

Service contract for the establishment of additional regional/local platforms on coexistence between people and large carnivores

Contract nr. 07.027739/2018/792763/SER/ENV.D.3



Report: Fact finding missions in Finland and Sweden (27-29/05/2019 and 17-19/06/2019)

Valeria Salvatori, Estelle Balian, Paola Fazzi



July 2019

Table of contents

1. Context.....	3
2. Purpose of this report.....	4
3. Brief timeline of the mission.....	4
4. Purpose of the mission.....	4
5. General approach to our intervention.....	5
6. The meetings.....	5
6.1 Persons met.....	5
6.2 Meeting procedure.....	6
6.3 Results.....	6
6.3.1 Issues.....	7
6.3.1.1 The fear for wolf	7
6.3.1.2 Impact of wolf on livestock and reindeer production.....	7
6.3.1.3 Impact of wolf on hunting practices.....	8
6.3.1.4 Issues of wolf population density and isolation, and illegal killing.....	8
6.3.1.5 Possibility to establish a local platform in Sweden / Finland.....	9
6.3.2 Identified parties.....	9
7. The conclusions from the mission (next steps).....	10
7.1 Helping to set up a regional platform in Sweden and Finland	10
8. Annexes.....	11
8.1 The members of the mission.....	11
8.2 Questionnaire.....	11

This report was prepared by Valeria Salvatori, Estelle Balian and Paola Fazzi following a visit in Finland and Sweden within the activities planned for the Service contract for the establishment of additional regional/local platforms on coexistence between people and large carnivores. The opinions and evaluations contained are those of the authors and do not reflect the position of the European Commission.

1. Context

The mission described in this report was carried out by Valeria Salvatori and Paola Fazzi (Istituto di Ecologia Applicata) and Estelle Balian (FEAL) in the framework of a service contract with the European Commission Directorate-General for Environment (Contract nr. 07.027739/2018/792763/SER/ENV.D.3). This service contract foresees “the establishment of additional regional/local platforms on coexistence between people and large carnivores” with respect to the ones already established within contract 07.027739/2017/771819/SER/ENV.D.3.

The impacts of large carnivores – notably bear, wolf, and lynx - recently have intensified with regard to a wide range of human activities, including the economically costly depredation on livestock and pets, and predation pressure on valuable game. In some countries, hunters perceive carnivores as competitors for shared prey species and in some situations, predation can influence traditional game harvests and hunting. In some exceptional cases, large carnivores (mainly bears) can be a risk for human safety, and fear of both bears and wolves is often expressed by rural residents in recolonization areas. Although the physical impact of large carnivores can be mitigated through the adoption of adequate tools in a technical way, the disagreement among different sectors of the society about the core issue of presence of large carnivores can result in social conflicts. Experience has shown that these conflicts can escalate to very high levels and can dominate political discourses in some areas.

In many cases, reintegrating large carnivores into the fabric of the European countryside requires making a number of adjustments to the practices of many sectors, such as agriculture, forestry, hunting, transport, and refuse treatment, as well as dealing with the general concerns of many rural residents. The social perception of such needed changes can be either positive or negative, resulting in difficult situations to be managed. Often, the nature of conflict is mainly social, and in this case no technical tool is expected to achieve full success if not welcomed and implemented through a shared decision making approach. Many management measures may be highly controversial and / or expensive, so it is crucial that their adoption can be justified by involving the interested parties in a participatory way.

Due to the diversity of European situations there are no solutions that work in all contexts. It is therefore necessary to identify the range of potential solutions and then pick the combination of measures that work best in different local contexts.

In 2012 the Directorate General for the Environment of the European Commission (DG ENV) launched an initiative for the conservation and sustainable management of large carnivore species, based on dialogue with, and involvement of, relevant stakeholders, with a view to ensuring their commitment to the long-term conservation of large carnivores in coexistence with humans in Europe. In 2014 the EU platform on coexistence between humans and large carnivores was established, with the vision *"To promote ways and means to minimize, and wherever possible find solutions to, conflicts between human interests and the presence of large carnivore species, by exchanging knowledge and by working together in an open-ended, constructive and mutually respectful way"*.

The EU platform represents a tool for sharing views and issues at a higher level, but somehow lacks the direct contact with local issues. There is a need to implement pilot activities that could serve as models for other contexts, and to show how and where the participatory approach offers an effective means to move large carnivore conservation from the purely ecological to the social dimension, thus taking full account of the perceptions, emotions and values of the local communities, and launching a shared responsibility process whereby actions to be implemented are selected on a common ground wherever that appears possible.

Therefore, it is the primary aim of this project to set up local platforms of stakeholders in areas where high levels of conflicts are detected, in order to promote dialogue among different interest groups. The project will support stakeholders, where this is desired, to reach agreement about key actions to implement in order to mitigate the impact of large carnivores on local human activities and smoothen the social conflicts that hamper the conservation status of the large carnivore population involved. The project also aims at improving the communication flow with the European

stakeholder platform on large carnivore coexistence, as well as promoting the existence of the local platforms through ad-hoc communication activities thus contributing to the promotion of stakeholder participation at different levels.

In our offer to the Commission for this service contract we initially proposed six potential sites for setting up regional dialogue platforms based on interest previously expressed in letters of support by local relevant authorities. As only three platforms can financially be supported, the European Commission-DG ENV decided on the final choice of sites. One of these sites is going to be in the Nordic countries, involving Finland and Sweden. We therefore have undertaken exploratory visits to both countries in order to gather insights of the current positions of all potentially interested parties.

2. Purpose of this report

In this report we will inform all interested parties about the work our team carried out during the visit made on 28th-29th May 2019 in Finland and on 18th-19th June 2019 in Sweden, plus additional interviews made remotely on 12th and 17th of June. This includes the objectives of our work, the approach we used, whom we met for which reasons, as well as some conclusions from our mission together with possible next steps.

3. Brief timeline of the mission

Date	Time of the day	Place and action
27 May	Evening	V. Salvatori and E. Balian arrive in Helsinki
28 May	Morning	Meeting of the Finnish Wildlife Council
	Afternoon	Presentation of project and discussion on potentials
29 May	Morning	Interviews with stakeholders
	Afternoon	Flight to Rome
12 June	Morning	Remote Interview
17 June	Morning	Remote interview
	Evening	V. Salvatori and P. Fazzi arrive in Stockholm
18 June	Morning	Presentation of project and interviews with stakeholders
	Afternoon	Visit to farmer and drive to Grimso
19 June	Morning	Interviews with stakeholders
	Afternoon	Interviews with stakeholders and drive to Stockholm
20 June	Early Morning	Flight to Rome

4. Purpose of the missions

The purpose of the mission was threefold with regard to the overall project objective of setting up a stakeholder platform in the Scandinavian region:

- > Assess the willingness of the Finnish and Swedish authorities to fully support the process, and provide suggestions on where to focus our activities
- > Collect information at national level on the main issues related to the presence of wolves
- > Foresee possible next steps

5. General approach to our intervention

The approach that we use in all sites of our work has three parts: A **first fact finding phase**, where we visit a selected site and interview some of the stakeholders in order to better understand the situation. This was the purpose of these missions to Finland and Sweden. Based on this first phase, we decide whether we need to meet yet more stakeholders in order to deepen our understanding or if we can already propose a specific process for a platform to be set up.

Typical questions to clarify in this first phase are to see who could convene and host the platform, which responsibilities the platform should have with regard to further decision making, who should participate in it, and what the likely issues to be discussed are.

Once we have a sufficient amount of clarity on these points, the **second phase** starts in which we suggest a specific process to follow during the platform meetings. We will check this suggestion before its implementation with the stakeholders – or at least with some of them – and the relevant authorities to see if they agree to it or if it needs to be changed.

For the **third phase** we will contract a local facilitator to begin facilitating the platform meetings.

At **all times** in this process our team will remain:

- > **Neutral** with regard to the issues under discussion. The only suggestions we will make are on the process to follow but even here we remain open to changes whenever they are requested by the participants.
- > In **support of each stakeholder** by way of understanding what is important to her/ him.
- > **Transparent** with regard to the decisions that we are intending to take on the process and the reasons for them as well as on the decisions that already have been taken (as far as we are aware of them).
- > **Confidential** with regard to who told us what in the preliminary interviews of the first phase. Nevertheless we will feedback information – to the EC-DG ENV but also to the stakeholders – about the general points that were raised and the overall situation albeit without indicating who stated which point (this is a purpose of the current report) unless the respondent authorized us to do so.

In accordance with the previous considerations, we will never propose any solution to the issues under consideration. Our role will remain that of a third party in support of all the other parties. Therefore the solutions will have to come from the local stakeholders themselves. If the latter can reach consensus on these solutions they will be more appropriate for the specific local context, as well as more lasting than any solution suggested by external experts.

6. The meetings

6.1 Persons met

The following table gives an overview whom we met, when and where.

Persons met	Location	Organizational affiliations	Date / time
			28 May 2019
Members of the Wildlife Council: Finnish Wildlife Agency, Finnish Hunters Association, Finnish Nature Association	Riihimäki, Finland	Finnish Wildlife Council	10.00-11.30
Jens Andersson	Riihimäki, Finland	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency	12.30
Sami Niemi, Vesa Ruusila	Riihimäki, Finland	Finnish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry	13.30
			29 May 2019
Ere Grenfors, Jukka Hantala	Helsinki,	Finnish Hunting Association	8.30

Persons met	Location	Organizational affiliations	Date / time
Haaren Angeli, Anne Olilla	Finland Helsinki, Finland	Finnish Reindeer Association	9.10
Sami Saynevirta, Francisco Sanchez Molina	Helsinki, Finland	Finnish Nature League (Luonto-Liitto)	9.45
Riku Lumiaru	Helsinki, Finland	Finnish Association for nature Conservation	10.20
Sakari Mykra-Pohja	Helsinki, Finland	Finnish Forest and Park Service	10.50
Timo Leskinen, Tapio Rintala	Helsinki, Finland	Finnish Land Owners and Farmers Association	11.20
Esa Kukkonen	Helsinki, Finland	Hunting Dog Kennel Association	12.10
			12 June 2019
Taru Peltola, Outi Ratamäki	teleconfer ence	CORE project	11.00
			17 June 2019
Camilla Sandstrom	teleconfer ence	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	9.30
			18 June 2019
Oscar Alarik	SEPA, Stockholm	Swedish Society for Nature Conservation	9.00
Jens Andersson, Sami Niemi, Vesa Ruusila, and others	SEPA, Stockholm	SEPA, Finnish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Swedish Ministry of Environment	9.30
Peter Jaxgard	SEPA, Stockholm	SEPA, presentation of monitoring activities	10.00
Mats Forsluud	SEPA, Stockholm	WWF Sweden	11.00
Field visit to livestock owner			16.00
Ann Eklund, Linn Svensson	Grimso, Sweden	Presentation of Wildlife Damage Center	20.00
			19 June 2019
Maria Falkevik, Daniel Mallwitz, Mona Hansers	Grimso, Sweden	County Boards	8.00
Gudrun Haglund, Britta Wendelius	Grimso, Sweden	Sheep Breeders Association	9.00
Gunnar Gloesen, Torbjorn Larsson	Grimso, Sweden	Swedish Association for Hunting and Wildlife Management	10.00
Jan Bergstam	Grimso, Sweden	Large Carnivore Association	11.00
Jens Gustafsson, Henrik Tagmark, Solveig Larsson	Grimso, Sweden	National Association of Huntsmen	13.00
Lotta Wiringe, Kristian Olofsson	Grimso, Sweden	Transhumance Association	14.00

6.2 Meeting procedure

Prior to the visit, our team had prepared a questionnaire that would be the basis for our exchanges (see Annex 2). However, during the interviews we did not always follow exactly the order of the questions in the questionnaire but sometimes preferred to follow up with questions according to the thematic flow of the conversation. Nevertheless, we usually tried to cover all questions contained in the questionnaire.

6.3 Results

As we assured semi-confidentiality (no reporting on who said what, just providing general impressions) to our respondents and as the number of respondent was small (making it easy to guess who said what even if we report content only), we will limit ourselves here to a more general description of the situation with regard to the wolf presence and related issues, stakeholders involved, relationships between stakeholders, the recent history and conflict dynamics, plus the readiness of the parties to address the situation in dialogue. Sometimes we will remain rather abstract on purpose so that it becomes more difficult to guess who said what.

6.3.1 Issues

6.3.1.1 *The fear for wolf*

Many interviewees reported that wolf presence had changed their relationship with the environment they had always lived in. This was reported to be particularly felt in areas of recent recolonisation by wolf. The sparsely inhabited areas are vast and awareness of the surrounding landscapes is particularly strong. The presence of wolf in the forested areas in sparsely inhabited regions would bring the development of a sense of fear for human safety due to the predatory nature of wolf. Memories of past depredation events (dating back to the 19th century) on children feed fear even if not supported by recent evidences. Having to find solutions at their own expenses was reported by some interviewees. Living in long months of darkness was reported to increase the sense of fear for the unknown and perceived danger posed by wolf presence. Also presence of snow during many months of the year makes wolf tracks more visible.

6.3.1.2 *Impact of wolf on livestock and reindeer production*

There is general agreement (with very limited exceptions) amongst interviewees that:

- The reindeer herding activities are severely affected when wolves are present in reindeer herding areas.
- Although in absolute terms numbers of attacks on livestock are not extremely high, given the nature of the livestock husbandry practices, their effect can significantly impact the traditional small scale production in particular cases.

The reindeer herding is a fundamental part of the traditional way of living of indigenous people and animals are raised in semi-wild conditions. The adoption of damage prevention measures is particularly difficult and clashes with traditional practices. Some interviewees agreed that the compensation received at the moment in the reindeer herding areas is far too low compared to the losses suffered to large carnivores (estimated to be around 20% of losses). In these areas, the growing tourism industry adopts uncontrolled practices to feed large carnivores in order to make them visible to tourists and this causes problems outside the touristic season as they get used to be artificially fed.

Most of the non reindeer livestock production in Sweden and Finland is for meat production and is raised extensively over large areas or fields interspersed with managed forested areas. This renders the implementation of damage prevention measures sometimes costly and difficult, but not impossible. Some of the people visited and /or interviewed stated they had implemented damage prevention measures with the aid of the relevant authorities (although the payment was not completely satisfactory) and reported no attacks to be suffered inside the fences.

A general sense of urgency and sometimes desperation was expressed by some interviewees involved in stock raising, as their work is facing many other difficulties and wolf is one that adds to them, with little possibility for immediate reaction. Lack of positive attitude was expressed for the future to come, as the situation may result in a general economic depression of the rural areas, given that the livestock breeding activities has many related economic activities that keep the territory alive. It is also to underline that livestock production was not reported as the most important economic production at national level in neither country, but impact at local level might be relevant.

There was also expressed concern by some interviewees that the problems with wolf damage on livestock was serious, but sometimes was given too big proportions. According to official reports, wolves killed or hurt 157 sheep and 2 cows in Sweden during 2018, and that the damage on sheep had decreased to a third compared to 2009.

Some respondents reported high levels of stress due to the uncertainty associated to the extensive livestock raising practices in wolf areas. In some cases frustration was also associated to the lack of consideration received by the relevant authorities.

Some respondents reported the lack of preparedness of the relevant authorities to tackle the many issues related to wolf presence and the assistance needed by the livestock owners. Although the staff of regional committees provides assistance (in Sweden), they sometimes have to face critical situations, and the personal attitude has an effect, thus some respondents reported that the assistance provided varies greatly from region to region. This made some of them to be unsatisfied by the services provided. The lack of adequate training was reported by those who work at the interface with the affected people, reporting they had to rely on their own capacities for empathically relate to some desperate reactions. Also, and particularly related to areas of recent recolonisation by wolves, lack of information made people to be unprepared.

6.3.1.3 Impact of wolf on hunting practices

In both Finland and Sweden the hunting practice is very common and involves a large part of the rural and urban communities, although some differences exist. Both countries have low human population densities and a strong difference was reported to be present in opinions and attitudes towards wolf between rural and urban communities ("*Urban dwellers do not understand*"). Lack of trust of rural communities towards central authorities was mentioned and the feeling of having to comply with policies that were elaborated somewhere far from the rural areas was reported.

Hunters play a social role in the rural communities of Finland and hunting is also perceived as a social practice supporting the strong forestry industry. In Sweden some level of conflict was reported between foresters and hunters on the moose population level, but support was expressed by Swedish hunters to the forestry practices. The reported impact of wolf on the hunting practice was reported to be related to two main aspects:

1. wolf as a competitor for valuable game (mainly moose)
2. wolf as a predator of hunting dogs

The issue of hunting dogs being killed was reported with emphasis and the element of fear appeared to be associated to such phenomenon. Some stakeholders, however, pointed out the relatively low number of dogs killed by wolves. According to official reports in Sweden only 8 dogs were killed or damaged by wolves 2018, compared to 187 by wild boars. Some respondents reported that habits of rural people had been modified due to wolf presence, as they would not walk the dogs in the forest anymore. In Finland, hunting dogs would not be taken to exhibitions in wolf areas anymore. This would lead to a feeling of loss of power or freedom, such that people did not feel they could do what they wanted in their own land. In general, hunters would feel their freedom would be limited because they cannot go hunting where they always had done, thus the quality of their lives would be affected. Cases of "*wolf refugee hunters*" had been reported in Sweden, whereby hunters drive over 1,000 km in order to go hunting in wolf-free areas. One respondent reported that moose hunting with dogs is a relatively recent habit, and that traditional moose hunting would imply a large number of walking hunters, whose presence in the forest might limit the wolf approaches to humans. Thus the shifting hunting culture has had many effects on the wolf conflict.

6.3.1.4 Issues of wolf population density and isolation, and illegal killing

Despite the recent years' efforts made by both countries' administrations to improve transparency and public involvement in wolf monitoring activities, some respondents were critical about the wolf population estimates provided by the authorities. The systems are slightly different in the two countries, with Sweden having invested in a structured monitoring system with experts

coordinating activities at regional level for compiling wolf presence data collected either extensively in a participatory manner or intensively by hunters and technicians. In Finland the system is relying strongly on voluntary work provided in the larger part by hunters. Notwithstanding the efforts to involve larger sectors of the society in the monitoring activities, some respondents were unsatisfied with the estimates (*"numbers reported before reproduction and without taking into account the dead animals"*; *"my tracks reports were not considered but I am sure they were wolves"*).

Some respondents acknowledged the fact that wolf population was increasing (except for the recent five-year's decline) but the range was expanding very little, thus density in a limited area was increasing. They would have desired the range to increase in order to have lower densities. Some respondents thought that the countries are large and there is a lot of space available that could be colonised by wolves. Nevertheless, they are concentrated in the southern parts, where also the largest share of livestock raising is concentrated. One interviewee reported the damage level was more related to the high density of livestock instead of the density of wolves. Some respondents had the opinion that a population of 300 wolves is too small for a country and more wolves should be welcomed but at lower density.

The issue of isolation of the Swedish population was mentioned and the provision of a "green belt" or "corridor" to allow wolves to pass through the reindeer herding area from Finland was hoped for.

Many interviewees reported illegal killing was retaining the wolf population to expand, and reported they were happy that authorities had recently recognised poaching as a relevant threat to be taken seriously, both in Finland and Sweden. The issue of illegal killing was also reported by some stakeholders to be related to the strict protection regime, given that hunting was not permitted, and was increasing. Other stakeholders expressed doubts about the casual link between poaching and the level of protection, pointing out recent research and the fact that poaching had not decreased during years with intensive wolf hunts. In one occasion illegal killing was considered a serious issue and the authorities were seen responsible for forcing people to act illegally because of no valid alternatives in place. The European Commission was also mentioned as responsible for imposing strict protection and threatening the countries with the infringement cases. Some respondents thought that illegal killing is the factor that determines wolf distribution and affects attitudes.

6.3.1.5 Possibility to establish a local platform in Sweden / Finland

All respondents were interested in wolf management and conservation, and no respondent thought it was likely that the wolf would disappear from the areas where it is currently present. All respondents declared to be willing and interested in taking part to a process of open dialogue among stakeholders provided this would lead to concrete solutions and not just talking. The fact that they are already involved in the many committees would have to be taken into consideration while planning for additional meetings. An additional participatory processes that would lead to no concrete solutions would be seen as counterproductive. Authorities of Finland and Sweden were eagerly interested in establishing participatory processes, even in cases where some work had already been done, and they hoped the intervention we propose would improve already ongoing initiatives. A special consideration should be done for the fact that in Finland a process of revision of the wolf management plan was just ended and more local inputs are hoped for; while in Sweden such a process has not been developed and could be planned for in the near future. Both authorities were also highly interested and supportive for more international exchanges at administrative level, between the two countries, in order to improve their management approaches and explore possibilities to harmonise monitoring systems; learn from experience in damage management and improve connection between the two wolf populations.

All stakeholders met were also interested in having international exchanges with their counterparts across the border, although no conflict issues were identified among groups across the borders.

6.3.2 Identified parties

Considering the issues that have arisen during the interviews, and the possibility to implement participatory processes at local or national levels, we have identified the following potentially interested parties. We have not spoken to all of them yet:

Reindeer herders: living in the northern areas, and relying mainly on revenues from the reindeer herding activities, are directly affected by wolf presence as losses due to the predator can amount to over 600 heads / year (period estimated 2010-2017).

Livestock owners: present mainly in the central and southern parts of the two countries, where also wolf distribution is currently concentrated. Working mainly for meat production (no milking activity) in extensive grazing pastures. In some cases difficult to implement damage prevention measures.

Hunters: Playing a social role in the rural communities, being affected by competition with wolf for game and by predation on valuable hunting dogs.

Environmentalists and their organizations: Mostly aware of the difficulties of the other groups, mainly those who economically rely on stocks predated by wolves, are willing to provide support and demand higher levels of capacity by authorities.

Local and regional authorities: Struggling with the adaptation to fast increase of the population, willing to improve management system and technical approaches.

Research Institutions: interested in processes and eventual evaluation of outcomes. Supportive of the approaches and willing to share information and technical results.

Tourism: possibly playing a role in contributing to the economic activities locally, required to be regulated by some other groups. Representatives not met yet.

7. The conclusions from the mission (next steps)

After this visit we confirm our willingness to support the interested parties in Sweden and Finland through the establishment of participatory platforms, either at local level in each country or a transboundary one. For the purpose, we would identify local facilitators who will be collaborating for the implementation of the dialogue meetings. Ideally we would support the different stakeholders through a decision making process for identification of concrete interventions to be put in place for improving the local situation, which will be implemented from Summer 2020 (or earlier if decisions are made quicker).

7.1 Helping to set up a regional platform in Sweden and Finland

There are broader societal issues related to wolf management in Sweden and Finland, and some of them are similar to those present in other European countries: wolf is a symbol and holds a special place in humankind culture. It is used in politics to raise votes and its predatory nature is seen badly (much worse than lynx, for example). Although the long term survival of the Swedish wolves is strictly dependent on the Finnish ones, thus the issues in the two countries are somehow interrelated, they show commonalities and differences that need to be taken into consideration when planning a potential transboundary platform.

Commonalities – Both countries have long term experience of social participation, democratic processes and civil society participation in social life. The sparse urbanisation outside of the capital cities make the relationship of people with the environment to be extremely direct and awareness of the landscape is particularly developed. Also, in both countries a remarkable amount of social

research has been carried out on issues related to large carnivore management. To a certain extent the relevance of moose hunting is coherent across the two countries, and the impact owl has on such issue is comparable.

Differences – The administrative structure and the resources available in the two countries show remarkable differences. Although some parallelisms can be done in the management system with local committees (or boards) made responsible for local issues related to monitoring and damage management, freedom to act locally in Sweden seem to be higher than in Finland. Also in Sweden a large investment has been done in identifying and training professional experts as local wildlife managers, while in Finland this is mainly done on a voluntary basis by local “experts”. The main obstacle to the connectivity of Swedish wolves to Finnish ones is the fact that in the Finnish reindeer area wolves are subject to management regimes under Annex V of the Habitat Directives conditions and both countries allow derogations to prevent damages to the reindeer herding, thus restricting the possibility to have wolves crossing the area.

Way forward - Meetings with the two countries administration representatives will be held in order to discuss potential objectives and confirm their commitment to support the process. The support from our team would be essentially to facilitate coordination and reinforce trust among institutions, reinforcing cross-sectorial collaboration and support the flow of information within and across countries, as well as providing technical support for the co-production of potentially positive solutions.

8. Annexes

8.1 The members of the mission

Member	Function	Affiliation
Valeria Salvatori	Project coordinator	Istituto di Ecologia Applicata (Rome)
Estelle Balian	Expert Facilitator	FEAL (France)
Paola Fazzi	Independent consultant, Biologist	Istituto di Ecologia Applicata (Rome)

8.2 Questionnaire

Part I: Explanations About yourself and the interview

Introduce yourself. Give some context and background of your own work (project) and what in particular led you to this stakeholder. Describe the purpose of the interview and the process that is likely to follow after the interviews. State your role in that process. Say what will happen with the data of the questionnaire. Add the following information:

- The interview will be confidential with regard to who said what but not with regard to the information provided
- Note taking during the interview
- Any questions before starting?

Part II: Questions to ask¹

1. Before we start, could you give us some insight into your work in your function as [...] ? How does this work relate to the [...] issue ? How long have you been in this function ?
2. What is the situation with regard to [... the issue] ? You have mentioned mainly problematic [if this is case] aspects – do you think there are other ones as well?
3. What has led to this situation?
4. Which persons or institutions are directly involved in this? What do you think are their interests or expectations?

¹ Do not miss to ask your own follow on questions whenever that appears more coherent in a given interview situation. This questionnaire is just a basic orientation so that you may not leave out important aspects.

5. How would you describe your relationship to these other stakeholders?
6. Which other persons or institutions/ groups are yet other stakeholders, observers or potential third parties in this situation?
7. What have you already done to solve the problem? Have you asked others to help you in this?
8. What would happen if nobody steps in to work on the situation? What would be the consequences for you/ for the other stakeholders?
9. How urgent is the situation?
10. What would be your personal goal in addressing this situation: For example if you imagine a positive outcome in one year of time what would it look like?
11. How does this whole situation affect you personally in terms of stress or any other emotions that the situation may stir [if this has not been said yet]?
12. What would you hope for from the intervention of an outside party in this situation?
13. If there were some kind of exchange process put into place with the other stakeholders would you be willing to participate? If you are willing to participate would you agree to a period of peace during that time [in case of conflict]? This would mean to abstain from public attacks outside of the agreed upon exchange platform and to agree to the principle of respect (be ready to listen) for the other parties within the platform?
14. Is there anything else that you would like to add?