather, the development committee itself initiated contacts with local government, and lobbied in relation to

their concerns. The structure created can be seen as resisting 'government-at-a-distance', something likely to occur in rural areas which are a long way from the political centre (Beer, 2014).

Multi-Actor Platforms initiated by Policy:

- European-wide regional structures for implementing the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and the EU's Rural Development policy exist in a variety of Multi-Actor Platforms (notably, Local Action Groups [LAGs] and Fisheries LAGs [FLAGs]). In establishing community-based approaches, LAGs are formed in collaboration with actors in civil society and business. However, the representation of research (that is, science) is often lacking in the core membership of these LAGs. The ENRD (2020) report 3,098 LAGS around Europe.

- In 2019, the European Committee of the Regions started a pilot RegHub network to contribute towards implementing the recommendations of the work from the Task Force on Subsidiarity, Proportionality and "doing less more efficiently". The RegHub network consists of 36 regional hubs, each aiming to support the review of policy implementation. Public procurement was chosen as the first topic for consultation by these regional hubs. This was reported in July 2019 (European Committee of the Regions, 2019).

- Out with the EU, an example of Multi-Actor Platforms initiated by policy in Senegal, where one was established in 2014 to support implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT). The MAP was supported by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment (MAER), the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Initiative Prospective Agricole et Rurale (IPAR), an independent think tank with a focus on rural and agricultural development in West Africa. The Multi-Actor platform supported and fostered a continued dialogue between state and non-state actors, and has provided support for capacity-building activities targeting civil society organisations, especially for women and young people (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2016).

Previous research on activities similar to those of Multi-Actor Platforms, shows that it can be challenging to ensure that they continue to be active beyond the lifetime of the project. In a review of 60 EU-funded information- or decision-supporting systems (IS/DSS) developed during the periods 2002–2006, and 2007–2013, Zasada *et al.* (2017) highlight that only 30 of the tools developed (50%) had been updated by the end of the project. Larsson and Grönlund (2014) note the issue of technical sustainability: such as ensuring the availability of homepages and web forums for communication over the longer term. Setting-up Multi-Actor Platforms through external funding and resources is likely to have a low probability of them continuing over the longer term (Poocharoen and Sovacool, 2012). In those cases, risks to the existence of Multi-Actor Platforms over the longer term needs to be assessed carefully, and the challenges addressed.

The Multi-Actor approach was adopted by the European Commission's in its strategy for EU agricultural research and innovation (European Commission, 2016). The aim is to "*boost demand-driven innovation and the implementation of research, creating synergies between EU policies*", and increase impacts through process of genuine co-creation of knowledge, focusing on real problems and opportunities (EIP-AGRI, 2017). The European Commission, through its Horizon 2020 programme, has allocated funds to multi-actor projects for research and innovation since 2014 (EIP-AGRI 2015; EIP-AGRI 2017; EIP-AGRI 2020).

Multi-actor projects and multi-actor approaches in Horizon 2020 focus on linking science and business together.

The EU has allocated about one billion euros to fund around 180 multi-actor projects of interest to agriculture, forestry and rural development in the seven years of Horizon 2020 (2014-2020). These projects bring together partners from practice and research, to develop innovative solutions for concrete issues that European farmers, foresters and other rural actors are facing. (EIP-AGRI, 2020)

Previous EU-funded research projects focused on developing society via participation and multi-actor interfaces:

- ✓ **WeGovNow** has developed and piloted a new type of civic engagement platform that supports communication and collaboration between citizens, civil society and public agencies. The research shows that online tools and interactive maps can be used to collect opinions from citizens on behalf of local administration. https://cordis.europa.eu/article/id/386895-collective-participative-approaches-to-local-policy-challenges

- ✓ **netCommons** has fostered an alternative concept for internet access called Community Networks (CNs). These are bottom-up initiatives to build and operate local, collective infrastructures for internet access. This project showed that it is possible to operate and own community-based wired or wireless network infrastructures. https://cordis.europa.eu/article/id/314296-community-networks-target-a-more-democratic-and-socially-aware-internet

- ✓ **Civiciti** has contributed to the development of direct democracy through an online tool for voting. https://cordis.europa.eu/article/id/286128-civiciti-technology-at-the-service-of-participative-democracy

- ✓ **ENLARGE** has used gamification to help public agencies better leverage the full potential of collaborative policy-making. The project developed a gamebook for integrating the views of politicians and bureaucrats with those of civil society and citizens in the field of sustainable energy. https://cordis.europa.eu/article/id/386888-adventures-in-collaborative-policy-making

- ✓ **ALTERNATIVE** has gathered knowledge about the framing of social conflicts among organisations, and resources mobilised for the handling of conflicts in intercultural settings. Rather than shielding actor groups from conflict, the research found ways of enabling communication through methods such as engagement circles, training, workshops on nonviolent communication, and restorative learning groups. https://cordis.europa.eu/article/id/151383-security-and-justice-with-a-new-approach

- ✓ **DemoInChange** has analysed the relationships between civil society organisations (CSOs) and EU institutions as a basis for supranational participatory democracy. The results show that CSOs are limited by EU institutions, and by their often-informal rules about who will be heard or invited to (for instance) informal arenas of policy-making. Equality CSOs do not compete directly with each other over access to EU institutions, instead, they react flexibly to changing demands and forge new alliances. https://cordis.europa.eu/article/id/413302-the-interaction-of-eu-institutions-with-civil-society-key-to-improving-democracy

Experiences from European Association for Local Democracy (ALDA)

Virtual Insanity — The need for transparency in digital political advertising

Start from the national level to reach the European level

The first stage of the project was to look at the national level of political advertising. During the European Parliament elections in 2019, experts and research institutes conducted research in Italy, the Netherlands and the Czech Republic on monitoring the level to which tech-platforms comply with the Code of Practice against disinformation on matters related to digital political advertising.

The second stage was to publish and share the results at the country level, through a national policy dialogue. During this dialogue, the research findings were discussed and reflected upon with the relevant stakeholders and policy-makers.

The third stage is to reach the European Union level. At the EU level, the project will conduct a dynamic mapping of the relevant stakeholders and national policy and reform debates on digital political advertising, linking the national level to the EU level. Reaching the EU level does not mean to forget the work already done at the national level. On the contrary, it is significant to keep the link between the national and the EU level. The output of the research as well as the debates from each national policy dialogue are taken into account in the preparation of policy recommendations directed at politicians at the EU level.

Following many exchanges with stakeholders, the project will draft a Roadmap for Policy Change. This will be the action plan that paves the way for future advocacy efforts towards strengthening EU measures that guarantee transparency in digital political advertising. To reach the objectives of the Roadmap, a Joint Advocacy Plan will be drafted and implemented. To reach the EU level, the local, regional or national levels have to be part of the process and the outputs of every level have to be taken into account.

About the project

The Virtual Insanity project aims at strengthening EU-level policy that guarantees transparency in digital political advertising. This will be done through research and multi-stakeholder policy dialogue at the national and European levels, followed by coalition-based monitoring and advocacy efforts towards an EU-level policy.

Read more on ALDA website: https://www.alda-europe.eu/newSite/project_dett.php?ID=146
Author: Lisy Piter, Project Manager at ALDA

2.5. Motivations for creating Multi-Actor Platforms

Science-society-policy interfaces that include local actors can **deal with issues of a lack of trust** between local actors and central governments. Weakness in trust can be exacerbated in rural areas by the actual (e.g. physical distance)c or perceived remoteness of centres of decision-making (e.g. central or regional government) from the places affected by its decisions (Beer, 2014; Lewis, 2018). Large distances can be problematic for gaining high quality information on which policy-makers need to base their decisions. The use of statistics and desk-based research, which can often be carried out from a distance, may say a lot about a local situation, but it remains impersonal in comparison with listening to local people's stories about their day-to-day lives. Lewis (2018) says that what is understood by policy-makers as 'evidence', is often very different from capturing the diversity of voices among the people involved or impacted (Lewis 2018, p.

17). A mixed-method approach to collecting knowledge as basis for decision-making is therefore best for dealing with issues of a lack of trust. Combining statistics and desk-based research with methods which also include gathering experience-based knowledge (for example, interviews and focus groups), provides a far richer understanding of local and regional situations.

Positive effects have been identified in arrangements whereby researchers engage in different types of processes connecting social actors in the science-society-policy interface within rural areas. Connecting social actors can **contribute to transformations**, spreading them within and across communities and groups (Horling, 2016, p.35). Public participation creates the **opportunity to share local information with experts,** and enable the **creation of common visions for sustainable regional development** (Bourgoin *et al.*, 2011, p. 272). Processes which create inclusive learning environments can **enable the transformation of disadvantageous power relations** and the creation of truly **collaborative social learning** (Medema *et al.*, 2014, p. 24). These steps are crucial for **democratising decision-making processes** (Lowe *et al.*, 2019).

In their study of participatory approaches in spatial decision-making, McCall and Dunn (2012) acknowledge that the promotion of such approaches is often done for reasons of efficiency and effectiveness, relevance, responsiveness, and the believedlow cost involved. Public participation should also **foster a sense of ownership** of a plan or a decision, and commitment to its implementation.

From the research perspective, stakeholder participation and the co-production of knowledge is used to **ensure stakeholder relevance and the applicability of the research**, while also increasing the prospects of key stakeholders using and applying the research results (Kettle and Trainor, 2015; Zasada *et al.*, 2017, p. 65).

From the European policy level perspective, place-based approaches to rural development are favoured because they aim to **strengthen the resilience of rural areas** to withstand global pressures. They do this by decreasing state dependency, and by increasing the economic competitiveness of and innovations in rural areas (Wellbrock *et al.*, 2013).

In summary, if based on inclusiveness, previous research shows that science-society-policy interfaces can contribute to:

- greater trust between local and central actors, and governments;
- the transformation spreading beyond individuals;
- the creation of common visions for sustainable regional development;
- the transformation of disadvantageous power relations;
- collaborative learning;
- the democratising of knowledge processes;
- a sense of ownership;
- a commitment to the implementation of plans and decisions;
- ensuring stakeholder relevance, applicability and the use of research results; and
- strengthened resilience and economic competitiveness for rural areas.

3. Setting-up Multi-Actor Platforms in SHERPA

SHERPA will establish 40 regional MAPs in 20 European countries (20 in Phase 1, and another 20 in Phase 2), and one at the EU level. These platforms will be established based on, or closely aligned with, existing structures. They will engage a mix of actors from three target groups (researchers, policy-makers and society). Their remit will be to stimulate policy dialogue and engagement with citizens regarding rural development. Recommendations will be produced for developing modern rural policies at European, national and regional levels, and concrete proposals will be developed for future research agendas based on discussions within MAPs. In this regard, SHERPA MAPs are a way of establishing science-society-policy interfaces that facilitate collaboration on finding solutions to complex problems.

All three spheres of science, society and policy are expected to interact and collaborate within SHERPA. All SHERPA MAPs will correspondingly share methodological features, as outlined in this document. They will also have the freedom to set their own agenda and to choose appropriate methods of interaction.

The Facilitator and Monitor for each MAP can use the motivations for participation described in Section 2.5 of this document to explain why research and policy specialists believe that co-creation and co-learning in Multi-Actor Platforms are particularly useful, and hence the benefits of setting up the MAPs.

3.1. Principles for setting up Multi-Actor Platforms

Chartier *et al.* (2020; D1.2), confidential to the SHERPA consortium, establishes four guiding principles which underpin the approach and methods for setting-up and implementing MAPs. To make these principles accessible for people outside of SHERPA, we include them here as well:

First guiding principle: flexible programming

Adopt an approach of flexible programming to allow timely contributions to policy-making at the EU level. This flexibility concerns both content and timing. It will be achieved through the use of Dynamic Action Plans (DAPs). The aim of this approach is to guarantee timely contributions for the preparation of future policy, and to adapt functioning platforms to new needs and challenges as they arise.

Second guiding principle: co-construction

This means co-constructing recommendations for future policy and research requirements. Making practical recommendations that can be implemented for a future policy and research agenda requires a strongly participatory approach; one that gathers information on the needs and experience of the final beneficiaries of policy, and which involves other stakeholders. Within each of the MAPs, activity should be focused in a way that maintains discussion and dialogue with representatives of society (e.g. civic society bodies, citizens), alongside decision-makers in charge of designing future policies, and researchers. Members of the MAP should be able to express themselves freely and should be treated equally.

Third guiding principle: multi-level interactions

This is about ensuring fruitful interaction among actors at multiple levels of governance (from local to the EU). Consideration needs to be given to multiple levels of interaction within local, regional and national policy-making, to the European 'landscape', and to the global context. The outcomes of debates within the MAP will support the development of policies at the EU level. So each MAP will provide inputs (through MAP Position Papers) which will be discussed at EU level. Results will then be debated at the EU-level MAP and discussed as part of the next SHERPA annual conference. Outputs from MAPs, as presented in their Position Papers, will serve to formulate recommendations for future EU research agendas and rural policies.

Fourth guiding principle: impartiality and transparency

Impartiality and transparency will be ensured through three main mechanisms:

1. Multiple contributions and peer review: each public document produced by a MAP should be prepared by multiple contributors. Each document should be peer-reviewed.

2. Documentation: the outcomes of consultations and discussions organised within each MAP should be documented and should be available for scrutiny by members of the MAPs.

3. Publication: A summary of the Dynamic Action Plans and Position Papers prepared by MAPs will be made publicly available (i.e. they will be published on the project website).

These mechanisms will also apply to the EU-level MAP. 'MAP Position Papers' will be used to initiate discussions within the EU MAP. The members of the EU level MAP will prepare a first version of the 'SHERPA Position Paper'. MAP members will then be given the possibility of commenting upon this draft version. The topic and content of the final 'SHERPA Position Paper' will be discussed at the following annual conference.

3.2. Activities and outputs from SHERPA Multi-Actor Platforms

The SHERPA project will produce policy recommendations based on specific topics which are deemed relevant to rural areas. Each MAP will contribute to policy recommendations based on various MAP Position Papers. The MAP Position Papers will be based on research regarding the topic. They will be discussed in the MAP and will then feed policy debates concerning European rural development and the EU research agenda for rural areas, via the EU-level MAP. These regional and national MAPs are crucial for basing policy recommendations (arising from Position Papers) on insights from actors with local knowledge, which will be provided by members of the different MAPs. There are some minimum requirements regarding activities and outputs for each MAP. In addition to those, each MAP can decide whether they want to undertake further activity.

The minimum requirement per year, regarding activities, is holding one discussion meeting, contributing to social media communication, and sending at least one representative from the MAP to the SHERPA annual conference (see Table 1).

Table 1. Scale of minimum, desirable and outstanding **activity** per year for the regional and national MAPs

Activity scale	Discussion meetings	Representation in SHERPA annual conference	Contribution to social media communication on the topic discussed in your MAP
Minimum requirement	1 per year	Yes	Yes
Desirable	2 per year	Yes	Yes
Outstanding	3 per year	Yes	Yes

Note: Discussion meetings can be either face-to-face or online, depending on the set-up of the regional MAP.

As a minimum output, MAPs are expected to deliver one MAP Position Paper per year. In addition to this minimum requirement, it would be desirable if each MAP delivered regional or national output linked to discussions in the MAP. Such outputs could be in the form of written material (e.g. a report, a policy brief or an opinion piece); or other types of communication (e.g. a video) or deliberation mechanisms such as a seminar, a workshop or a presentation. See Table 2.

Table 2. Scale of minimum, desired and outstanding **output** per year for the regional and national MAPs

Output scale	MAP Position Paper	Regional or national output linked to the MAP discussions
Minimum requirement	1 per year	-
Desirable	2 per year	1 per year
Outstanding	3 per year	2 per year

3.3. Who should be involved?

Sattler *et al.* (2018) note that community-based approaches are based on partnerships between actors from all spheres of society. Other researchers describe and discuss the spheres as different helixes which come together to solve problems or to develop innovation in business (Refsgaard *et al.*, 2017).

In SHERPA, the specific aim is to include actors from the spheres of science, society and policy, in order to ensure the democratisation of knowledge and influence over those policies and topics which will be discussed in the MAPs. Examples of what types of actors pertain to which spheres are outlined below. It is important not to have to narrow a view of the three spheres, and to allow for a broad variety of governance systems in Europe to influence the process. The three spheres include the following types of actors:

- **Science –** Scientific actors, such as representatives from universities or research institutes, produce new knowledge on a range of issues which are important for the development of rural areas. They can either work independently, or on projects commissioned by public (or private) institutions. This means that they can influence policy-making or private business in different ways. While some voices will want research to have social relevance and therefore a direct use for public or private actors, other will criticise this stance, arguing that science should be independent of its social context to avoid possible bias. Science members of SHERPA MAPs can be, for example, researchers with national or regional knowledge of rural areas. These researchers may have expertise in rural development, agriculture, bioeconomy, or any other rural topic of relevance to the MAP. Preferably, researchers should have documented expertise in research concerning rural areas.

- **Society –** In SHERPA, society includes private companies, NGOs and civil society organisations, as well as citizens. The r opportunities for private companies and citizens will be affected by rural policy. By engaging in MAPs these actors can influence the shaping of the opportunities. Civil society organisations are actors advocating the interests of specific groups or causes, such as farmers' rights, the inclusion of young people in policy-making, the future well-being of people in areas of depopulation , or the mitigation of climate change. Societal members in SHERPA MAPs can be, for example, actors in civil society organisations, non-governmental organisations, private businesses or citizens interested in rural issues.

  Policy – In the context of the composition of the Multi-Actor Platforms, policy can have different forms of representation. The most important aspects for SHERPA is that they have a formal role in the design, approval or implementation of public policy. i) Elected representatives formulate policy within the remits of the institutions to which they belong (e.g. national, regional local government; elected to bodies with responsibilities for polices, such as National Parks; elected to structures in community government with limited resource but with statutory powers). ii) Officials in a public authority, responsible for developing or implementing policies (at national, regional or local levels).

iii) Private sector with responsibilities for developing or implementing policy (e.g. roles outsourced to business through public procurement).

In each MAP there should be at least three or four representatives from each of the three spheres. The minimum number of active members in each Multi-Actor Platform is 10. Guests or External stakeholders can be invited for the meetings and activities of the MAP. These can have specific knowledge or interests in the particular topic of the MAP discussions and Position Paper. There are no limitations on how many guests are included, but it would be wise to reflect on the size of the group as the number of people in a meeting clearly affects the possibilities for effective dialogue.

A wide variety of actors is an important way of ensuring that a multitude of voices and perspectives are included in the MAP Position Paper. Based on their national and regional expertise, the Facilitator and Monitor for the regional MAPs are tasked with identifying and inviting the most suitable organisations or individuals to participate in each MAP. To facilitate this selection process, a list of relevant criteria has been drawn up. Table 4 lists criteria for the selection of MAP members, building on those of Budniok *et al.* (2018).

Table 3. Criteria to select MAP members.

Criteria	Description
Interest and Willingness	Actors should demonstrate an interest in being engaged in the co-creation of knowledge for rural policy and research. Actors will be selected for their willingness to share their own knowledge and to listen to others. For MAPs to work effectively, actors need to be willing to share their own opinions, to listen to others, and to take the concerns or points of view of other actors into consideration.
Availability/Commitment	Actors will be asked if they can make a commitment to being part of a MAP for one phase. It is valuable for the groups of people who make up each MAP to remain consistent over the course of the project, so that the members get to know each other, build mutual trust, and become more comfortable in participating in a spirit of openness. Changes in membership or composition of the MAPs over time may hinder the capacity of the group to work together effectively.
Balance	The relevance of each actor should be considered with respect to their relationship with the types of groups identified for the EU-level MAP, and the regional MAPs (e.g. actors from science, society and policy). The composition of membership of the MAP as a whole – with regard to the roles of members – will be considered, in order to ensure that is balanced in terms of the different types of stakeholder, views, approaches, etc. No group should be disproportionately represented in a MAP, because that may render its purpose ineffective.
Representativeness	An actor can be considered as a representative of a group (institution, company, organisation, etc.) or as an individual. The facilitator and monitor will evaluate this status based on their participation in existing networks, or whether they are part of a membership organisation. Invitations to actors will specify whether they are representing an organisation or attending as individuals.
Gender	Efforts will be made to ensure gender balance in the membership of MAPs.

Age	Efforts will be made to ensure a range of ages for members in MAPs.
Actor Groups	To ensure the co-creation of knowledge across different spheres of society, the regional MAPs will be formed of three main actor groups: • Science (e.g. researcher with national or regional knowledge of rural areas). Researchers should have expertise in rural development, agriculture, bioeconomy or other rural topic of relevance for the regional MAP. Note that the researchers should preferably have a formal qualification and/or relevant expertise in researching rural areas. • Society (e.g. civil society organisation, NGO representative, private business, or citizen actively engaged in rural topics). • Policy (e.g. elected politician or official working at public authority at local, regional or national level).
Geographical Distribution	Efforts should be made to ensure that MAPs include representation in terms of locally significant geographical variations. Efforts will be made to ensure that members of the EU-level MAP are drawn from across Europe to bring perspectives linked to their region (e.g. Eastern Europe, Central Europe, the Mediterranean, and North-West Europe).

Source: Authors, based on Budniok *et al.* (2018).

Using the criteria set out in Table 3 can help avoid including only 'the usual suspects' within the Multi-Actor Platforms. They are applicable to recruiting people who do or do not belong to an organisation.

Consideration should be given to the types of contexts of potential recruits to the Platforms. That includes showing flexibility for when and how meetings are set up, noting that civil society organisations are usually based on voluntary work and meetings are after regular working hours, or employment regulations of some organisations may prohibit them being represented outwith specified working hours.

3.4. Power to influence decisions

Power is an important yet intricate aspect of science-society-policy interfaces (Medema *et al.*, 2014; Zasada *et al.*, 2017, p. 65). Importantly, power does not have to be about 'winning' or 'losing', but rather about influencing others (Beer, 2014, p. 261). In SHERPA, what is meant by power is a neo-Foucauldian understanding of power – concerned with the 'power to', rather than with the 'power over' (Beer, 2014, p. 256). The power to influence political decisions is a core motivation for actors engaging in participatory processes.

Power dimensions also influence group constellations. How the members in a MAP act, speak and engage is influenced by who they are, how they perceive themselves, and how they perceive each other. This means that the actors involved shape the interactions possible within the arrangements made. It is unavoidable that who we are shapes the interactions that exist between us as humans (Wyborn, 2015). If a member of a Platform do not feel secure in a group due to their social status in relation to other group members, it can be challenging to speak up and state their opinion. To help resolve this, and for the purposes of setting-up and running a Multi-Actor Platform, which really does let all actors influence its decisions, it is important that the Facilitator and Monitor selects and applies methods of interaction that include different stakeholders' viewpoints, adding science-based and experienced-based knowledge, and process-based methods (Bryden and Gezelius, 2017; Dockes *et al.*, 2013; Horlings 2016; Medema *et al.*, 2014; Sattler *et al.*, 2018; Zasada *et al.*, 2017).

Science-based knowledge provides one a way to structure the creation of knowledge through evidence-based methods, which uses new knowledge based on theory and previous research. Experience-based knowledge is generated by practice, such as carrying out a specific task, or living or being embedded in a place in order to acquire local knowledge (e.g. about what it is like to live or work there). The process adopted by SHERPA aims to use both types of knowledge, by basing discussions about a topic in a MAP (experience-based knowledge) on a foundation of research on that specific topic (science-based knowledge). To ensure this knowledge integration, the processes that will take place within each MAP aims to be based on process-based methods. Process-based methods are explained further in the next section.

3.5. Process-based methods for co-learning and co-creation in Multi-Actor Platforms

In SHERPA, process-based methods for co-learning and co-creation start before face-to-face meetings take place, and continue after they conclude. Careful planning of activities before and after meetings is key to ensuring good levels of engagement, for achieving common understanding, and for capturing the reflections of the involved stakeholders. In the SHERPA process for co-learning and co-creation, face-to-face meetings are of primary importance, and complement any other online interactions. Using face-to-face meetings enables personal chemistry, cultural differences and ideological concerns to be acknowledged, and to influence the process (Horlings 2016, p. 37). Using face-to-face meetings can also facilitate the integration of tacit knowledge into the co-creating process.

To enable co-learning and co-creation, a combination of research-based and experience-based knowledge is crucial. In order not to get caught in traditional power relations or hierarchies, it is important that MAP meetings are experienced as a safe space to raise different opinions or experiences. The Facilitator and Monitor need to create such a safe space throughout the process. To achieve this, it is useful to apply methods that enable people to get to know each other, to use means of communication that value everyone's experiences, and to select methods that enable active listening and group reflection. For each of these purposes, some direct methods are summarised below:

Methods that help people get to know each other:

- **Roundtable introductions** with the addition of a personal aspect, such as a favourite food or favourite landscape.
- **Group walks,** to find one thing outside that represents what rural development means to you. The objects are placed on a big table when you come back in, and all participants are given the opportunity to explain why they have chosen it.
- **Study tours,** visiting a site relevant to the topic in order give the group a shared experience.

Methods that encourage dialogue so as to invite everyone to talk about their experiences:

- Make sure always to **start MAP discussions by sharing evidence from, or the results of, research**. This provides a common framework for the ensuing discussion and enables people to achieve a shared level of knowledge on a topic before offering insights from their own experience. Share the research results by presenting the key recommendations from the SHERPA discussion paper or invite regional experts to present the results of their research. Inspiration for how to present and discuss different topics can be found at the Knowledge for Policy website of the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (European Commission, 2020).

- **Use open questions**, such as:
  - "What is your view of the research that was presented?"
  - "How does this relate to your experience?"
  - "What is your experience of [topic] in your [region and/or country]?"

- If **not everyone feels comfortable speaking**, ask all actors to contribute to the discussion through written responses on notes, cards, or online survey tools – such as Mentimeter's interactive presentation software.

- **If someone takes up a lot of time in a meeting**, say something like:
    - o "I'm sorry to interrupt you, and thanks for sharing. There's a lot of food for thought there. But to get through the agenda we need to move on to [next person or next point on the agenda]"
    - o "I'm sorry to interrupt; we have noted your opinion, and now we want to hear from others. What do you think [person's name]?"

- <u>**If a debate is heated and the participants cannot agree**</u>, ask yourself the following questions:
    - o Is agreement or a shared view necessary?

    - o Is disagreement caused by misunderstanding, or by lack of trust?

    - o On what issues do they agree? For example, on a long-term perspective.

- If necessary, **try to <u>calm the situation</u>** by saying something like:
    - o "I hear that people are saying different things. That's okay. We can include both these viewpoints/opinions in the Position Paper."
    - o "At the moment there's a lot of negative energy in this discussion. I suggest we take a break for ten minutes."
    - o "We are aware that the topic of today's discussion is controversial. That's why we want to have the discussion with you as local experts, to try to find solutions and agree on next steps."
    - o "It seems that we can't come to a consensus on the best way forward. Can we take a break and let the facilitator suggest how to proceed afterwards?"

During the MAP discussions, there can be, and probably will be, divergence between MAP members regarding a given topic. In those situations, we should first see if it is possible to reach a consensus among participants. If consensus cannot be reached, then please document the divergence so that it is clear that there is a difference of perspectives on the issue, or solutions to the problem.

<u>**Methods that enable active listening and group reflection**</u>:

- Hold a **group reflection** session. Give out specific roles for group discussions involving three people A, B, C, below.
  The role of A: talk about the experience of [topic] for five minutes.
  The role of B: listen actively, summarise what A says, and if needed ask questions.
  The role of C: write down what A says and summarise what A has said.
  The three people take turns to be the role of A, B and C during the session.
- **Use silence** as a method to allow time for reflection on what has been said. After a presentation, you can say, "Please be quiet for two minutes and think about what [name of person] said. Then write down one thing that you thought was particularly interesting".
- Use the online tool Mentimeter (or similar) to create a **shared word cloud**. Use the word cloud to obtain an indication what the group thinks was the most important to work on going forward.

3.6. Monitoring and Evaluation of the MAP process

Monitoring and evaluation of activities and their effects are intrinsic parts of co-creation and co-learning in MAPs, and therefore an ongoing part of the MAP process. Successful implementation of monitoring and evaluation enables refinement of the approach while running the MAPs, drawing on and sharing the lessons learned.

For SHERPA, the central learning question is: How do we effectively set up, support and run Multi-Actor Platforms in order to engage science, society and policy actors in a meaningful way in a policy and research agenda on rural development?

In order to be able to answer this question, a SHERPA Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is developed (Task 6.2), which includes the following aspects:

- **Composition:** History, socio-economic factors, political context, members, institutional setting, organisation.
- **Input and support:** Use and usefulness of the input provided (SHERPA discussion paper, MAP discussion paper, expertise, information) as perceived by the stakeholders.
- **MAP dynamics**: Activities, methods used, co-creation of knowledge, engagement, influence/power, successes and drawbacks, and interest in continuation of the MAP.
- **Results**: MAP Position Papers and other regional or national outputs, identification with results, perceived value of the MAP process, the impact on the SHERPA Position Paper, indications of an effect on policy or research at local, regional, national or EU level.

These aspects are monitored by 1) observations on the basis of the templates provided; 2) enquiry or survey of MAP participants; 3) keeping a MAP journal, to reflect upon relevant events; and 4) creating moments for reflection within the MAP team and the MAP process. A M&E plan for SHERPA provides guidance for each MAP to monitor, a means to evaluate the MAP process, and for drawing out lessons that may be learned about the MAP process during the M&E workshops.

3.7. Ensure longevity and territorial representativity

The SHERPA project explicitly aims to establish MAPs that continue to function beyond the SHERPA project timeline. Approximately half of the SHERPA MAPs (ten platforms) in phase 1 are newly established, operating with support from external funding from the Horizon 2020 Programme. The fact that they are externally funded can create challenges for the longevity of these MAPs (as was noted in section 2.4, above). The other half of the SHERPA MAPs (ten platforms) had been set up before SHERPA started. In these cases, the challenge for longevity might be in relation to networks and procedures for engagement that can also be used after the end of the SHERPA project. To increase the prospects for the continuation of the SHERPA MAPs over time, concise planning, continuous updating of information, clear ideas about costs and benefits, and a link to the 'community of practice', are all required. Monitoring and evaluation of the MAPs also provide information with which to confront the challenges.

To increase the prospects of operation of the MAPs post-SHERPA the following considerations are proposed for the set-up phase:

- Work with existing MAPs and/or link the MAP to existing governance structures in the regional context from the outset (e.g. leadership groups, public authorities or civil society-based networks).

- Include on regional and national policy processes, as well as international and EU-level agreements.

- Focus on empowering local MAPs to voice their perspectives.

- Design procedures and channels for communication in such a way that they can continue to be used after the end of the project.

- Include consideration of engagement at the EU level in the development of the procedures and channels of communication and define responsibilities for members of MAPs after SHERPA-project has ended.

The degree of (territorial) representativeness of MAPs is central to ensuring that the different geographies of rural areas in the EU (mountains/coast/plains, etc.) are included. To facilitate (territorial) representativeness at the European level, SHERPA grant agreement state that the D5.1 shall include "data

for identifying regions (version 2)". However, as the implementation and development of SHERPA MAPs have resulted in MAPs having actor groups with a combination of national and regional representation it is not consider fruitful to only do a mapping based on a rural typology or territorial representativeness. Instead, the lessons learned and checklists from first phase MAPs (presented in Potters et al. 2021, SHERPA deliverable 6.2, and the non-public SHERPA deliverable 5.2) will be used to select the types of the second phase MAPs, and influence the further composition, preparation, input, MAP dialogue, output, and overall process.

APProach — Online and offline communication tools: a great mix to engage citizens

A way to engage people is to use different communication tools. To reach a certain target group, it is important to know which communication channel best reaches this group and which tool to use to engage them in the process.

In the APProach project the target group is European Mobile Citizens and their existing networks. The project used a combination of online tools and face-to-face meetings.

The online tools were mainly online surveys to have the views and opinions of the citizens. As a tool the online survey can be adapted to a large multi-language audience by conducting the survey in parallel in several languages.

Face-to-face meetings are also very useful to involve citizens, such as focus groups. These 'offline' meetings are carried out in each municipality involving staff from local authorities and EU mobile citizens from the existing networks. Organising focus groups or working groups shows the target group that they are important and we are involving them in the process and their views can have an impact on the project. It is a co-creation process.

The most important thing is to identify which tools are the best for your target group. Otherwise, the process of co-creation and co-learning can be hindered.

About the project

APProach is a pilot project targeting EU mobile citizens (i.e. EU citizens that are residents in another EU country), to help them have better communication with their welcoming city. A digital ecosystem was designed with the active participation of EU mobile citizens and the partner cities.

Read more on ALDA website:
https://www.alda-europe.eu/newSite/project_dett.php?ID=124

Author: Lisy Piter, Project Manager at ALDA.

Mind Inclusion 2.0 — A multi-actor group to design an app

The project Mind Inclusion 2.0 organised various working sessions with actors not used to work together, to co-create an app. The sessions are organised at the local level in Spain, Italy and Lithuania.

The working groups are composed of a mix of actors: Intellectual Disability Persons (IDP), Caregivers, Health professionals and Manager of public spaces. The three first groups are often working together, while managers of public spaces are seldom involved. Nevertheless, managers of public spaces must be part of the session in order to hear and understand the daily issues of the IDP and their caregivers.

During these sessions, each actor has the opportunity to express his or her own opinion. They are moderated and facilitated by a Social Educator, Researcher or an IT developer. Having the support and views of the research and an IT company helps to understand how science and technology can help.

The combination of knowledge, experiences and views of these actors is a real added-value, for the development of the app, and of the project as a whole. And most importantly, it has helped to create a common vision on the inclusion and integration of the disabled people in social and civic life.

A multi-actor working group or platform is the opportunity to have a great reserve of knowledge and to build a solid group of people with ideas to share.

About the project

Mind Inclusion 2.0 is a European project funded by the programme Erasmus+. This project aims to find sustainable and inclusive solutions to help caregivers improve their skills and allow disabled individuals to participate in social life.

Read more on ALDA website: https://www.alda-europe.eu/newSite/project_dett.php?ID=133

Author: Lisy Piter, Project Manager at ALDA

4.   Acknowledgements

5.   References

Beer, A. (2014). Leadership and the governance of rural communities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 34, 254-262. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.01.007

Brown, A. V. (2008). *A Collective Social Learning Pattern.* Paper at EuroPLOP Workshop, Klosters Irsee, Bavaria, July 9-13, 2008

Bryden, J., and Gezelius, S. S. (2017). Innovation as if people mattered: the ethics of innovation for sustainable development. *Innovation and Development, 7*(1), 101-118. doi:10.1080/2157930X.2017.1281208

Budniok, M-A., Howe, M., Miles, B., Vlahos, G., Smyrniotopoulou, A., Irvine, K.N., Miller, D. and Schwarz, G. (2018). *Deliverable 7.1 Guidelines for the Selection of Multi-Actor Platform (MAP) Members.* Understanding & Improving the Sustainability of Agro-Ecological Farming Systems in the EU. Available online at: https://uniseco-project.eu/resources, accessed 2019-12-04

Bourgoin, J., Castella, J.-C., Pullar, D., Lestrelin, G., and Bouahom, B. (2012). Toward a land zoning negotiation support platform:"tips and tricks" for participatory land-use planning in Laos. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 104(2), 270-278.

Chartier, O., Salle, E., Miller, D. and Martino, G. (2020). *Deliverable 1.2 Working Principles of the Multi-Actor Platforms*, SHERPA Project, Report to the European Commission. pp. 19.

Council of Europe (2000). European Landscape Convention and reference documents. Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural F-67075 STRASBOURG Cedex France www.coe.int/EuropeanLandscapeConvention, accessed 2020-03-19

Dockes, A-C., Barjolle, D., and Bourdin, D. (2013). *THE "SOLINSA APPROACH" TO SUPPORT LINSA.* Innovation brokers training course. Solinsa.net. FP7: project nr 266306.

Edwards-Schachter, M., and Wallace, M. L. (2017). 'Shaken, but not stirred': Sixty years of defining social innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 119, 64-79. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.03.012

EIP-AGRI (2015). EIP-AGRI Brochure on Participatory approaches for agricultural innovation. pp.12. https://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/en/publications/eip-agri-brochure-participatory-approaches, accessed 2020-03-19

EIP-AGRI (2017). Horizon 2020 Multi-Actor Projects. European Commission, DG Agri, EIP-Agri, pp.8. https://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/en/publications/eip-agri-brochure-horizon-2020-multi-actor, accessed 2020-03-19

EIP-AGRI (2020) Multi-actor projects: scientists and farmers creating solutions together. https://ec.europa.eu/eip/agriculture/en/about/multi-actor-projects-scientists-and-farmers, accessed 2020-03-19

ERND homepage (2020). LAG Database. https://enrd.ec.europa.eu/leader-clld/lag-database_en, accessed 2020-03-20

European Commission (2016). A Strategic Approach to EU Agricultural Research & Innovation: Final Paper. European Commission, DG Agri, EIP-Agri, pp. 40.

European Commission (2020). Knowledge for policy site. https://ec.europa.eu/knowledge4policy/, accessed 2020-03-19

European Committee of the Regions (2019). *Network of Regional Hubs for EU Policy*. Implementation Review. Implementation Report. First Consultation on Public Procurement. https://cor.europa.eu/en/engage/Documents/RegHub/report-first-consultation-public-procurement.pdf, accessed 2019-09-16

European Investment Fund (2020). https://www.eif.org/what_we_do/microfinance/easi/easi-guarantee-instrument/index.htm, accessed 2020-03-27

European Rural Parliament (2019). http://europeanruralparliament.com/, accessed 2019-12-04

European Social Fund (2013). ESF Regulation. Regulation (EU) No 1304/2013. https://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=33&langId=en, accessed 2020-03-27

European Social Fund (2020). https://ec.europa.eu/esf/home.jsp, accessed 2020-03-27

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2016). A good practice on multi-actor dialogue - The Voluntary Guidelines at the heart of Senegal's tenure reform. Available online at http://www.fao.org/3/i6271en/I6271EN.pdf

Geels, F.W. (2019). Socio-technical transitions to sustainability: a review of criticisms and elaborations of the Multi-Level Perspective, *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 39: 187-201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.06.009.

Haxeltine, A., Pel, B., Dumitru, A., Kemp, R., Avelino, F., Jørgensen, M. S., Wittmayer, J., Kunze, I., Dorland, J. and Bauler, T. (2017). *TRANSIT WP3 Deliverable 3.4: Consolidated Version of TSI Theory. July 2017. Transformative Social Innovation Theory project.* TRANSIT: EU SSH.2013.3.2-1 Grant agreement no: 613169.

Hela Sverige Ska Leva (2019). https://helasverige.se/, accessed 2019-12-04

Hodge, I. (2007). The Governance of Rural Land in a Liberalised World. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 58(3), 409-432. doi:10.1111/j.1477-9552.2007.00124.x

Horlings, L. G. (2016). Connecting people to place: sustainable place-shaping practices as transformative power. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 20*, 32-40. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2016.05.003

Ingram, J. (2018). Agricultural transition: Niche and regime knowledge systems' boundary dynamics. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 26, 117-135. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2017.05.001

Isaksson, K. and Heikkinen, S. (2018). Sustainability Transitions at the Frontline. Lock-in and Potential for Change in the Local Planning Arena. *Sustainability*, 10(3):840.

Janowski, T., Estevez, E., & Baguma, R. (2018). Platform governance for sustainable development: Reshaping citizen-administration relationships in the digital age. *Government Information Quarterly, 35*(4, Supplement), S1-S16. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2018.09.002

Kemp, R. and Loorbach. D. (2006). Transition management: a reflexive governance approach. In: J-P.Voss, D. Bauknecht, and R. Kemp, editors. Reflexive governance and sustainable development. Edward Elgar, Camberley, UK. pp.103-130.

Kemp, R., Parto, S., and Gibson, R. B. (2005). Governance for sustainable development: moving from theory to practice. *International journal of sustainable development, 8*(1-2), 12-30.

Kettle, N. P., and Trainor, S. F. (2015). The role of remote engagement in supporting boundary chain networks across Alaska. *Climate Risk Management*, 9, 6-19. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2015.06.006

Kivimaa, P., Bergek, A., Matschoss, K. and van Lente, H. (2020). Intermediaries in accelerating transitions: Introduction to the special issue, *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 36, 372-377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2020.03.004.

Kivimaa, P., Boon, W., Hyysalo, S., and Klerkx, L. (2019). Towards a typology of intermediaries in sustainability transitions: A systematic review and a research agenda. *Research Policy, 48*(4), 1062-1075. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.10.006

Kluvánková, T., Nijnik, M., Spacek, M., Sarkki, S., Lukesch, R., Perkel, R., Melnykovych, M., Valero, D., Brnkalakova, S. (2021). Social innovation for sustainability transformation and its diverging paths in marginalised rural areas. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 61: 1630189.

Koopmans, M., Rogge, E., Mettepenningen, E., Knickel, K., and Šūmane, S. (2018). The role of multi-actor governance in aligning farm modernization and sustainable rural development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Volume 59, 252-262. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.03.012.

Larsson, H., and Grönlund, Å. (2014). Future-oriented eGovernance: The sustainability concept in eGov research, and ways forward. *Government Information Quarterly, 31*(1), 137-149. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.07.004

Lewis, D. (2018). Peopling policy processes? Methodological populism in the Bangladesh health and education sectors. World Development, 108, 16-27. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.03.012

Lo Piparo, L. and Nieto, E. (2020). *D2.3 Online stakeholder engagement support tool*, SHERPA Project, Report to the European Commission. pp.49.

Lowe, P., Phillipson, J., Proctor, A., and Gkartzios, M. (2019). Expertise in rural development: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *World Development*, 116, 28-37. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.12.005

McCall, M. K., & Dunn, C. E. (2012). Geo-information tools for participatory spatial planning: Fulfilling the criteria for 'good'governance? *Geoforum*, 43(1), 81-94.

Mazzocchi, G., Prosperi. P., Rolandi S. and Brunori, G. (2020). *D6.1 Synthesis report of the initial Dynamic Action Plans for 20 Multi-Actor Platforms*, SHERPA Project, Report to the European Commission. pp. 33.

Medema, W. J., Wals, A. E. J., & Adamowski, J. (2014). Multi-loop social learning for sustainable land and water governance: Towards a research agenda on the potential of virtual learning platforms. *NJAS Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences, 69*, 23-38.

Miller, D., Chartier, O. and Salle, E. (2020). *D8.1: Human (H) Requirement No. 1. Deliverable 8.1*, Sustainable Hub to Engage into Rural Policies with Actors (SHERPA). Report to the European Commission.

Neßhöver, C., ten Brink, P., Balian, E., van den Hove, S., Vandewalle, M., Watt, A., Wittmer H., and Young, J. (2014). Summary report and recommendations on Improving the Science-Policy Interface for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in Europe. DG Environment contract: Towards an EU mechanism interfacing science and policy on biodiversity and ecosystem services (Reference No. 07-0307/2013/661961/SER/B2).

Polman, N., Slee, W., Kluvánková, T., Dijkshoorn, M., Nijnik, M., Gezik, V. and Soma, K. (2017). Classification of Social Innovations for Marginalized Rural Areas. Deliverable 2.1, Social Innovation in Marginalised Rural Areas (SIMRA). Report to the European Commission. pp.32.

Poocharoen, O.-o., and Sovacool, B. K. (2012). Exploring the challenges of energy and resources network governance. *Energy Policy, 42*, 409-418. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.12.005

Potters, J., Bulten, E., and Vermue, A. *D6.2 Findings of monitoring and evaluation (phase 1)*, SHERPA Project, Report to the European Commission. pp.27

Ravazzoli, E., Dalla Torre, C., Da Re, R., Govigli, V.M., Secco, L., Górriz-Mifsud, E., Pisani, E., Barlagne, C., Baselice, A., Bengoumi, M., Dijkshoorn-Dekker, M., Labidi, A., Lopolito, A., Melnykovych, M., Perlik, M., Polman, N., Sarkki, S., Manfred Perlik, Nico Polman, Simo Sarkki, Vassilopoulos, A., Koundouri, P., Miller, D.R., Streifeneder, T. and Nijnik, M. (2021). Can social innovation make a change in European and Mediterranean marginalized areas? Social innovation impact assessment in agriculture, fisheries, forestry and rural development. *Sustainability, 13, Article No. 1823.*

Refsgaard, K., Bryden, J., and Kvakkestad, V. (2017). Towards inclusive innovation praxis in forest-based bioenergy. *Innovation and Development, 7*(1), 153-173. doi:10.1080/2157930X.2017.1281343

Rip, A. and Kemp, R. (1998). "Technological change." In S. Rayner and E. Malone (eds.) Human Choices and Climate Change, Vol. 2, 327-399. Battelle, Columbus, Ohio.

Roberts, J. (2018). Carlos Moedas: The EU will fund more social innovation because it's the future of innovation. Article in *Horizon – the EU Research Innovation Magazine*. Published 07 November 2018, https://horizon-magazine.eu/article/carlos-moedas-eu-will-fund-more-social-innovation-because-it-s-future-innovation.html, accessed 2020-03-27

Sattler, C., Loft, L., Mann, C., & Meyer, C. (2018). Methods in ecosystem services governance analysis: An introduction. *Ecosystem Services, 34*, 155-168. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2018.11.007

Secco, L., Pisani, E., Da Re, R., Rogelja, T., Burlando, C., Vicentini, K., Pettenella, D., Masiero, M., Miller, D.R. and Nijnik, M. (2019). Towards a method of evaluating social innovation in forest-dependent communities: First suggestions from a science-stakeholder collaboration. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 104: 9-22.

SIMRA homepage (2020) http://www.simra-h2020.eu/, accessed 2020-03-27

Slee, B. and Mosdale, L. (2020). How policy can help bring about social innovation in rural areas. Policy brief (document produced within the framework of the H2020 founded SIMRA project).

Slee, B., Miller, D., Weiß, G., Ludvig, A., Zivojinovic, I. and Lukesch, R. (2020). Practice Guide 1: Social Innovation for Policy Target Groups, Deliverable D6.3, Social Innovation in Marginalised Rural Areas. Report to the European Commission. pp. 26. (document produced within the framework of the H2020 founded SIMRA project).

Smith, A. and Stirling, A. (2010). The politics of social-ecological resilience and sustainable socio-technical transitions. *Ecology and Society* 15(1): 11. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss1/art11/

UNECE (1998). Convention on access to information, public participatoin in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. pp25. https://www.unece.org/env/pp/introduction.html, accessed 2020-03-19

Valerie project site (2020). http://www.valerie.eu/, accessed 2020-03-19

Van Bommel, S., Röling, N., Aarts, N. and E. Turnhout (2009). Social learning for solving complex problems: a promising solution or wishful thinking? A case study of multi-actor negotiation for the integrated management and sustainable use of the Drentsche Aa area in the Netherlands. Environmental Policy and Governance, 19, 400-412. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.526.

Van Dyck, B. and Van den Broeck, P. (2013). Social innovation: a territorial process. Chapter 2.4 in "International handbook on social innovation". Editors Moulaert, F., MacCallum, D., Mehmood, A., Hamdouch, A., and Edward Elgar.

Wellbrock, W., Roep, D., Mahon, M., Kairyte, E., Nienaber, B., Domínguez García, M. D., Kriszan, M. and Farrell, M. (2013). Arranging public support to unfold collaborative modes of governance in rural areas. Journal of Rural Studies, 32, 420-429. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2013.10.002

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). Our Common Future. http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf, accessed 2020-03-19

Wyborn, C. (2015). Co-productive governance: A relational framework for adaptive governance. Global Environmental Change, 30, 56-67. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.10.009

Zasada, I., Piorr, A., Novo, P., Villanueva, A. J., and Valánszki, I. (2017). What do we know about decision support systems for landscape and environmental management? A review and expert survey within EU research projects. *Environmental Modelling & Software, 98*, 63-74. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2017.09.012

6.   Annex: Methods for developing support to MAPs in SHERPA

Initially SHERPA partners took the following steps to develop support for MAPs in SHERPA October 2019-March 2020.

1.   Literature review

A literature review of existing science-society-policy interfaces in Europe, and elsewhere in the world, was performed in order to provide an overview of the governance and nature of relationships, forms of engagement, and participation in such interfaces. In other words, the aim of the literature review was to guide the development of WP5 in SHERPA. The method and results of literature review is described in chapter 2 of this deliverable, although the whole report is written with the scientific literature and lessons from previous studies as a basis.

2.   Developing templates for setting up MAPs based on the literature review

Based on the literature review and dialogue within the SHERPA consortium, the following templates were developed to guide the facilitators and monitors when setting up MAPs:

- Invitation
- Information sheet
- Consent form

These comply with the requirements of the Grant Agreement regarding ethical processes, described in Miller *et al.*, 2020 (D8.1).

3. Training workshop for facilitators and monitors

The workshop on 16 January 2020, was organised by Nordregio and the SHERPA partners Wageningen Research, University of Pisa and the European Association for Information on Local Development (AEIDL). The aim of the workshop was to train facilitators and monitors on how to facilitate and monitor SHERPA Multi-Actor Platforms, and to update already experienced facilitators and monitors about their roles. After the workshop, the presentations and the notes from the day were shared with the participants.

4. Follow-up training workshop

A targeted e-mail, with detailed information from the workshop and potential time slots for questions, was sent to those unable to attend the workshop, but who will be SHERPA facilitators or monitors.

AEIDL set up an online platform for sharing documents, asking questions, and peer-to-peer discussions between the facilitators and monitors. It is accessible for partners who will be SHERPA facilitators and monitors. Messages about lessons learned from some previous EU-funded projects, and concerning online engagement, were written and uploaded to the SHERPA online platform for facilitators and monitors to access.

5. Organise ongoing support to MAP teams

Support and feedback to the MAP teams (that is the facilitator and monitor) is designed to make MAPs work better. SHERPA will elaborate and test appropriate channels for providing support to MAP teams, such as:

- Peer-to-peer groups of two to five MAP teams providing mutual inspiration and support.

- Each MAP team will be supported by a team member from Wageningen Research as a main contact point. The aim is to support the peer-to-peer group, provide feedback to MAP teams, be a contact person and sounding board for MAPs, facilitate communication between SHERPA and MAPs, and support M&E and learning.

- Exchange webinar: on specific occasions, webinars can be organised to exchange experiences between MAPs. They can also be used for specific themes or instructions (e.g. on monitoring and evaluation, on review of research results, and on the development of EU rural policy).