# Case "Jyväskylä Forest Programme 2030"

- Jyväskylä city decided to use a *collaborative decision process* (2016-2018) to <u>create</u> the Jyväskylä Forest Programme 2030 proposal.

- The aim was to create the strategic plan describing how the city of Jyväskylä will take care of its forests (about 8600 hectare) until 2030.

- As the forests are of economic, social and ecological importance, this meant that there existed different, conflicting values which needed to be reconciled.

- Jyväskylä city used an external, neutral facilitator to guide the programme development process.

- After a stakeholder analysis, key stakeholders from within the city administration (five different departments) and from outside the city administration (eight different organizations, across sectors) were chosen to participate in the process.

# Collaborative tools used in the process

– Stakeholder mapping

- Analysis of how key stakeholders think – their values, their needs, their wishes, their fears, etc.
- Based on interviews with stakeholders

– Joint fact finding

- Shared analysis of research results, facts, knowledge, insights by stakeholders of the situation, from different perspectives
- Based on Maptionaire (citizens), expert presentations, field visits

– Joint programme packaging & writing

- Drawing up a common document, finding consensus on possible solutions
- Using different consensus building tools, consensus finding votes, etc.

strategic RESEARCH        CORE

# Research by CORE

- Research focus: A value co-creation and knowledge sharing view on collective governance process and tools.


- Data (to be) collected and analysed:
  - Documents created during the process (stakeholder report, maptionaire report, expert presentations, part proposals, final policy document, evaluation of the process by the facilitator)

  - Interviews with participants, facilitators and decision-makers.

# Initial reflections on tools

- Stakeholder mapping
  - Provides opportunities to gain insight into different viewpoints
  - Provides a starting point for the process
  - Demands identifying the key stakeholders

- Joint fact finding
  - Provides space for learning, to see things anew
  - Demands an acceptance of a variety of views by participants
  - Demands identifying key perspectives

- Joint programme packaging and writing
  - Demands people to take responsibility

# Initial findings

- Value co-creation
  - Value was perceived by all respondents, generated through compromise and facilitation
  - Views differed on what the other participants were aiming to achieve
  - Process itself regarded as heavy, though end-results seen positive (personal pride)

- Knowledge sharing
  - Knowledge transfer took place between the participants
  - But! Knowledge was rarely shared with the "home organization"
  - Furthermore, the person presenting an organization was sometimes seen as presenting her/his *personal* views, rather than the view of the *organization*
  - Participants talk about feeling they are "the only one" to promote a particular stance