

**From Little Things Big Things Grow:  
Transforming Relationships with  
South Australia's Recreational Fishing Sector**  
*Lessons in stakeholder engagement*

**Rebecca Lang**

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change

from

The Process Work Institute  
Portland, Oregon

May, 2012

Disclaimer

This thesis is the work of Rebecca Lang and is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change from the Process Work Institute Portland, Oregon. Any views or conclusions expressed in this thesis are those of the author, and do not represent the views of the South Australian Government or the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries.

**From Little Things Big Things Grow:  
Transforming Relationships with  
South Australia's Recreational Fishing Sector**

*Lessons in stakeholder engagement*

**Abstract**

At the heart of this project lies the intention of Fisheries, part of the Department of Primary Industries and Resources in South Australia, to build a strong working relationship with the recreational fishing sector. With a background of entrenched conflict and mistrust between Fisheries and the stakeholders, this project used group facilitation techniques to develop an effective approach to engagement that moved beyond adversarial positions. Informed by Process Work approaches, it consisted primarily of facilitation training for Fisheries staff, followed by their co-facilitation of a series of workshops and a forum that engaged recreational fishing stakeholders around issues of importance to them.

**Keywords**

Stakeholder engagement; facilitation training; Process Work;  
role plays; awareness

“Involving the public in the development of public policy recognises that, while government is a key player, the policies that guide society are the result of a complex set of interactions involving multiple groups and multiple interests ultimately combining in fascinating and unpredictable ways.” (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000, p.553)

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This project would not have been possible without the participation of the Fisheries Division of the Department of Primary Industries and Resources South Australia, members of the South Australia Recreational Fishing Advisory Council (SARFAC) and recreational fishers in South Australia.

My heartfelt thanks to the following recreational fishers:

Brenton Schahinger, President, SARFAC, Trevor Watts, retired Executive Officer, SARFAC, Gary Flack, Executive Officer, SARFAC, Tony Bainbridge, Warren Beer, Wayne Carn, Neil Charter, Malcolm Clifton, Lyall Dee, Gary Denton, David Eccles, John Filmer, Ian Fitzgerald, Knut Gassmanis, Dean Griffiths, Jon Huie, Nigel Hunt, Greg Irving, Greg James, Keith Jones, Graham Kerr, Ross Manthorpe, John Marsh, Craig McLaren, Mark Mills, Eric Murray, Bob Oliver, Norm Pope, Rob Richards, Robin Sharp, Ron Sherriff, Damien Smart, Jim Stacey, Peter Teakle, Ron Trinne, Neville Virco, Stuart Walsh, Malcolm Wilksch, Bob Wood, Kym Woolford and John Zilm

To Martin Smallridge, former Executive Director, Fisheries, thank you for sponsoring and championing the project and giving me the opportunity to undertake this initiative with your team.

My deepest respect and heartfelt thanks go to Alice Fistr, Manager Fisheries Policy for being there every step of the way with this project. Your enthusiasm, humour and leadership on this project was inspirational.

My gratitude and thanks to the Fisheries Project Team Members. I loved working with your passion for Fisheries and your incredible commitment to the project. Thank you for your willingness to pitch in, experiment and help in designing the process as we went along. You have been an amazing team to work with:

James Bennett, Michelle Besley, Gary Darter, Randel Donovan, Troy Harris, Jonathan McPhail, Merilyn Nobes, Craig Noell, Adriana O'Brien, David Primer, Keith Rowling and Lianos Triantafillos.

Thanks also to Kelly Crosthwaite and Sean Sloan for helping to get the project up and running and providing leadership in this initiative.

Toni Cox, Andrew Dixon, Paul Faithow and Greg Rowley, thank you for your participation and support.

My thanks also go to Erma Ranieri, former Group Executive Director, Strategy, Policy and People, for giving me the opportunity to undertake this development initiative within the organisation and for making it a priority.

To Kerrie Ashcroft, thank you for your enthusiasm for the project and your support in helping behind the scenes and behind the camera.

My heartfelt thanks and deep appreciation to Julie Diamond, Susan Kocen and Gary Reiss, my Advisor and Study Committee members. Your excitement for this project was inspiring and made me believe that I had

something to offer. Thank you for all your guidance and support in helping me to find new ways of applying Process Work in a conventional organisational context and for staying the distance with me. I could not have done this project without your support.

I am indebted to Howard Aaron, for editing this paper so generously and skilfully with me. You are a master of the art of editing, Howard and I learnt so much from working with you. Thank you also to Howard and Kristin Konsterlie for giving me a home in Portland and the wonderful times we spent together.

To David Glazbrook, my partner and friend, my deepest appreciation for all that you have done to support me through this prolonged journey. Your patience, love and generosity have been incredible. Thank you.

Finally, to Arny and Amy Mindell and all the awesome teachers who have worked so hard to create and bring Process Work and Worldwork into the world, thank you. You have given me a way of being in the world that helps me to try to be all of who I am and to bring this to the way that I work with others.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction—A Story of Fishing</b> .....	<b>9</b>
A Passion for Engagement.....	11
<b>Chapter 1 The Nature of the Problem Facing Fisheries</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Recreational Fishing in South Australia.....	15
A Question of Sustainability .....	15
The Politics of Sustainability.....	17
The Basis for the Project Design.....	20
<i>The History and Relationship with Recreational Fishers</i> .....	20
<i>Challenges in Engaging with the Recreational Sector</i> .....	21
Moving from Consultation to a Deeper Level of Engagement.....	22
Fisheries Policy in South Australia .....	24
Fisheries Management in South Australia .....	25
<b>Chapter 2 Government’s Move towards Stakeholder Engagement in a Policy</b>	
<b>Context</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Chapter 3 The Project Approach</b> .....	<b>51</b>
Engaging PIRSA Fisheries as a Partner in the Research Project.....	51
Building Capabilities in the Organisation .....	53
The Phases of the Research Project.....	53
Phase 1 – Facilitation Training.....	56
<i>Strategies for Working with Stakeholders</i> .....	59
<i>Feedback from the Training</i> .....	72
A Critical Moment in the Project .....	74
Phase 2 – Workshops with the Recreational Fishing Sector.....	75
<i>The Impact of the Workshops on the Engagement Process</i> .....	80
Addressing the Conflict between Fisheries and SARFAC .....	88

Phase 3 – The Recreational Fishing Forum .....	90
<i>The Impact of the Forum on the Engagement Process</i> .....	98
Project Evaluation .....	107
<b>Chapter 4 What this Approach to Stakeholder Engagement Achieved .....</b>	<b>109</b>
My Personal Overview .....	125
<b>Chapter 5 Where to Next? .....</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>145</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>147</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>150</b>
Appendix 1 Sample Training Session Facilitation Plan.....	151
Appendix 2 Sample Training Session Outline .....	156
Appendix 3 Facilitation Training Program Evaluation Questionnaire .....	158
Appendix 4 Sample Facilitation Plan for the Workshops .....	160
Appendix 5 Sample Recreational Fishing Workshop Outline.....	165
Appendix 6 Consent Release Forms.....	166
Appendix 7 The Recreational Fishing Forum Program.....	167
Appendix 8 The Recreational Fishing Forum Facilitation Plan.....	168
Appendix 9 The Recreational Fishing Forum Activities.....	173

## **INTRODUCTION—A STORY OF FISHING**

Picture this: a sleepy coastal town in regional South Australia. There's a pub, a general store, a petrol station and a caravan park lining the shore of an idyllic bay. A jetty extends out into the water, where a grandfather is patiently and lovingly teaching his grandchildren how to fish. This particular grandparent, like most of his friends, has been fishing these waters since he was a child and he knows where the fish are, when they'll bite and what gear to use. He's passing on this local knowledge to his grandchildren in the hope that they'll develop the same love of fishing that he has. He'll tell you, given half the chance, that there's nothing better in life than witnessing the joy and excitement on the faces of children when they catch their first fish, and the pride on their faces when they take their first whiting home to grandma to cook for tea.

Out past the jetty, fishing boats are dotted around the bay, with their lines out in the hope that they might catch some snapper or whiting for dinner. But these recreational fishers will tell you, when you ask about what fishing means to them, that it is a whole lot more than simply catching fish. It is about the joy of being out on the water, surrounded by beautiful scenery and pristine coastline, spending time with family and friends away from mobile phones and all the pressures and worries of everyday life. It is about catching up with yourself and relaxing with the people you love and it's about pitting your skills against the fish and the natural elements.

They'll also tell you that there is an art and science to fishing and that their fishing practices have changed over the years: previously it was all about catching fish, but now there is much more interest in the sport of fishing and using light gear and catch and release practices. For these people, fishing is one of the most important pastimes in their lives and they are passionate about its long-term survival.

These wonderful scenes can be found in many parts of coastal South Australia and is one of the reasons South Australia is a popular holiday and tourist destination for many thousands of people. However, behind this picture lies a story of competition, conflict and frustration about fishing.

There are three distinct fishing sectors in South Australia: the recreational fishers, the commercial fishers and the Aboriginal traditional fishers. These three groups are in a fight with one another over the limited bounties of the sea. They're also in conflict with the Environment Department and conservation groups who don't believe current fishing regimes are sustainable. And all of these groups are, at times, frustrated with Fisheries (part of the Department of Primary Industries and Resources South Australia) whose role it is to manage aquatic resources (fish and aquatic plants) in this state.

This research project was borne out of a need that Fisheries had to build an effective approach to engaging the recreational fishing sector, to attend to recreational fishers frustrations with the department and to begin to address

the conflict between sectors and stakeholders. It is one step in Fisheries' longer-term strategy to engage all stakeholders in achieving sustainable management of the aquatic resource in South Australia.

### **A Passion for Engagement**

I work in Primary Industries and Resources South Australia (PIRSA), not in Fisheries, but in Organisational Development. In my role as Manager of Learning and Organisational Development, my team and I provide people across the organisation with a range of learning and development initiatives that will help them to grow and perform their jobs more effectively.

PIRSA is a relatively small state government organisation of approximately 1,400 people who work with a complex array of industry, government, not-for-profit and community stakeholders from the food, agriculture, seafood (fisheries and aquaculture), minerals and energy resources sectors. The agency has seven divisions with diverse roles including research, policy development, commercial projects and consultancy services. Staff are located in a range of geographic locations across metropolitan and rural South Australia.

One of the most satisfying elements of my role is supporting the diverse work undertaken within the industry portfolios, including with Fisheries, and I am strongly committed to helping my government colleagues to be as effective and successful as they can be in working with our industry and community partners and stakeholders. A current challenge in this role is to strengthen people's capacity to be more facilitative in their interactions with stakeholders,

rather than operating from the basis of “technical” experts who already know the answers. This includes being able to demonstrate openness and respect for the capacity industry and the community have in participating in problem solving and decision making on issues that are important to them.

My background is in working with natural resource management issues and I am particularly passionate about building people’s capacity to work together more effectively to tackle these challenging issues.

Previously, I worked in a Government-led community development initiative: the Community Landcare Program, which enabled local community groups to form and work together to address land management and degradation issues. My experiences in Landcare showed me the capacity people have to achieve great outcomes if they are given the support, encouragement, tools and resources to do so. I was inspired by the potential for government to bring stakeholders together to address the significant environmental and social challenges that we face as a community.

My passion for facilitating engagement has been fuelled over the past two and a half years while undertaking a Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organisational Change at the Process Work Institute in Portland, Oregon. In this program I was presented with concepts, tools and practices for facilitating groups and working with conflict and diversity. As I began to apply these in my own work, I saw the possibilities they offered for a different way of working with stakeholders on complex resource management issues.

This project, undertaken as the research component of the Master's program, provided me with the opportunity to explore the use of process-oriented facilitation methods to engage the recreational fishing sector about issues facing the fisheries in South Australia. As a social action and educational project, it also provided a platform for experimenting with Process Work's concepts, tools and practices to address conflicts amongst stakeholder groups. I approached Fisheries at a time when they were keen to establish an approach to engaging with the recreational fishing sector, or recreational anglers as some in the sector prefer to be called. Testing the effectiveness of the approach I developed to enable Fisheries to engage constructively with the recreational sector is one of the outcomes this project seeks to address.

In the following pages I tell the story of the project. In Chapter 1, I provide a more detailed account of the nature of the problem facing the recreational sector and the Department in achieving the long-term survival of fish and fishing. Chapter 2 draws from some of the academic thinking to discuss the role of government in working with stakeholders and citizens in addressing problems of this nature. Chapter 3 outlines how I worked with colleagues from Fisheries and members of the recreational fishing sector in South Australia to strengthen their relationship and build understanding of each other's perspectives as the basis for resolving issues of fisheries management in South Australia. I show how I utilised Process Work concepts and tools and share feedback received during the project's implementation. In Chapter 4, I discuss the outcomes of the project, the extent to which it achieved what it set out to do and what has changed as a result. I share feedback about the

project's effectiveness, reflect on the research approach and discuss insights about what helped to make the project successful and what could have been done differently. Chapter 5 looks at future steps that could be taken.

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM FACING FISHERIES**

#### **Recreational Fishing in South Australia**

In South Australia, some 240,000 people, approximately one-fifth of the state's population, fish recreationally. They are people from all walks of life, cultural backgrounds, ages and socio-economic groups. They fish on rivers and lakes and in the sea. They fish as individuals, with friends, with family and as members of clubs. Their relationship with fishing ranges from those who fish occasionally, to families who love fishing on holidays, to the serious anglers who get out and fish whenever they can.

With so many people involved in recreational fishing in South Australia there are times of the year when sleepy little coastal towns turn into thriving holiday destinations. Local caravan parks and holiday shacks are full and local businesses, especially the tackle and bait shops, are booming. The charter boat operators are busy, the jetties are crowded and there can be a couple of hundred boats vying for access to the local boat ramp to get out on the water. The boats of the really keen recreational fishers are equipped with an array of new technologies, such as global positioning systems (GPS) and depth sounders, to help them locate schools of fish. Many of the boats will stay out until they've got their boat limits filled.

#### **A Question of Sustainability**

This many people fishing has an impact on fish stocks and the recreational sector is not alone in their desire to see the long-term survival of fishing.

Under legislation in South Australia the recreational fishers share access to the resource with the commercial sector and the Aboriginal traditional fishers. All three groups want to be able to fish long-term and have access to their fair share of fish and there is a growing acceleration of rivalry and competition between them that includes concerns about access to fish and the sustainability of each other's practices.

It is this desire to see the long-term survival of fishing across all three sectors that places the question of sustainability firmly at the heart of fishing in South Australia. Are there enough fish in the sea, reproducing in sufficient quantities to ensure that there are viable fish stocks for the future? How many fish can be caught, and at what time in their life cycles, if the fishery is to be sustainable? What effects are pollution, coastal development and climate change having on the ecosystems that support the fish stocks? Do we really know what is happening to fish habitats in our oceans and rivers and the impact this is having on fish populations? How sustainable are current fishing practices and are the fisheries being managed in the most sustainable way?

This link between fishing and sustainability is not just an ecological one. For the three fishing sectors there are also economic, social and cultural considerations. For the commercial sector, fishing is not only about a way of life, it is also about making a living. The sector operates as a very diverse and competitive industry, with high business costs in infrastructure, but also the possibility of high returns. Sustainability includes being able to effectively

and efficiently run a business and make a profit, while also maintaining a lifestyle.

Recreational fishing also has an economic impact, with many recreational fishers investing large sums of money in boats and fishing equipment. The income that fishing and tourism generates in South Australia, particularly on Yorke and Eyre Peninsulas, is important. In small coastal towns, it can be a significant contributor to the economic survival of many local businesses.

For the Aboriginal traditional sector, fishing is an inherent part of their way of life and is embedded in their culture and belief system. Being able to continue to fish in ways that are part of their spiritual beliefs is vital to their ongoing health and wellbeing.

Recreational fishing also contributes to the social and psychological health and wellbeing of both regional and urban communities. It affords people the opportunity to get away from the stresses of everyday life and provides a shared interest that enables people to connect and interact with each other. Fishing plays a critical role in providing young people with a safe, healthy and affordable recreational pastime, particularly in small regional communities, where substance abuse is a common response to the lack of access to recreational opportunities.

### **The Politics of Sustainability**

Entangled with questions of sustainability about fishing are issues of democracy and expectations of rights, freedoms and decision making.

Although the recreational and commercial sectors and the Aboriginal traditional fishers all share a common desire to fish long-term, the question of what is a fair and sustainable share of fish is the source of conflict between the groups. The recreational and Aboriginal traditional fishers can be critical of the commercial sector's fishing practices, believing that they are unsustainable. The commercial sector believes that their practices are sustainable and are concerned that the recreational fishing lobby will have their industry shut down, as has happened in other States in Australia. All three groups are frustrated that government isn't doing enough to support them and would like Fisheries to act on their concerns about the other's practices.

In addition to the three fishing sectors, a multitude of other groups have a stake in fishing and an interest in the fishing sector's impact on the aquatic environment. These stakeholders include different government departments, such as the environment, water and transport departments; conservation groups; scientists; tourism operators; small businesses and the general public. Many are passionate about fishing or about the environment and have strong and often competing views in answer to questions of sustainability. Their opinions vary about what is happening to the fish and the environment based on their different roles and ways of relating to the resource and each group can be unwilling to listen to the other.

(I wonder what the fish would say to this if they could!)

These questions of sustainability and democracy mean that all the stakeholders involved in the fishing sector, including government, are faced with a 'wicked problem'. Achieving sustainability in economic, social, environmental and cultural terms is a complex issue and our understanding of it changes with investigation and over time. There are no simple technical solutions, quick fixes or known policy responses when it comes to developing a sustainable fishery in South Australia. Determining an agreed upon position on sustainability that meets people's expectations of democracy at work will require the participation of diverse groups of people, many of whom could find that arriving at such a solution is as much about them changing their mindsets and behaviour as it is about others having to change and behave differently.

The impact of recreational fishing, taken together with the amount of fish harvested by the commercial sector in particular, raises questions about just how much pressure can be placed on these stocks before the long term survival of fishing is under threat. With so many stakeholder groups wanting to have a say in what happens to the fish and the aquatic environment, Fisheries are also under pressure. As part of their responsibility for managing aquatic resources (fish and aquatic plants), Fisheries staff are expected to provide answers to such questions and to manage the resource in ways that ensure that both fishing and the resource are sustainable in the long-term. This includes all the sectors having a fair share of fish and a say in how resources are managed.

## **The Basis for the Project Design:**

### **The History and Relationship with Recreational Fishers**

In keeping with the history of fishing legislation in South Australia, and in response to the size and economic importance of the commercial fishing sector to the State, Fisheries has had a long-established relationship with the commercial sector. This sector is organised into distinct industry groups on the basis of the species they harvest and includes the marine scale fish, rock lobster, abalone, pipi, prawn and crab fishers. Each industry is permitted to harvest their particular species using specific fishing methods and is involved in the development of management plans for their fishery. Fisheries staff are assigned to work with different industry groups, which includes assisting in the development of management plans and providing the sector with day-to-day management, policy and regulatory services on a cost recovery basis.

Fisheries' focus on the commercial sector has been a source of frustration for the recreational sector for a number of years. Prior to 2007, recreational fishing was not defined by fisheries legislation, which only recognised licensed (commercial) or un-licensed fishing. One of the impacts of this was that the recreational sector, by and large, was managed by default by Fisheries and not given the same direct focus as the commercial sector. When Fisheries introduced new legislation in 2007, one of the intents of the legislation was to remedy the situation with the recreational sector. In addition to changing the legislation, Fisheries saw the need to develop effective working relationships with the recreational sector and this became the key outcome for this research project.

## **Challenges in Engaging with the Recreational Fishing Sector**

When the project began, Fisheries staff had already undertaken a comprehensive survey of recreational fishing activity in South Australia and knew something of the patterns of recreational fishing in the State. However, they did not have a clear picture of who was in the sector. Nor did they know how to most effectively engage with the sector.

Unlike the commercial sector, where many of the distinct industry groups are organised and cohesive and speak with a more unified voice, the nature of recreational fishing is predominantly about individuals or individual groups getting out in nature and away from it all. This means that the sector is not organised into discrete representative groups with whom government can more readily interact. This adds to the difficulty of engaging with the sector.

Fortunately for Fisheries a peak body has been established to represent recreational fishers in the State: the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council (SARFAC). However, at the commencement of the project the relationship between SARFAC and Fisheries was tense, with SARFAC frustrated by government's handling of the fishing sector and angry at the much greater allocation of Fisheries staff to managing the commercial sector. SARFAC felt that government had neglected them for over ten years and believed that South Australian recreational anglers, in comparison to those in other states, were being very poorly supported.

Likewise, when the project began, Fisheries staff found the relationship with SARFAC difficult. Fisheries staff were frustrated that SARFAC commonly utilised the media to publically criticise Fisheries' management decisions and paint a negative view of Fisheries initiatives and actions.

Funding arrangements also exacerbate the relationship between SARFAC and Fisheries. Current government policy in South Australia not to introduce a recreational fishing licence reduces SARFAC's capacity to raise funds, compared with its counterparts in other states. Instead government provides limited funding directly to SARFAC, which it believes is inadequate and restricts its capacity to be an effective voice for the recreational fishing sector.

Given the overarching purpose of the project was to build an effective mechanism for PIRSA Fisheries to engage with the recreational fishing sector in South Australia, it was imperative that the project address these existing relationship issues.

### **Moving from Consultation to a Deeper Level of Engagement**

The need for more effective ways of engaging stakeholders is also a sign of the times. Governments have the power to shape people's lives in both positive and negative ways. One of the ways in which they do this is through the policies they create—the rules and regulations—that govern many aspects of community life. However, in Australia the balance of power is shifting in response to an increasingly educated community, and government policy makers are expected to develop policy that not only takes society in the direction of the current political party in power at the time, but that also

understands the impact of its rules and regulations on industries and communities. Implicit in this is the need for policy makers to engage stakeholders in the development of policy.

How this engagement occurs at present varies both across and within government departments in South Australia and can depend on the particular role and culture of the agency. PIRSA has a long history of working cooperatively with industry and the community, with consultation processes an established part of the policy development cycle. However, feedback from industry and the community is that sometimes these consultation processes don't go far enough; and while they identify the immediate considerations that stakeholders want a policy to address, they can fail to understand and respond to the broader concerns stakeholders have about the impacts of the policy on themselves, the wider community and the environment.

Another frustration with the government consultation processes is that they can be seen to be a 'tick the box' exercise. Such experiences of consultation occur when stakeholders feel that government does not have a genuine interest in seeking the views of the community and listening to what they have to say. Rather people are left with a sense that the policy makers have already decided what the response will be. This dynamic is exacerbated when consultation occurs towards the end of the policy development cycle and when drafts of legislation are released for final comment that don't appear to have incorporated or addressed the issues or concerns previously raised by stakeholders. This increases the level of cynicism about government's

commitment to working cooperatively with stakeholders and builds mistrust of government's intention to have stakeholders shape policy directions.

In committing to this project, Fisheries staff knew that they had a poor working relationship with the recreational sector. They knew they had limits to their understanding of the sector, the people in it and the impact that policy decisions had on the lives of the fishers. They sought to build a new and more responsive relationship with the sector that would allow them to share the policy challenges facing all fishers and develop an understanding of how these challenges affected recreational anglers. Fisheries staff saw this as a critical step in enabling them to work together with the recreational sector to develop plans and policy documents that would continue to build the sustainability of the fishery.

### **Fisheries Policy in South Australia**

The policy framework for fisheries management in South Australia was renewed in 2007, with a new Fisheries Management Act coming into effect. This legislation was significant because it recognised, for the first time, the need to deliberately manage and foster the three distinct fisheries sectors:

- Commercial Fishing Sector
- Recreational Fishing Sector, and
- Aboriginal Traditional Fishing Sector

Under the Fisheries Management Act 2007 there is an explicit requirement that percentage shares of aquatic resources be allocated to each of the three sectors, with these shares to be included in Fisheries Management Plans.

Fisheries staff believe that they have shown leadership in fisheries management in Australia by recognising the three sectors in the legislation and acknowledging that each sector requires a share of fish. Including a requirement for explicit shares in the legislation is seen as a bold step, since almost all conflict in fisheries management is about access to the resource—determining who gets what when the pie is divided up.

However, Fisheries staff know that it is one thing to name sectors in the legislation and recognise that each needs a share of the resource and another to identify what the share for each sector is to be. The need to engage the sectors in determining issues such as these was one of the drivers behind this project.

### **Fisheries Management in South Australia**

In managing aquatic resources (fish and aquatic plants), a goal of Fisheries is to achieve ecologically sustainable development of fisheries in South Australia. The division uses four key mechanisms to facilitate this:

- 1) Research to inform management decisions
- 2) Policy frameworks and management tools
- 3) Regulatory and licensing arrangements and
- 4) Education and awareness strategies, deterrence and enforcement.

Given the range of competing stakeholder interests that government is expected to consider, reaching agreement on sustainable management practices for the entire fishery is a daunting challenge. For members of the Fisheries policy group it raises a whole raft of questions, including:

- How does government determine what is fair use of the aquatic resource for all the stakeholders? On what criteria is fairness to be based? Is this about the greatest economic return from the use of the resource (the highest dollar value for the fish)? What about the social and environmental issues and impacts?
- What share of fish should each of the sectors be entitled to access if the fishery is to be sustainable? How many fish should fishers be allowed to catch? How does the government justify shifting the share of fish from one sector to another and what is fair 'compensation' for losing access?
- What share of fish should be left for the environment?
- How does the policy group understand what the science is saying about how to manage the resource in a sustainable way? What do they do when the science is imperfect, has gaps in it and is open to different interpretations?
- How does the policy group balance the technical expertise of scientists with the local wisdom of experience of the recreational, commercial and Aboriginal traditional fishers? How do they make the 'right' decision when the local wisdom is contradictory and is in conflict with the science?

- What are the politics of this policy challenge—the competing positions, views and power bases of the different stakeholder groups, including politicians? How does the policy group work with these?
- What does the policy group need to do to create the conditions within which all stakeholder groups will be willing to work together to determine an agreed position on sustainability?
- What is needed to gain stakeholder commitment to managing the fishery sustainably, particularly when it might mean that stakeholders have to cooperate and collaborate, give up some of their current practices or leave the industry altogether?

Developing appropriate policy responses to these questions cannot be done by working with any one group of stakeholders in isolation from all the others. Ultimately, it will require democratic decision making processes in which all the stakeholders participate to genuinely understand the economic, social, cultural, environmental and political impacts of those decisions on each other's lives. It will also require much more robust and resilient relationships between stakeholders than those that currently exist, including with Fisheries.

Fisheries staff know that they cannot manage this alone and that they need to work with others if they are to foster the long-term survival of fish and fishing. They also understand that two of the critical issues they face in achieving a sustainable fishing industry are mistrust of government and the strong competition between different stakeholder groups for access to the fishing resource. Only by breaking down the mistrust and antagonism between

stakeholders, and enabling them to really listen to each other stories and perspectives, can the depth of relationship be built that is needed if everyone is to work together to find common ground, build a shared vision and agree the strategies needed to make that future a reality.

This research project was designed to engage the recreational fishing sector about issues facing the fisheries in South Australia and to offer insight into methods for facilitating stakeholder engagement, including working with conflict amongst stakeholders. It responded to Fisheries' need to achieve two things:

- Build the confidence and capability of Fisheries staff to facilitate conversations rather than driving their particular agenda in interactions with recreational fishers
- Develop an approach to engaging with the recreational sector.

This need coincided with the researcher's belief that process-oriented facilitation approaches could offer government staff the opportunity to:

- Build a better understanding of stakeholder's hopes, interests and concerns, and through this achieve more robust relationships with stakeholders
- Work with stakeholders to explore areas of conflict and disagreement amongst different stakeholder' positions on issues, and
- Engage stakeholders in working together to resolve conflicts and find ways to implement workable solutions to challenging issues.

The challenge of this project was to explore the potential for facilitated discussions to engage recreational fishers in policy issues in ways that moved beyond competing agendas and beliefs and entrenched mistrust and adversarial positions. It sought to use these discussions to build relationships that would support a deeper level of communication where the complexity of positions, the emotional nature of the discussions and the values and experiences shaping people's mindsets and behaviours could be expressed. It experimented with an approach to facilitation training and group facilitation that could:

- Enable a deeper, more comprehensive and compassionate understanding of multiple stakeholder perspectives and positions on policy issues and directions
- Facilitate collaboration by multiple stakeholder groups in determining agreed upon policy positions
- Support government workers to become more aware of the impact policy decisions have on the lives of industry and community stakeholders
- Enable policy decisions and program strategies to be identified that more effectively address policy issues.



## CHAPTER 2

### GOVERNMENTS' MOVE TOWARDS STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT IN A POLICY CONTEXT

In this chapter, I provide a brief overview of notions of democracy, the changing role of government and expectations of relationship between government and stakeholders. Not having a background in political science has meant that unpacking some of the academic thinking that provides the context for this project has been both an exciting and confronting task. I tend to do things intuitively, so it has been challenging and rewarding to 'dig-deep' into my own thinking and beliefs about why I approach stakeholder engagement in the way that I do and link this to some of the contemporary thinking and research that continues to shape my approach.

At times, I thought that if I had known when I started the project more of the broader landscape of government, politics, governance and stakeholder engagement in which the project is set, I'm not sure I would have had the courage to do what I set out to do. Despite having worked for the State Government of South Australia for many years, I realise that my understanding of political science, relative to the body of academic knowledge and expertise that exists in this field, has been limited.

On the other hand, this lack of knowledge has blessed me with a beginner's mind: a capacity to bring to this work a fresh perspective that is not locked into a specific view or frame of reference about how things should be.

I am also someone who gets inspired by ideas and, several years ago, I came across an article by Gerry Stoker, Professor of Politics and Governance at the University of Southampton, in the United Kingdom, which introduced me to the concept of public value management: the idea that a core role of governments is to tackle issues that the public cares most about (Stoker, 2006, p.42). It is important to me that the role of government is contemporary and relevant and that it is able to respond to the community's needs. This idea of public value resonated with my desire for government to build a different kind of relationship with the industry and community stakeholders in my field. It also offered up a challenge: that those of us who work in government need to find more effective ways of achieving benefit and value for the citizens we serve. This includes the ways that we determine and implement policy outcomes which, in turn, impacts how we approach management of the state's resources. As Gains and Stoker (2008) propose, it calls on those of us who are public managers to ask ourselves whether or not the interventions or services we are delivering are achieving positive social and economic outcomes. This project was, in part, inspired by this challenge.

Change is one of the key constants that I have witnessed during my two decades in the public sector. This has come in the form of shifting government management paradigms that have not happened in isolation, but within the context of profound developments around the world, such as the unification of Germany and the end of the Cold War; the move towards a global market place; the rise of China and India; an expanded use of multilateral organizations to foster global values and the proliferation of

innovative technologies, such as the internet. These and many other developments “have transformed the world economy, our global society, the role of government and citizen expectations.” (Bourgon, 2008, p.4)

To remain relevant, public sectors around the world have undergone rapid and significant reform. Much of this has been focused on making the sector more productive, efficient, effective and transparent. Reforms have challenged the hierarchical, bureaucratic and controlling nature of more traditional forms of public administration. According to Bourgon, historically the role of the public sector was about performing “predictable tasks under prescribed rules”, with “top down and hierarchical” power structures and a focus on compliance. (2008, p.5) Certainly, in the early days of the commercial fishing sector, government’s role was to set licence conditions and regulate the industry.

However, there is a growing awareness of the unpredictability of the world in which we live. The role of government has shifted and has needed to do so in response to changes in community values, preferences, education and cultural maturity. As societies have changed and evolved there has been a demand for governments to be more flexible and responsive to changing circumstances and emerging issues. This is happening at a time when governments around the world are also under severe financial pressure, as is the public sector in South Australia, which is experiencing its own significant resource constraints as well as job cuts.

In political science literature there is considerable discussion about the ways in which governments attempt to change how they manage or govern. While there is diversity in the reform processes of different countries—based on different contexts, needs and philosophies about the role of government—there are some important similarities. According to Bourgon, governments have:

- focused on improving performance, efficiency and productivity
- implemented citizen-centered approaches to service delivery
- striven to increase user satisfaction
- focused on cross-cutting issues
- tried to become more open and inclusive in their relationships with citizens (2009, p.3).

Within these common themes, much of the reform debate has been about governance: the “traditions, institutions and processes that determine the exercise of power in society,” and has called into question “the respective roles and responsibilities of the private sector, the public sector, civil society and citizens.” (Bourgon, 2008, p.11)

To understand these reforms within the context of the project, I draw on Stoker (2006), who compares three different theories of public sector management: traditional public administration, new public management and public value management. He characterises the differences in these management paradigms using six key features:

- the key objectives of the system
- the role of managers

- definition of public interest
- approach to public service ethos
- preferred system for service delivery
- contribution of the democratic process.

Of these features, “the key objectives of the system,” “the definition of public interest,” and who gets to determine what this is, and “the contribution of the democratic process” are particularly relevant to this research. According to Stoker (2006), in the traditional public administration approach, politicians and experts determine what is in the public interest with very little input from the public. By comparison, the new public management paradigm adopts a more market-like approach to governance, and senior politicians or managers make decisions about the public interest, based on evidence about customer choice. However, the core objective of a public value management approach is achieving public value, which involves governments being more effective in tackling the problems that the public cares most about.

In describing how public value is determined, Stoker points out that “public value is more than a summation of the individual preferences of the users or producers of public services. The judgement of what is public value is collectively built through deliberation involving elected and appointed government officials and key stakeholders...Networks of deliberation and delivery are central features of this governance approach.” (2006, p. 42)

The notion that the judgment of what is public value is built collectively through processes of deliberation between government and stakeholders is central to this project. Fisheries staff acknowledge that they have a limited understanding of, and relationship with, the recreational fishing sector. They know that they need to be able to engage effectively with the sector if they are to develop policies and management approaches that achieve the intended results while minimising any unintended and potentially negative consequences. A key goal of this research is to enable Fisheries staff to listen to recreational anglers' views about the future of fishing, a subject the anglers care most about, and to establish networks within the sector to enable deliberation about a strategic plan for the sector, based on an understanding of the interests of the anglers.

The scale and complexity of issues facing the fishing sector as a whole don't just affect those in the sector. They have implications for the broader community, which means that stakeholders from industry, government and the community will need to participate in their resolution. Many of these stakeholders hold quite different views about what constitutes a sustainable fishery and how this should be managed. They have quite different values and beliefs about what is in the public interest. The systems of dialogue, exchange and deliberation that characterise networked governance will be required if the various stakeholders are going to be able to understand each others' preferences and collectively make choices about solutions.

According to Stoker, public value management requires a facilitative style of leadership that steers society through the development of networks and bottom-up approaches to decision making. He argues that there is a need for greater recognition of the legitimacy of a wide range of stakeholders in decision-making, and contends that, “for a decision to be legitimate or for a judgement to be made, it is necessary to have all the stakeholders involved.” (2006, p. 47)

One of the perceptions of some in the recreational fishing sector is that Fisheries and another division of PIRSA, the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI), discount their local knowledge and wisdom of experience in the face of their scientific or expert knowledge. This leads to a mistrust of science by these members of the sector and is part of the antagonism between the sector and government.

The lack of trust in government is one of the drivers behind the support for networked governance. While Stoker acknowledges that it is important for governments to listen and learn to design better policies and services, he argues that finding new ways to engage with people is essential to achieving many social and economic outcomes. He advocates the need to rebuild public confidence in political institutions and states that the most powerful way to do that is to “seek active citizen endorsement of the policies and practices of public bodies.” (2006, p.48)

By directly involving stakeholders in deliberation and decision making, Stoker suggests that networked governance “offers a richer form of democracy.” (2006, p.53) It achieves more effective governance than other paradigms by enabling shared learning and ownership in the development of solutions. It also delivers accountability as it extends the level of citizen involvement.

In discussing government reforms, Bourgon writes that public sector institutions are being required to adapt and find new ways of working that will enable them “to innovate, to experiment, to anticipate, to seize opportunities when they emerge, to deflect problems before they become ‘wicked,’ to reduce frictions where possible and to face adversity when it cannot be avoided.” (2008, p. 8)

Here, Bourgon makes reference to another pressure for change facing governments, which is that many of the policy problems governments are being asked to solve are so complex that they are referred to as *wicked problems*. These are problems that are highly resistant to being solved, where there is uncertainty over their root causes and a lack of known and proven solutions.

The characteristics that define *wicked problems* include:

- having boundaries that go beyond the capacity of any one organisation to understand and respond to
- there is often disagreement about the causes of the problems and the best way to tackle them.

Additionally, they are challenging because trying to resolve them:

- commonly involves behaviour change of groups of citizens or all citizens
- requires public servants to work across both internal and external organisational boundaries and to engage stakeholders and citizens in policy making and implementation
- calls for innovative and comprehensive solutions that can be refined through practical experience and feedback. (Australian Public Service Commission, 2007)

Climate change, obesity, indigenous disadvantage and land degradation are all examples of wicked policy problems. So, too, are policy issues involving the sustainable use of natural resources, including achieving the sustainable management of fishing in South Australia.

Fisheries encounters the difficulty inherent in wicked problems, in that there are many interdependencies, multiple causes and internally conflicting goals or objectives, to try to develop a sustainable fishery. Fisheries staff need to consider the multiple and competing interests of the commercial, recreational and traditional Aboriginal fishers, conservationists, aquaculture enterprises, tourism operators, bait and tackle shop owners and more, when considering policy options to achieve their goal. There is disagreement amongst these stakeholders about what sustainability means and each can place a different emphasis on the factors they believe contribute to achieving sustainability. Stakeholders have different ideas about the nature and extent of problems

and often there is an element of truth in each of their views, but “no one version is complete or verifiably right or wrong.” (Australian Public Service Commission, 2007, p.3)

Successfully addressing the issue of sustainability will involve trade-offs between conflicting goals and require a range of coordinated and interrelated responses. It will also require ongoing refinement of responses as, often, efforts to address wicked problems lead to unanticipated consequences.

The Australian Public Service Commission writes that the literature around wicked problems concludes that it is their social, rather than technical, complexity that “overwhelms most current problem-solving and project management approaches.” Therefore, resolutions are usually only achieved through coordinated action by multiple stakeholders. (2007, p. 4) Bourgon suggests that it is in addressing these problems, which are beyond the control of any one government department, that a networked approach is increasingly useful in mobilising the range of stakeholders and organisations both within and outside government. (2008, p.15)

The Australian Public Service Commission refers to Rittel and Webber, the originators of the wicked problem terminology, who suggest that wicked problems cannot be addressed successfully using traditional linear, analytical approaches that are characteristic of a scientific approach. These authors believe that wicked policy problems cannot be definitively described and that, because of the rich diversity within society, there is no such thing as

undisputable public good and, therefore, “no objective definition of equity.”  
(1973, p.155)

All of these factors mean that, in dealing with wicked policy issues, no one government department or stakeholder group has the answer, nor do they have all the tools, power or resources needed to address these issues. It also means that, while technical expertise is needed, it can only ever address some aspects of the problem. As a result, Fisheries staff need to adopt multiple roles in working with their stakeholders. At times a facilitative approach is needed, whilst at other times technical expertise is required. Sometimes they will be called upon for leadership, while at other times they will need to follow the community’s lead.

This need to be able to move between multiple roles is one of the current challenges for Fisheries and it is tied to the evolving nature of government’s relationship with industry and the community. No longer is it appropriate or acceptable for government to develop policy in isolation, nor to base their policy decisions solely on technical expertise. Industry and the community expect to be involved to ensure that decisions made by Fisheries reflect the economic, social, cultural and environmental factors that are important to them—that they believe that they have a stake in.

The need to improve both public participation and citizen engagement in policy development has been increasingly recognised in many public sector reforms over the past two decades. This is part of a broader interest in

deepening and extending democratic political processes by finding new ways of gaining citizen participation in decision-making, resource allocation and service design and delivery. (Bourgon, 2008, p.19)

Bell and Hindmoor (2009) affirm that while the principle of community engagement is not new, there are several reasons why the scale and scope of engagement efforts by government have increased over the last decade or more. These include:

- ease of access to citizens through the internet
- public deliberation and civic engagement extends democratic processes and enhances legitimacy of policy decisions
- civic engagement and the fostering of 'active citizens' can be argued to lead to healthier and more prosperous societies, where rights are balanced with responsibilities
- an enhanced capacity to formulate and implement policies; minimise discontent and increase perceptions of fairness; enhance legitimacy of decision; ease implementation; broaden the base of responsibility for policy, helping to shield government from blame; and incorporate wider inputs or participation in government decision-making
- growing concerns about the appropriateness and reliability of centralised forms of expert knowledge and a stronger valuing of the forms of knowledge garnered through dialogue and engagement with citizens or communities.

When Fisheries recognised the recreational fishing sector and the Aboriginal traditional fishers in the Fisheries Management Act 2007, in addition to the commercial fishing sector, it signalled a new era in fisheries management; one that was going to need to be based on having effective relationships with each of the three sectors. As stated previously, under the Act, Fisheries is required to allocate a share of the aquatic resource to each of the three sectors and these shares are to be included in Fisheries Management Plans. Fisheries staff know that the most effective approach to managing these allocated shares to the resource is one in which they engage each of the sectors. This will include working with the sectors to develop their management plans. They know that without this engagement their decisions would be uninformed and considered illegitimate by the stakeholders. It would exacerbate the already difficult relationship with SARFAC, triggering a flurry of vitriolic publicity and letters to the Minister, make implementation of any plans extremely difficult, and exacerbate the sectors' mistrust of government.

A wide range of engagement approaches are utilised under the umbrella of citizen participation. The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) has developed a public involvement spectrum which depicts five levels of engagement: inform, consult, engage, collaborate and empower (see Table 1). The spectrum recognises that all public participation initiatives are not the same and defines the public's role at each of the levels of participation.

Table 1: Public Involvement Spectrum

INFORM	CONSULT	INVOLVE	COLLABORATE	EMPOWER
<b>Public Participation Goal</b>				
To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.
<b>Promise to the Public</b>				
We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.
<b>Example techniques to consider</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fact Sheets</li> <li>• Web sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public comment</li> <li>• Focus groups</li> <li>• Surveys</li> <li>• Public meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshops</li> <li>• Deliberate polling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizen advisory committees</li> <li>• Consensus building</li> <li>• Participatory decision making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizen juries</li> <li>• Ballots</li> <li>• Delegated decisions</li> </ul>

**Source:** Adapted from the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2), 2004.

Fisheries intent in engaging with the recreational sector is to collaborate; achieving the public participation goal of partnering with recreational anglers in each aspect of decision making, including the development of alternatives and identification of preferred solutions. This project takes the initial steps in the engagement approach and seeks to establish the relationships that will be

needed for Fisheries and the sector to jointly develop a strategic plan for the sector.

Fisheries approach is consistent with Lukensmeyer and Torres (2006) who see citizen participation as a means of reinvigorating democratic governance and propose two key shifts in how public administrators view and approach engagement. First, they believe engagement models need to focus on information processing rather than information exchange and, secondly, that citizens need to be seen not as consumers, but as active shapers of government policies and programs. In making these shifts they emphasise that engagement is about knowledge building and relationships of influence.

These are important distinctions and highlight the ways in which expectations of the public sector's role in engaging with stakeholders is changing. They signal the extent to which governments are increasingly being asked to share control and power.

Bell and Hindmoor (2009) discuss some of the limitations of, and impediments to, community engagement. They raise questions about:

- The willingness and capacity of citizens and communities to maintain sustained participation
- Who exactly is being engaged, and the extent to which the engagements are representative and legitimate
- The motivations and capacities of Government, especially in relation to power sharing.

These issues are important for Fisheries staff to consider as they engage with the recreational fishing sector. They are aware that many people go fishing to get away from the pressures of everyday life; it is a recreational pastime and a sport. How much will recreational anglers want to participate in engagement initiatives? How do Fisheries design and implement engagement activities that will gain the participation of recreational fishers and be seen as representative and legitimate by the sector? Are Fisheries staff clear about their motivation and capacity in wanting to share their power with the sector?

In discussing some of the dangers of poor participatory processes, Bell and Hindmoor (2009) advise that governments need to be clear with stakeholders about the extent of their willingness to share their authority in order to avoid confusion and disappointment. There is nothing more frustrating for stakeholders than contributing time and effort to a process only to find that government will make final decisions that appears to ignore their input altogether.

They also list a number of skills that public administrators need if they are to be successful in community engagement. These include: “networking, negotiation, mediation, conflict resolution, and synthesising or reconciling diverse frames of knowledge while also focusing on broader strategic and accountability concerns (Hess & Adams, 2002; Davis & Rhodes, 2000, cited in Bell & Hindmoor, 2009, p.157).” This list of skills highlights another challenge for Fisheries, since many in the division are more confident in

utilising their scientific and technical knowledge in their interactions with stakeholders than they are using their interpersonal skills.

Fisheries staff already have a difficult relationship with the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council (SARFAC), the peak body for recreational fishing in South Australia. They know that SARFAC and many in the recreational sector are frustrated with what they perceive is a lack of government support for recreational fishing. They also have concerns about some of the initiatives that the recreational sector wants government to support, viewing them as problematic or at odds with current government policy. Given this background, if Fisheries staff are to be able to effectively engage the sector, it will be important that the project approach enables them to build a solid base of interpersonal skills. It will also require them to build the conditions for cooperation.

In discussing processes that will enable the public to engage in dialogue and exchange about the issues that they care about, Gains and Stoker call for an embracing of politics, which they view as “the processes of collective decision-making that help us manage conflicts and create conditions for cooperation.” They suggest that politics be valued as a mechanism for social co-ordination for three reasons:

First it enables people to cooperate and make choices on the basis of something beyond the individualism of the market. It treats people and encourages them to treat others with recognition of the full roundness

of their human qualities and experience. Second, political decision making is flexible; therefore it can deal with uncertainty, ambiguity and unexpected change. Politics is an essential coping mechanism in an uncertain and unpredictable world. Finally, politics can move beyond a distribution of benefits—a rationing function also offered by markets—to establish a process of social production in which interests are brought together to achieve common purposes. Politics can influence the basis for cooperation by changing people’s preferences and creating an environment in which partnership is possible. (2008, p.17)

Working with politics in this way will require a significant shift in how Fisheries engages with stakeholders. It will require Fisheries staff to recognise, accept and embrace different views, experiences, beliefs and values, provide avenues for these to be expressed, and establish mechanisms for ongoing dialogue and exchange, so that deliberations can occur about choices and alternatives. It will also call for Fisheries staff to develop the capacity to facilitate between conflicting views and deal with strongly expressed emotions and heated exchanges.

Contemporary thinking about dialogue is relevant to Fisheries’ interest in promoting positive exchanges with stakeholders. Yankelovich suggests that true dialogue implies an interaction in which there is a genuine openness of each participant to the concerns of the other. “I fully ‘take in’ your viewpoint, engaging with it in the deepest sense of the term. You do likewise. Each of us internalizes the views of the other to enhance our mutual understanding.”

He describes dialogue as a process of successful relationship building where people move beyond surface interactions and defensiveness to listening and responding to each other with “an authenticity that forges a bond between us.” (1999, p.14)

According to Yankelovich, when dialogue is skilfully conducted, it can lead to extraordinary results. This includes “dissolving long-standing stereotypes, overcoming mistrust, achieving mutual understanding, shaping visions grounded in shared purpose, and finding people previously at odds with one another aligned on objectives and strategies.” (1999, p.16)

However, he states firmly that, beyond the fact that dialogue is often not done well, strong feelings and attitudes, such as violence, hate, and mistrust, and differences in the interests of participants can severely limit the process, proving stronger than the motivation to find common ground. He makes it clear that dialogue is not an instrument of decision making as considerations of power and interest interfere with the process.

While the purpose of dialogue is aligned to the outcomes Fisheries is seeking with the recreational sector, the deep seated resentment, long-term mistrust and strongly-held vested interests that Fisheries will need to address in building relationship with stakeholders, limits its usefulness in this particular project.

Process Work offers a contrasting approach to building relationship and creating community. While it seeks to dissolve stereotypes and achieve awareness and mutual understanding, it engages in heated conflict, rather than running away from it, as the most effective means of resolving divisiveness in relationships. According to Mindell,

Instead of thinking in terms of the paradigm that condemns what's going on in a given conflict situation by implementing programs, methods and procedures that implicitly look down on the people involved, process-oriented organisational work discovers the missing power of transformation in the tension itself and in people's behaviour. In the new paradigm, *conflict itself is the fastest way to community*. Conflict is its own healing. (2002, p.4)

It is Process Work's capacity to embrace all possible states of mind, all people and all feelings, working with and then moving beyond polarised viewpoints, (Mindell, 2002) that offers Fisheries the approach and tools it needs to begin to engage with the recreational fishing sector in South Australia.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **THE PROJECT APPROACH**

In this section I describe how I worked with Fisheries to build the engagement process and detail the methodology I used to scope, implement and evaluate the project. I show how I utilised Process Work concepts and tools in the way that I facilitated the project's implementation and I share the feedback received during the phases of the project.

#### **Engaging PIRSA Fisheries as a Partner in the Research Project**

This project would not have been possible without the partnership of Fisheries, a division of Primary Industries and Resources South Australia (PIRSA). It was undertaken as a participatory, action-learning project and addressed the specific need Fisheries had to better engage with the recreational fishing sector.

The Executive Director of Fisheries sponsored the project and the Manager of Fisheries Policy collaborated in all phases of the project. In addition, the leadership group of Fisheries invited eleven members of the policy and compliance groups of Fisheries to participate, and this group became the team with whom I worked with most closely.

The project involved over three hundred hours of planning, preparation, meetings, training sessions, workshops and debriefings, the majority of which was undertaken with either the Manager of Fisheries Policy, a small working group of the project team or the full project team.

In focussing on building an effective approach to engaging the recreational fishing sector, the project signalled a new direction for Fisheries. It raised questions for the project team about the expectations Fisheries management had of their role in working with the recreational sector. Everybody on the team already had a full workload and, for some, this involved working solely with the commercial sector. This meant that any work with recreational anglers would be in addition to their current work commitments.

If the project was to be successful, I had to gain the interest and commitment of the team members. Each of them had to see ways in which they could benefit if they were to participate. They needed to understand the pressure for change that was coming from their senior leaders and they had to feel that they were going to be supported by these leaders to make those changes. This meant that the project was not only about my capacity to support Fisheries staff as they engaged with the recreational sector; it was also about my capacity to engage the Fisheries staff themselves.

Going into this, I knew that I had the full support of the division's leadership. At critical moments at the beginning and during the project, both the Executive Director of Fisheries and the Manager of Fisheries Policy clearly communicated the need for the project, confirming that the work with the recreational sector was to be ongoing and would not cease once the project itself was finished. They framed the research as an opportunity for staff to build their facilitation skills in working with all stakeholders and positioned the project as a first step in working with recreational fishers to build a

recreational fishing plan for South Australia. This affirmation was important to the project team, many of whom had concerns about their managers' expectations of them in working with the recreational sector.

### **Building Capabilities in the Organisation**

I also had broader support for the project in the organisation, especially with my manager, the Executive Director of People and Culture. She recognised the importance of the project in building PIRSA's capabilities in stakeholder and community engagement. This resulted in an agreement that the project become one of my key work priorities for the year.

### **The Phases of the Research Project**

From February to May, 2010, I undertook a scoping process to determine the intent, outcomes and context for the research and to define its focus and boundaries. In working with Fisheries, the project had opened up new territory for me that I found incredibly interesting. I had a good grasp of natural resource management and sustainability issues and strong experience in working with communities. However, I had little background in fisheries management and had not worked with the fishing industry or the recreational fishing community. It was important for me that I become familiar with the history and background to fisheries management in South Australia, the hopes and fears of the Fisheries leaders and staff, and the strategic challenges, operational issues and relationship dynamics that they faced.

I read relevant documents and met with the Executive Director of Fisheries and members of the Fisheries leadership team to develop an understanding

of their world. Through these conversations we identified the kinds of challenges that Fisheries staff experienced in working with stakeholders and the capabilities they believed their people needed to develop. The questions, issues and needs that emerged during these conversations became key considerations in the design of the project.

The leadership team acknowledged that, despite good data on the numbers of recreational anglers and what species they preferred to catch and where in South Australia they were fishing, they had a more limited understanding of the people who made up the sector. The questions that emerged in my discussions with them included:

- What does Fisheries need to do to effectively engage with the recreational fishing sector?
- How does Fisheries identify who to engage with to build a credible plan with the sector?
- How does the recreational fishing sector itself decide who engages with Fisheries?
- What future does the recreational sector want to build for the industry?
- How does Fisheries engage with the recreational fishing sector to foster greater participation in decision making about the sector?
- What capacity building do members of this sector/the stakeholders need?
- What are the things that are impeding an effective engagement process?
- What are the core elements of an effective engagement process?

There are a myriad of clubs and groups dedicated to fishing in South Australia, such as amateur angling clubs, sports fishing clubs, fresh water fishing clubs, lure fishing clubs, etc. Although many of these clubs are members of the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council (SARFAC), not all are. In addition, many of the 240,000 people who fish do so to “get away from it all” and are not members of a club or association. This lack of an established structure across the whole sector made the idea of engaging with recreational fishers a daunting one and highlighted just how important PIRSA’s relationship was with SARFAC.

The leadership team talked about their frustrations with the lack of an effective working relationship with SARFAC and their need to address this.

They also expressed concerns about how their staff engaged with stakeholders. Many of the staff had scientific and technical backgrounds that resulted in them having strongly-held positions about fisheries management and issues. It was the leadership team’s perception that this prevented staff from listening effectively to stakeholders, and was causing problems in their interactions with anglers. This was supported by feedback from fishers that indicated that they felt that Fisheries staff had fixed views on issues, and that the Fisheries Department discounted their experiences and didn’t want to listen to what they had to say.

As a result of this scoping process, the Executive Director of Fisheries identified his need for the project to achieve two things:

- Develop an approach to engaging with the recreational sector
- Build the confidence and capability of Fisheries staff to facilitate conversations rather than driving particular agendas in interactions with the recreational fishers.

Having sought guidance from my Masters Program Study Committee on a design for the project that would achieve these outcomes, I gained the support of the Fisheries leadership group to implement the project in three parts:

- Phase 1: Facilitation Training with PIRSA Fisheries
- Phase 2: Recreational Fishing Workshops
- Phase 3: Recreational Angling Forum.

The following pages describe what happened in each of these phases.

### **Phase 1 – Facilitation Training**

The four women and eight men who made up the project team came from either the policy or the compliance groups in Fisheries. These groups perform different, yet complementary functions. Those from the policy area are involved in day-to-day management decisions, in developing laws, policies, and fisheries management plans, and setting limits to what fishers can and can't do. While those in the compliance area are responsible for delivering education and awareness strategies and monitoring the communities' behaviour in conforming to the limits set down by law. This includes having the power to fine people who are caught breaking the law and referring cases for prosecution.

All members of the project team were experienced in their work. Through the differences in their roles, some had stronger connections with recreational anglers than others, but all had stories to tell about their experiences in working with the sector. Many members of the project team were also passionate recreational fishers and some were not.

If the training was to be successful, it was important that it build on their experiences and support them to be successful in their roles, as well as meet the development needs required by their managers.

To achieve this, I focussed the training on enabling the participants to plan, prepare for, and facilitate effective engagement with stakeholders. This included being able to:

- Listen to recreational fisher perspectives and frustrations without getting defensive, and, by listening, develop an understanding of people's positions on issues
- Have conversations that resulted in stakeholders feeling that government was open to their views and interested in understanding the significance of their positions on an issue
- Stand in the "line of fire" as government workers, balancing the need to listen with an ability to build stakeholders' understanding of why government held a particular position on an issue.

The training would support the participants to understand their own position on an issue and identify where they might have strongly held views that could

prevent them from listening. It would help them to step into stakeholder positions and respond empathically to concerns, handle verbal accusation and attacks, and deal with exaggerated statements and outrageous claims; as well as giving them an understanding of the power that they have as government representatives and how to use that power effectively.

I planned and conducted four half-day training workshops in May and June 2010. During these sessions, I worked with the project team participants to establish the context for the project. I determined their expectations of the training and then provided them with tools and resources, practice in facilitation, and guidance in how to plan and prepare for different stakeholder engagement activities.

The topics covered during the sessions included:

- The history, stories and myths that have shaped PIRSA Fisheries
- “Yes, buts ...” to the project
- Barriers to engagement
- Stereotypes and biases – of recreational fishers and of government
- Being part of government – joining the government story
- Bars on the cage – a tool for building listening skills

The training was interactive and experiential and used methods of group facilitation that included concepts and tools from Process Work. I utilised the participants’ experience in working within the sector, their understanding of different stakeholder positions, and their personal experience of fishing. I

combined the presentation of key concepts and tools with activities, discussions and role plays, to keep the learning practical, stimulating and relevant.

I prepared detailed facilitation plans for the first three training workshops and, prior to each session, emailed the participants an outline of what would be covered in the workshop (see Appendices 1 & 2).

### ***Strategies for Working with Stakeholders***

Given that the project was about engaging with the recreational fishing sector, I invited a recreational fisher to the first training workshop to share his story with the group. He joined the session, following the scene setting by the Fisheries leaders, and shared his responses to the following questions:

- What does recreational fishing mean to you?
- What future do you want for the recreational fishing sector?
- What is it like to work and interact with Fisheries and government?

In talking about what fishing meant to him, the fisher engaged both the hearts and minds of the project team. He spoke personally and with passion about its impact on him as a man, a father, a businessman and a member of the community. The openness and honesty with which the fisher shared his hopes for the future and his views enabled the group to hear feedback about positive and frustrating experiences in dealing with government. By drawing on specific examples of the impact of policy decisions on recreational fishing, he made the issues facing the sector real, giving the project authenticity and bringing it to life.

In bringing an angler in to talk with the group at the beginning of the project, I demonstrated the depth of information that can be uncovered and what we can learn if we are open to another's experience and point of view. It modelled that creating opportunities to listen to stakeholders tell their stories and speak about their views was at the heart of the project.

During the training I also paid attention to three key concepts in Process Work's method of group facilitation: *roles*, *ghost roles* and *rank*. In Process Work a role can be thought of as a "position or viewpoint that depends on time and place." (Mindell, 1995, p.42) All of us are more than any one role and, although we may identify with some roles more strongly than with others, all roles are a function of a given moment and are not fixed. For example, while the person invited to speak with the group identified as being a recreational fisher, and was primarily talking from that particular role, his position on fishing was also shaped by the other roles that he identified with: a father, a small business owner, an advisor to other recreational fishers and a member of his community. I wanted the group to hear the diversity of this one person's views about recreational fishing and how his perceptions of government's role in fishing was influenced by the multiple roles that he occupied at any one time.

Having a fisher talk with the group also took the role of a recreational angler away from the abstract realm of fictional characters and stereotypes and made the experience real. When a group talks about a role, but it is not present in the group, nor represented by anyone, in Process Work it is

referred to as a ghost role. I wanted to start the training with the voice and views of a recreational fisher being present. I wanted the group to hear directly from a fisher about what fishing meant to him, what hopes he had for the future of fishing and what experiences he had in interacting with government. This enabled the group to engage with the reality of this fisher's experience, rather than having to make assumptions or guess at what these responses might be. This allowed the group to gain a fresh sense of the depth and diversity of the recreational fisher role.

I was also aware that the project participants had different levels of experience in working with anglers because of their different roles. Some had limited experience in dealing with the sector, while others worked with recreational fishers on an almost daily basis. Process Work recognises that people in a group have a different rank, or power base, depending on factors such as their education, economic status, cultural background, gender, sexual orientation and age, and that this plays an important role in group dynamics and in conflict. Inviting a recreational fisher to speak at the training provided the group with a common experience of a recreational fisher's story. This helped to address some of the power imbalance or rank issues that existed in the group because of people's levels of knowledge and experience of the sector.

The fisher spent time and effort in preparing and coming to talk to a group of government people about a topic close to his heart. He disclosed personal views and perspectives in answering the questions I had posed. To respond

to his generosity and vulnerability, and to build trust in the relationship between Fisheries and the stakeholder, I asked the group to share what stood out for them in what they heard in the session. This helped the group to integrate the key messages and insights they gained from listening to the stakeholder and it provided the fisher with feedback about the impact of his comments on the Fisheries participants. This was well received by the fisher, who made positive comments about what the project was intending to achieve as he left the workshop.

After the recreational fisher left the session, each of the Fisheries participants was asked to share what recreational fishing meant to them. Even though they were all from the same division, and some were from the same work unit, the group had not worked together as a team. This meant that there were different levels of relationship and comfort amongst the participants. It was important they share their personal experiences and perspectives about recreational fishing as a way of getting to know each other more and build trust within the group. Afterwards, they shared that they had never had the opportunity to talk about this topic with each other.

After the first two training sessions, I realised that I had underestimated the amount of time the participants would need to connect and form as a group and that one of the ways that they did this was by talking about issues in Fisheries, including some that didn't seem directly related to the project. One need raised by members of the group was to be able to express ideas and opinions, and share frustrations and difficulties with each other without being

seen as complaining. It seemed that an unspoken aspect of the division's culture was that expressing frustrations and difficulties wasn't well supported.

Throughout the project I tried to remain alert to any ghost roles that emerged in conversations amongst the project team and with stakeholders. In this instance, it appeared that the role of the "complainer" or "whinger" was repressed. As a goal of the training was to support the participants facilitate conversations with stakeholders, it was important that I model creating space for all roles to be present. So I took time in the early training sessions for conversations that were important to the group, letting the project team explore specific concerns that they raised, and supporting them to think about what they wanted to do differently in dealing with their frustrations. If the training was to be successful, it was important that the group developed enough comfort to talk openly and be vulnerable with each other and with me, even if this meant moving through the schedule I had developed for the training more slowly than I had anticipated.

At times I found matching the pace of the group challenging. I was mindful that I had four sessions in which to "train" the group in facilitation and, at the same time, I knew that I had to work with the group's process rather than trying to impose my idea of what we needed to be doing and when. This didn't mean that I abandoned my plans for the training. However, it meant that I had to be awake to feedback from the group. In addition to their verbal responses, I watched the group's signals, such as their level of interest, or alertness, their body language and the level energy with which they were

participating, to gauge how much time we spent on different topics or discussions.

The project team also spent time in the early training sessions grappling with their expectations for the project and what working with the recreational sector would mean for them. All the participants were keen to receive facilitation training, but many of them were concerned about the impact of the project on already heavy workloads. Some didn't see the recreational fishing sector as a priority and others were concerned about setting up expectations with the recreational sector that they would not be able to meet in the future, once the project ended.

To support the group to settle into the project and enable us to focus on the skill-building components of the training, I undertook a "yes, but ..." exercise with the group. This activity acknowledged that the group thought aspects of the project were worthwhile, the "yes" to the project, and it allowed them to express all the "buts" or reservations that they had about what it might mean for their future work. Having one of the Fisheries senior managers participate in the group was also helpful, as they were able to address some of the group's concerns and affirm Fisheries commitment to ongoing work with the recreational sector.

The training approach was a balancing act, with a strong focus on using the knowledge and experience the group had in working with the sector and

introducing concepts and tools that would build the group's capacity to facilitate interactions with stakeholders.

A fundamental component of the training was building the project team's listening and responding skills. In "*The Good Listener*," Hugh Mackay (1994) writes about communication and uses the metaphor of the "bars on the cage" to discuss the idea of mental models, or world views. I used this tool to build awareness and listening skills, including exploring how our beliefs, values and experiences become frames of reference that underpin how we see the world. They operate like invisible bars on our psychological cage. The "bars on the cage" tool enabled the participants to understand important communication concepts, such as the assumptions we make about people when we are trying to communicate with them. The project team particularly resonated with the idea that when people feel like their ideas or viewpoints are being attacked it serves to reinforce the bars on their cage and makes it difficult for them to listen. Working with people's cages became a core tool for the group in building their communication skills and in managing attacking or defensive behaviour.

I also used activities that were based on their experiences of being listened to, to draw out the key elements of effective listening, such as responding to both the content and feeling in what was being said and being able to paraphrase and summarise what they had heard. This was followed by practice in listening and responding to each other.

Role plays were another key tool I used in developing the participants' skills and in preparing them for their facilitation roles in the project. One of the inspirations behind this project is the way in which Process Work understands and works with roles and how this might be used to support stakeholder engagement. Process Work conceives a role as being an expression of a momentary partial identity that does not belong to any one person but to a dynamic of interests in an issue. This dynamic gives rise to certain polarised positions or viewpoints on an issue. For example, inherent in the issue of sustainability are the opposing poles or sides of sustainable and unsustainable; of long-term and short-term; of in balance and out of balance; of exploitation and conservation. Within the idea of sharing a resource will be the dynamic of a fair share and an unfair share; of moderation and of greed. And within the idea of stewardship lie the polarities of responsible and irresponsible, ethical and corrupt, moral and immoral. In any conflict about sustainability, roles will emerge that represent these opposing positions, as well as the diversity of viewpoints that are held within the sides themselves.

From a Process Work perspective, a role is also not the sum of all of who we are (Mindell, 2002). We are more complex and multifaceted than any position or point of view we have on any particular issue. In other words, while at a given point in time we might represent the role of recreational fisher or government worker; this does not mean that we are not also a father or sister, son, granddaughter, breadwinner or community member. We have many identities and fulfil many roles.

In the Process Work model, roles are used as a way of enabling all the voices that need to be represented on an issue to be heard; even those that are unpopular, make us feel uncomfortable or even frighten us. This approach stems from a belief that these voices gain more power and become more dangerous when we ignore them or marginalise them. If, instead, we represent these roles and are willing to genuinely engage with what they have to say, we can move beyond the surface content of their position on an issue to hear the personal stories that have shaped the way they are responding. When a group can move from speaking in roles to sharing personal experiences, there is the possibility of building a deeper understanding of people's reactions. When people are willing to open up to the group and speak personally, this can lead to a different level of dialogue where people are able to talk about the emotional and psychological impact that a particular issue might have on them. Often this can be a moving experience. It reduces the tension between people, and the participants can feel empathy for another's position. It helps the group to find a place of common ground, a shared humanity and understanding. These can be transforming moments for a group.

The facilitator's task, from a Process Work perspective, is to support the participants to step into the opposing roles in a conflict, and help them to speak out the views that are present, even those that are commonly too difficult or uncomfortable to say in our normal style of conversation.

Sometimes the facilitators will need to step into these roles themselves, as it may be too difficult for the participants to do this in the early stages of a role

play. Practiced Process Work facilitators don't let mainstream cultural norms of behaviour prevent all the voices from being heard. While this can be confronting and can turn the heat up in an interaction, it is also more real, as it brings all the often unexpressed ghost voices into the conversation. Thus, the facilitation task is to support the participants to interact between roles, until the group organically moves beyond role playing, and people begin to share their personal experiences from the roles.

Since a facilitator needs to be able to work with all roles and support all the voices to be heard, a key part of their preparation and ongoing development is to get to know which issues or aspects of an issue are likely to trigger them in ways that may mean that they can no longer remain impartial to particular views that are being expressed. This is important in creating safety for people to speak.

Developing this awareness and impartiality is not always easy and takes practice. Most of us have views and beliefs about issues. Some views we hold more strongly and are more consciously known to us than others, and we can be more comfortable with some of our views than others. Often we can have a position on an issue without knowing why we hold that view point and, in most contexts, we're not encouraged to build a level of self-awareness that enables us to understand what has shaped the way we think about an issue. I saw role plays as a way of helping the project team to build more awareness of their views on issues and those of stakeholders and of the views most likely to trigger them, while building their facilitation skills.

The breadth of experience the project team had of stakeholder reactions to different issues and to other stakeholders lent itself to using role plays to give the participants practice in facilitating common situations that they faced in their work.

We identified a number of issues and viewpoints that the sector and other stakeholders raised in their interactions with Fisheries. These included:

- Recreational fishers not feeling supported by government; seeing the department as only interested in the interests of the commercial sector, and viewing the recreational sector as nothing but a nuisance
- The team witnessing competition between recreational and commercial fishers, with each sector criticising the other's practices as unsustainable and prophesising that there wouldn't be any fish left if government didn't do something about the other's behaviour
- A history of interactions with conservationists and the environmental department, that left the project team believing that these stakeholders were opposed to any kind of fishing because of concerns about sustainability.

Working with role plays based on these kinds of issues and viewpoints made the training relevant and valuable. It enabled the participants to experiment with putting their listening skills into practice and to gain self-awareness.

I used role plays to support team members to explore their own positions on issues. By having to stand strongly for their own viewpoints in these

interactions, the participants gained a deeper understanding of the factors, such as their education, family background, cultural or spiritual beliefs or personal values, which were driving them to respond in a particular way.

For the role plays to be effective, it was important that the participants felt fully supported to express views that went beyond what is normally considered polite or acceptable and to be 'one-sided' about an issue. Often, only by stepping into a role and interacting with others, can we get to know our own diversity of views on an issue, including those with which we are less comfortable. It is also difficult to take another's side on an issue unless we have been supported to understand our own views.

Working with role plays also enabled the participants to step into different stakeholder shoes and see an issue from "the other side." There is a difference between talking about a stereotype of a stakeholder and becoming that stakeholder in a role play where you are asked to represent views that you normally find yourself in opposition to. Practicing walking in another's shoes and experiencing what it is like to see an issue from that stakeholder's perspective, gives the participants access to a deeper level information about the role, including its emotional content. Gaining insights into the different dimensions of a role also helped to challenge some of their assumptions about that role. It helped to build the participants' capacity to listen to different viewpoints and strengthened their capacity to facilitate by being more able to support their opponent's side of a conflict.

Additionally, the participants practiced facilitating interactions between conflicting stakeholder roles.

The role plays, and the debriefings we had about them, built the participants' awareness by offering them insight into their own views, beliefs and values and those of different stakeholders. They were more able to see where they might be triggered inadvertently by a view point and become one-sided. The role plays gave the participants an entry point for understanding the deeper conversation that is trying to happen between the stakeholder groups.

Access was provided to the kinds of impasses that are present in working with the sector and other stakeholders and offered insight into the decisions that are trying to be made. This helped the participants to understand that roles are not static and allowed them to build the resilience needed to handle attacks as a facilitator and government worker.

Working with roles and stereotypes was also useful in helping the participants understand that there will be times when community or industry stakeholders can only see them as "the government" role and not as individual human beings. The project team were able to see that sometimes all they represented to recreational anglers was the role of government as the rule maker or legal authority; the one who has the power to make and change fishing regulations. They were able to appreciate that, in working for the government, whether they liked it or not, they became part of "the government story" and would encounter community and industry reactions to them that

were based on all the stories, experiences and beliefs those people had of government (J. Diamond, personal communication, May, 2010).

At the end of the first four training sessions, the project team was keen to continue practicing their facilitation using role plays. So I conducted an additional two half-day sessions in July, 2010.

At the end of the training, it was agreed that different members of Fisheries project team would facilitate a series of workshops with the recreational fishing sector to gain practical experience in facilitation.

### ***Feedback from the Training***

Feedback from the participants was gathered at the end of many of the sessions, and at the end of the training an evaluation was undertaken (see Appendix 3). The participants' feedback from the training was positive. The benefits and insights the group gained included:

- The freedom to be more open with each other and with stakeholders
- Understanding that it isn't a weakness to let your position go and really join with someone and listen to them
- The need to look past your own position; people have a story to tell that is "right" in their eyes
- Being able to identify people's personal barriers and power bases, and considering this when engaging with them
- The importance of planning and preparation
- Understanding different values, opinions and experiences within the group, and hearing where people are coming from.

In one of the participant's words:

A brief outline of what I have learnt, or perhaps better understand, is the importance of actively listening, paraphrasing to demonstrate and ensure that you have heard the message, and then, from what has been told to you, try and delve a bit deeper into what the issues really are. This is because the "real" issues are not actually directly spoken.

Re-enforcement of actual "listening" is in being able to respond (at a later time) to the issues raised; being able to portray the actual reasoning behind decisions/policies. Being able to step back and consider the issues and determine whether they can really be addressed and what, as an individual or agency, can be done to accede to the issues.

I have learnt to not be so defensive in potentially adversarial situations.

(R.Donovan, personal communication, September 3, 2010)

Many in the group appreciated having the chance to say more than they normally would feel comfortable to share and being able to be open with each other. They spoke about never having had the opportunity to discuss their position on recreational fishing before and that having the background to the fishery helped to understand why some recreational fishers might behave the way they do.

## **A Critical Moment in the Project**

A critical moment in the project emerged during the final training session when a discussion was taking place about the next phase of the project, which was to be the workshops with the recreational sector. Once again the “yes, buts ...” re-emerged, with some of the group expressing concerns about the extent to which the project was a priority and the effect on their credibility if they couldn’t meet the expectations it raised with the recreational fishing sector. Some team members were uncertain about their ongoing participation in the project, and were unsure of the level of commitment that they were being asked to make.

I took these concerns seriously and suggested that the group meet with their Executive Director to address the issues that they were raising. A discussion was taking place about this idea, when I heard two of the participants commenting that they could use some of the questions we had been working with during the training in their meeting with the Executive Director. When I checked with the two participants, they agreed to play a part in facilitating the meeting with the Executive Director. In the lead up to this meeting, I realised that they intended to facilitate the whole meeting, having asked me to provide feedback on the approach they were intending to take. At this point, I became aware that it was time to step back from facilitating and let the participants take the lead. It was a crucial moment in the project and set the scene for the workshops with the recreational fishing sector.

The meeting with the Executive Director was very successful. It was well-facilitated by the project participant facilitators. They received strong reassurance from the Executive Director that the project was a priority and that working with the recreational sector was an ongoing part of their work. However, there was acknowledgement that it would require a greater commitment from some members of the team than others depending on their roles. The Executive Director also gave the team positive feedback about how they were approaching the project and praised them for the way in which they were putting the tools and skills from the project into practice.

The meeting ended any further questioning by the group about their role in the project.

## **Phase 2 – Workshops with the Recreational Fishing Sector**

The second phase of the project began the engagement process with the recreational sector. In July and August, 2010, the project team and I co-facilitated five workshops with recreational fishing groups, three in regional South Australia and two in Adelaide.

Working with three members of the Fisheries project team, we agreed that the purpose of the workshops was to:

- Get to know who the recreational sector is and how to engage with them
- Identify the networks needed for the recreational sector to work together with Government

- Give recreational fishers the opportunity to shape the future of the sector

One of the team members, the Fisheries Communications Officer, utilised existing networks within the recreational fishing sector to gauge people's interest in participating in a workshop and determine appropriate workshop dates and times.

In preparation for the workshops, I drafted a facilitation plan that detailed the activities, timing and roles of the facilitation team. I then met with the project team members who were to be facilitating the workshops and together we finalised the plan (see Appendix 4).

Invitations outlining the purpose of the workshop, the timing and venue details were sent to potential participants through emails and letters (see Appendix 5). Significantly, the invitations included an acknowledgement by Fisheries staff that they hadn't been very effective in working with the sector to date and that they were serious in wanting this to change. This message was important, as it conveyed to fishers that Fisheries staff weren't satisfied with their past performance, and that they recognised they needed to change how they engaged with the sector.

The invitation also communicated that the workshops would be about Fisheries listening to the fishers, and it included the questions that the participants would be asked to respond to at the workshop. The workshops

were also described as being the start of a larger strategy by Fisheries staff, to build ongoing relationships and communication channels with the sector, that would enable them to work together to address issues affecting the sector.

This form of invitation resulted in workshops being held in Port Lincoln, Kadina, Berri and Adelaide, attended by a mix of anglers who represented a range of recreational fishing interests. The Port Lincoln and Kadina workshops were hosted by members of the region's Recreational Fishing Committee, who were all salt water fishers. Amongst these participants were charter boat operators, former commercial fishers, tourism operators and scientists. One participant was also a member of the Fisheries Council of South Australia—the body established under the Fisheries Management Act 2007, to provide advice to the Minister on the management of fisheries. Participants in the Berri workshop were fresh water fishers who attended as individuals rather than as part of an established group.

One of the Adelaide workshops was conducted with the Recreational Fishing Champions Group, a stakeholder group established in 2009 by Fisheries, to provide two-way communication between Fisheries and the sector. In addition to being keen recreational anglers, these participants all held media and communication roles devoted to fishing.

The other workshop was hosted by the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Committee. As the peak body for recreational angling in South

Australia, SARFAC has an extensive membership with the following associations and clubs represented at the workshop: SA Fresh Water Anglers Association, SA Fly Fishers Association, Upper Spencer Gulf Recreational Fisheries Committee, Australian National Sport Fishing Association, Fishing Disabled Australia Inc., SA Game Fishing Association, Black Point Progress Association, Port Augusta Coastal Homes Association, Inland Recreational Fisheries Committee, SA Field and Game Association and Sheoak Flat Progress Association.

Based on feedback from the prospective participants, the workshops were held at night, starting at 7pm and finishing at about 9.30pm. The numbers attending the workshops were small, with a total of 35 participants across the five workshops. However, this allowed time for genuine conversations to happen, deepening Fisheries understanding of the recreational fishers and their hopes and concerns.

Different teams of the Fisheries project participants facilitated the workshops to put their training into practice. As people arrived at each workshop, introductions were made and people were invited to have a cup of tea or coffee. I talked to participants about the research project and sought their permission to record the sessions, which I formalised by having them sign consent release forms developed for the project (see Appendix 6).

For four of the workshops, the Chair of the committee or group hosting the session opened the workshop. Where the participants were not part of an established group the Manager of Fisheries Policy opened the workshop.

At each workshop, before moving into the questions for the fishers, the Manager of Fisheries Policy reiterated the acknowledgment by Fisheries staff that they hadn't been very effective in working with the sector to date and that they were serious in wanting this to change. She also explained that the information shared in the workshop was to form part of the larger strategy by Fisheries that included the development of a strategic plan for recreational fishing in South Australia.

I then introduced the research project, giving a brief overview of its purpose and why the topic was important to me. I explained that we had undertaken facilitation training and that different members of the project team would facilitate different parts of the session, and that I may also ask questions of clarification. The participants were then asked if they had any questions or any comments before we moved on to the questions we had for them.

With the focus on creating a space for listening, at each workshop different members of the facilitation team asked one of the following questions of the recreational fishers:

- What does recreational fishing mean to you?
- What future do you want for the recreational fishing sector?

- If we are to have a great future for recreational fishing, who needs to be involved in making this happen?
- What part could you play in making this future happen?
- Where to from here?

The fishers' responses were recorded in different ways. I took notes as I listened to the fishers talk about what fishing meant to them. Then butchers' paper was used to capture responses to the questions about the future and who needs to be involved. I took notes of the responses to the last two questions. The workshops were also recorded on video.

Following the workshops, the notes from the workshops were documented and sent to the participants. I also talked with the participant facilitators, individually or in groups, to debrief their experience of facilitating the workshops.

### ***The Impact of the Workshops on the Engagement Process***

By declaring their intention to change and then demonstrating their commitment to listening to the sector in the workshops, the Fisheries facilitators eased the anger that the recreational fishers felt with government. Although frustrations with government were expressed, and some provocative issues were raised, the facilitators did not respond defensively to what was said. Instead, they put their own agendas, beliefs and values to one side and supported the participants to discuss these frustrations, to draw out the underlying issues. There was a great generosity on the part of the recreational sector in giving Fisheries a chance to build a different kind of

relationship with them, to the extent that one of the Chairs of a Recreational Fishing Committee arrived at the workshop with freshly baked muffins and his own harvested honey for everyone. The Fisheries facilitators were also effective in responding to the fishers in ways that made them feel heard and that supported them to continue talking.

The participants responded well to the questions posed at workshops and seemed to relish the opportunity to talk about why fishing was so important to them. The questions tunnelled beneath any frustrations with government and other stakeholders and provided Fisheries with a lot of rich information about the things that were important to the fishers. In listening to people's stories and experiences during the workshops, and discussing their hopes, ideas and concerns, the Fisheries facilitators gained a much better understanding of the sector and their issues. The benefits they got from the workshops included:

- Listening to the passion people had for fishing and hearing how much joy it brings them
- Understanding the social connections and economic considerations of recreational fishing
- Hearing the concern recreational fishers have for the environment and achieving sustainability
- Understanding the link between fishing and the health and wellbeing of communities
- Increasing their confidence as facilitators who are able to listen to stakeholders, including to their frustrations with government, and not react defensively.

For all of us involved in the facilitation teams, the workshops generated extremely valuable insights about what fishing means to people and how important it is to the social and economic fabric of communities, particularly in regional centres. We heard very powerful messages about fishing as a way of escaping from the pressures of life, being out on the water with mates, friends, families and kids. The importance of fishing as a way of men connecting with each other and with their children, and grandparents spending time with grandchildren, was spoken about in every workshop.

The fishers spoke about their hopes for a sustainable future for the sector in which fish stocks were healthy and there was ongoing access to fish and fishing spots. They talked about their desire for recreational angling to be supported by government, and wanting greater recognition of the links between fishing and tourism and the economic benefits fishing generates for the state. They wanted Fisheries to treat their sector fairly and for it to be on an equal playing field with other sectors.

Common frustrations with Government were that Fisheries staff didn't talk to recreational fishers when they did things that affected them and that there was a lack of action on issues. There was a perception amongst anglers that too much emphasis was placed on the need for proof before taking action on issues, which meant that issues weren't getting fixed. There was a desire for leadership, decision making and taking action earlier and refining the action later, if needed.

The fishers were frustrated by the lack of funding for the sector and many spoke about wanting a recreational fishing licence introduced in South Australia as one way of boosting funding. Concerns were also expressed about Fisheries being under-resourced, with a desire for an increase in the number of Fisheries Officers available to monitor the catch limits that people take.

Across the five workshops, the following five themes consistently emerged as the issues of most importance to the sector:

- Funding
- Sustainability – realistic size, boat and possession limits for recreational/commercial sectors (Total Allowable Catch)
- Access – to fish and fishing spots
- Leadership, representation, co-management – continued listening by government and openness to ideas
- Education and promotion.

In utilising networks within the recreational fishing sector, the workshops built on Fisheries existing relationships with these stakeholders, rather than establishing new relationships. Although the numbers at the workshops were small, this had the advantage of allowing time for individual stories, and exploration and discussion of issues and perspectives with the participants. The individuals who attended were passionate about their sector and it was appropriate that the engagement strategy begin with them. As many were representatives of established committees and associations, it acknowledged

their commitment to recreational fishing and their leadership within the sector. If we had not engaged with these groups first, the project would have run the risk of alienating them and exacerbating their frustration and anger with Fisheries.

This was borne out in the three regional workshops, with participants wanting Fisheries to utilise the existing structure of SARFAC as part of how government worked with the sector. In addition, in one of these workshops, some on the Recreational Fishing Committee (RFC) also saw the opportunity for the RFCs to become a local peak body. They believed that they could bring together all the different groups who have a role in recreational fishing, so that they are not competing with each other. They saw the RFCs as already being in a position to catch what's going on in the community and acknowledged the need for all the local recreational fishing groups to get their own house in order, since they all want the same outcome—to save the fish. They saw themselves as bringing in information and knowledge and being able to bring others in, and their ideas. They wanted government to support them in this role, particularly in providing the RFCs with regular updates and information so that they were able to answer questions put to them, without having to chase it.

There was a feeling that all the players, resources and knowledge were already there to build a future for the sector, but that there needed to be broad participation so that all the players and resources could be better utilised.

Some fishers also acknowledged that the sector needed support to pick up its

power and that, with more flexibility and greater involvement, they would be able to take more ownership and responsibility for what they are doing in recreational fishing areas.

Prior to undertaking this project, I had not understood the significance of fishing on the health and well being of this sector of the community, particularly its role in mental health. I have been changed by what I heard in the workshops, and some of the Fisheries people have recognised that government may need to change its position on some issues, if there is to be an ongoing and effective relationship with the recreational sector.

In debriefing conversations that I had with the project team facilitators following each workshop, most commented that the stories they heard in these workshops were powerful and changed the way they understood the recreational fishing sector.

Feedback about Fisheries engagement with the sector emerged even before the final workshop took place. One of the participants who attended the Recreational Fishing Champions session posted the following, entitled “PIRSA Listening To Rec Fishers” on Strike & Hook: A Reel Fishing Forum—a fishing website in South Australia:

Last night I attended a workshop with the Rec Fishing Champions Group with PIRSA Fisheries...I must say it was a good 3 hours and I think if things keep going as they are there can be vast improvements

for Recreational Fishing in South Australia. I am pleased that PIRSA is willing to listen, and last night one of the questions was “What does recreational fishing mean to you?” There were a lot of passionate responses and it reflected on how fishing is such a major part of so many people’s life, of all generations. Fishing means so much to the economy as we know, tackle, bait, fuel, servicing boats, accommodation, food and I think this is now being realised. The stories of fishing since a lad etc really hit home to how this is such a lifestyle for so many people and it lasts a long time.

There were questions of how we could work together to get the best for recreational fishing and also the sustainability of fishing for the future. Also how we could all work together to do the best for all people involved/affected by decisions made.

I think this is a great thing and I would like to thank PIRSA for allowing me to have a say amongst such a distinctive group of people who are all passionate about the lifestyle, we and our families enjoy...

I sincerely hope this all gets somewhere that will benefit all of us for a good fishing future with good fish stocks available in the future to keep generations enjoying the environment and fishing for fun. (Waterboy, 2010)

This posting prompted a number of responses, including:

You've got me all fired up now ..., my shot at the workshop is not until next week and I'm so looking forward to it. (tonyb, 2010)

And this one:

I had PIRSA out to my place last week... and although they put me straight on a few points it came through that they are looking to the future and how recreational fishing has to change.

They spent 5 hours with me talking through various points, and listening to my ideas of how to promote the possibility of a private, user pays day ticket fishery.

Some of my ideas go against the grain, i.e. the catch and release of noxious species. This usually gets an adamant no way from the government bodies. At least this time they asked how it could work and why I have asked for the possibility of an exemption...

I am not saying my plans and ideas are a 100% right but at least they are ideas and I'm trying to do something. As a trial fishery it has tremendous potential and things learnt here could pave the way for future fisheries. I was pleased with the time fisheries gave me. In the past it's been a grunt "don't know" "no" or "too hard". [Staff members] came across as interested, informed and open.

For the first time in years I actually feel things are changing in SA and the government bodies are waking up to the requests and needs of the fisherman. (Lord Blackbilly, 2010)

Following these posts, sixteen fishers attended the final workshop with SARFAC, which we were told was the strongest attendance at a SARFAC meeting for quite some time.

In the final workshop with SARFAC, despite the high attendance, we decided to keep the same format for the session and start with what recreational fishing meant to the participants. Listening to the sixteen stories took close to half the workshop time, so we broke the participants into small groups to work through the final three questions. Each group was then asked to share the key points of their discussion and we ended the session with the whole group identifying what they believed the priorities were for the sector. These are outlined above in the five key themes that emerged from the workshops.

### **Addressing the Conflict between Fisheries and SARFAC**

I was aware from conversations with Fisheries that their relationship with the Executive Officer (EO) of SARFAC was strained. I believed that this individual would be a key opinion leader in the engagement process and that it was important that I try to establish a relationship with him, if I was going to be able to help Fisheries build a more effective relationship with SARFAC. I wanted to give the EO the opportunity to talk about his role and his experiences of working with Fisheries. So I asked to meet with him and we

went and had lunch one Friday in August, prior to the workshop with SARFAC.

I learnt a lot about the passion and dedication that the Executive Officer had given to recreational fishing and SARFAC in his years in the role. I understood his frustrations with government and Fisheries, including how upset he was at the lack of funding for SARFAC as he saw this as limiting what he and SARFAC were able to do for the sector. At times during the lunch it was hard to not get discouraged by what seemed like intractable positions that would have to be addressed if the relationship between SARFAC and Fisheries was going to improve. It was also an important conversation, as it gave me more ability to support SARFAC's position in interactions with Fisheries during the project. It also gave the Executive Officer an opportunity to share his perspective on issues and get to know me.

In November, 2010, a couple of months after the workshops with the recreational sector, and in the lead up to the forum with recreational fishers, I spoke with the President and Executive Officer of SARFAC and discovered that they were really frustrated by their relationship with Fisheries. There had been some recent instances where policy decisions affecting recreational anglers had been taken by Fisheries and released in the media, without any interaction between Fisheries and SARFAC. This led SARFC to believe that Fisheries staff were not serious about building a relationship with them as the peak body representing the sector.

From my conversations with the President and the EO, I believed that the breakdown in the relationship was serious and that it needed immediate attention. Through conversations with the Executive Director and Manager of Fisheries Policy, I was able to gain support for a meeting with the President and Executive Officer of SARFAC. I facilitated this meeting, which enabled both sides to air some of their frustrations with each other. It also created the space for some misunderstandings and misinformation to be addressed. At the end of the meeting both groups affirmed their commitment to keep working together and agreed to meet on a monthly basis, as a means of continuing to build their relationship and share information in an informal way.

Following this meeting, SARFAC strongly supported their members' participation in the final phase of the project—the Recreational Fishing Forum.

### **Phase 3 – The Recreational Fishing Forum**

As the final phase of the project, in December, 2010, we held a forum that brought together participants from the previous workshops and other recreational fishers. This was conducted during the day, starting at 9.30am and finishing at 3pm and was facilitated by the Fisheries project team members and myself.

Prior to the event, four members of the project team and I collaborated to define the purpose of the forum, design the format for the day and coordinate participation by the recreational fishers. We agreed that its purpose was for recreational fishers and Fisheries staff to work together to address the key issues identified in the workshops held in July and August.

The workshops had focussed on hearing a range of perspectives and concerns about recreational fishing from those in the sector, and while the issues that emerged were consistent, they were broad, umbrella issues, and we had not had the time to go into their positions on these in any detail. We also knew that the issues raised in the workshops could not be tackled in isolation from other key stakeholder perspectives. For these reasons the aim of the forum was to:

- Explore a range of stakeholder positions on the key issues to identify areas of common ground and opportunities to build workable solutions and strategies

It would also build on the workshops by continuing to:

- Give recreational fishers the opportunity to shape the future of the sector
- Determine the approaches and networks needed for the recreational sector to engage and work together with government.

We held meetings with the President and Executive Officer of SARFAC and a member of the recreational fishing Champions Group (the stakeholder group established by Fisheries, to provide two-way communication between Fisheries and the sector), to discuss the forum and have them participate in its design.

The PIRSA Fisheries Communications Officer coordinated the invitations. He worked with the Executive Officer of SARFAC, the Chairs of the recreational fishing committees and other stakeholder groups to utilise existing networks

within the sector to invite people to attend. Everybody who had attended the previous recreational fishing workshops was invited to the forum.

Invitations were sent through emails and letters. These described the purpose of the forum and gave people an outline of the session, including the three issues raised in the workshops that the forum would address (see Appendix 7). The invitation provided timing and venue details. It also acknowledged that the forum was part of a larger strategy by Fisheries to build ongoing relationships and communication channels with the sector, to jointly foster the sector and address issues impacting recreational anglers.

Following significant collaboration from the four members of the project team and representatives from SARFAC and the Champions Group, I drafted the facilitation plan for the day. This detailed the activities, timing and roles of the facilitation team. The plan was discussed and refined in a briefing session with all the project team members who were going to participate in the forum, and the facilitation and recorder roles were allocated amongst the team (see Appendix 8).

Twenty recreational anglers attended the forum, which commenced with a welcome and introduction by the Executive Director of Fisheries and a welcome and acknowledgment of the importance of the forum by the President of SARFAC. I followed this by outlining the purpose of the session and the format for the day.

In his welcome, the Executive Director stated that Fisheries' was committed to maintaining the relationship with the recreational sector and to continuing to engage with them, rather than just meeting when something went wrong or needed to be fixed. He talked about the project as giving Fisheries the opportunity to form a genuine partnership with the sector in setting the direction for the future.

The President of SARFAC also commented that in the 10 or 11 years that he had been involved in SARFAC, he had a strong sense that they seemed to be at logger heads with PIRSA all the time and "a lot of the communication between us seems to be formal and contrived and we get in the trenches and we get things sorted out by writing letters, and I guess that's the way we've done things." (B.Schahinger, personal communication, December 8, 2010)

He acknowledged that the project was a good step, to try to open up the lines of communication: "I get the impression that PIRSA really want to try and understand recreational issues, the things that motivate us, the things we want out of the recreational fishery..." and went on to say:

I suppose there's the other side, too. It's going to help us understand the pressures PIRSA are under, too, and the different stakeholders they have to manage. PIRSA aren't just about looking after recreational fishing issues; they've got a whole lot of other stakeholders to manage as well. They've got a difficult balancing act. It's a good move to try and break down some barriers and get talking and I hope it

continues and I hope there are some good benefits down the track.

(B.Schahinger, personal communication, December 8, 2010)

Following these opening remarks, I framed that one of the things that we wanted from the day was for the participants to strengthen their understanding of each other. I acknowledged that one of the things I had learned from the project was the huge diversity in the recreational sector. I also shared that being involved in the project had changed me in terms of my understanding of the significance of recreational fishing, particularly in building social connections and the health of the community. Then I invited the participants to get up and introduce themselves to someone they didn't know in the room, to help build community through the forum.

Following this, to re-affirm for the participants that the forum was about engaging with recreational anglers, and that it would build on the key themes that had emerged in the workshops, three members of the Fisheries project team shared the key messages they had heard in facilitating these workshops and what this meant to them. This also gave those anglers who hadn't participated in a workshop, a sense of what Fisheries had heard and the impact it had on them.

Here is feedback from one of the project team members:

The really key messages that stood out for me in listening to those stories, firstly was about the role of men in the community. The ability

for men to connect with each other while they're out fishing, to connect with their families, and connect with people of different generations, particularly children. We had lots of people talking about how important teaching others and teaching children is to them; and that that was a big part of what drives them, people's ability to pass on skills and knowledge to other people in the community. I know it's not just men that go recreationally fishing at all, but that was a really strong theme that stood out for me.

Following on from that, the way that fishing allows people to connect with each other, without having a whole lot of barriers in place, whether it's about people talking to each other right across different age groups or different socio-economic statuses; it doesn't really matter how old you are or how much money you earn or what you do for a job or where you're from; there's this common theme that people can have a conversation about fishing and speak a common language and it's a very inclusive way to connect with people and have those conversations with people.

It has reinforced for me that Fisheries management is really all about people. It's not actually about fish at all. The importance of building and maintaining the relationships with people is an incredibly important part of what we do and, with a better understanding of the people that are involved, it allows us to get much better results and have better

policies and programs in place. (A.Fistr, personal communication, December 8, 2010)

Another team member affirmed much of the previous team member's comments, acknowledging the passion and diversity of people's stories and the cross-generational value of fishing. He noted that one story that stood out for him was that fishing could be a positive mechanism for changing the direction of people's lives and help them to see a future for themselves. The impact of recreational angling on whole communities had also been a powerful message. The team member also commented that he thought the engagement project had changed the way Fisheries was interacting with each other and with stakeholders.

The third team member shared that a key message he'd received in going to the workshops was the need for Fisheries to communicate more openly and effectively with the sector about the factors that were being considered in policy decisions about fishing. He saw the need to provide more explanation about why Fisheries was taking particular courses of action, as well as whether or not these had a positive impact.

I then introduced the activities for the day and explained that we would be taking the participants through a set of activities that addressed three of the key issues raised consistently in all of the workshops: sustainability, access, and ongoing engagement (see Appendix 9). I shared my belief that issues usually only become issues because they are complex, and that there are

competing needs and concerns about them that we need to understand if we're going to come up with workable solutions. I explained to the participants that we wanted to give them the opportunity to keep working on these key topics with Fisheries and, at the same time, we wanted to build a greater understanding of some of the challenges we faced in trying to address these issues.

In moving to address the issue of sustainability, I noted that it was one of the fundamental issues that came out of every single workshop. I explained that part of the planning process for the forum had been to recognise that sustainability seemed to be the umbrella issue for recreational anglers and that we needed to get clearer about what it meant to people in order to work on the other issues that had been raised.

The participants were seated in groups, at tables, and the activities took them through a series of questions related to the issues. Each table had a facilitator and a recorder and fed their thinking back to the whole group at various stages through the workshop.

The activities were designed to enable the recreational fishers to respond to the questions from their own perspective, in other words, they were supported to express their own viewpoints and take their own side. Each table was then asked to put on a different hat and imagine that they were a different stakeholder group—commercial sector, conservation group, general community, Fisheries (government)—and respond to the same questions. The

participants were then asked to identify common ground and differences between their position on the issue and the stakeholder group they were asked to represent.

The final session explored how the participants wanted to progress with these issues in collaboration with Fisheries.

The Fisheries project team facilitated the small group activities and I facilitated the feedback sessions and the work with the large group.

As in the workshops, the responses to the questions were recorded in two ways: butchers' paper was used to capture responses to the questions and the forum was recorded on video. Following the forum, the notes were documented and sent to the participants.

When the forum finished, the project team discussed how they felt the day had gone.

### ***The Impact of the Forum on the Engagement Process***

The forum generated a lot of discussion and information. It became clear that recreational fishers shared a definition of sustainability that included the sustainable management of fish stocks by allowing all species of fish having the chance to breed before they are caught. There was agreement about the need to balance catching enough fish to feed a family with the need to protect fish stocks for the future, the need to protect habitats where fish spawned and to have size limits in place. (In South Australia, if fish species are caught

below the size limit set for that species, anglers are legally required to put them back in the water unharmed).

There was support for government decision making to be based on science, although there was concern that the science needed to be credible. Anglers also wanted to contribute anecdotal information and be able to ask questions when their experience differed from the science. It was also important that information about the science and decision making be made available to the fishing public.

There was a desire to get to the point where the regulations didn't need to keep changing. At the same time, the need for a whole-of-system approach to managing fishing was seen to be important, with flexibility in management arrangements required to cater to changing conditions. Once again, the issue of more policing by Fisheries of the regulations was raised.

The recreational sector wanted to be taken seriously in the decision making process; to be part of it, utilising the experience of SARFAC and the stakeholder groups it represents.

Also identified was the need for a program to educate children in particular, about shifting attitudes to recreational angling, and helping to assist the sector in changing its fishing behaviour.

When it came to viewing sustainability through the lens of the commercial sector, there was recognition of the need for a healthy sustainable commercial fishery, with commercial fishers being able to make a profitable living on an ongoing basis. There was a perception that the commercial sector wanted an assurance that their share of fish was not going to be reduced, that they could continue to expend the same effort for the same size catch and that the size of the catch and the effort the catch required would stay level over a number of years. There was also the view that the commercial sector saw recreational angling as a very inefficient way to catch fish.

As a stakeholder group, the general community were seen to defer their decisions about what was sustainable and what wasn't to others, but were becoming more conservation minded. There was a sense of the differences between urban communities who, as consumers, wanted cheap, fresh Australian fish, and regional communities who were more aware of the effects of fishing on local businesses. For river communities, there was a reliance on the river and, therefore, they had an emotional investment in sustainability. The participants believed that information and education were critical for this stakeholder group in managing perceptions about recreational fishing and in providing children with the opportunity to go fishing. The need to have clearly defined fishing practices for the general community was seen as important in achieving sustainability.

The group that was asked to put on the hat of PIRSA Fisheries (government) saw sustainability as the need to manage the catch that is harvested by the

different sectors in a manner that ensures that there is enough for everyone for future generations. There was recognition that things can change rapidly and that management arrangements had to be responsive and able to be adjusted quickly.

In defining sustainability, this arm of government was concerned with determining which fishing practices were and weren't sustainable and that commercial licences were economically viable. Compliance was seen as important, as was the need to understand the influence of culture on people's attitudes to sustainable fishing practices. There was a perception that Fisheries viewed the recreational sector as lacking understanding about sustainability and that there needed to be better communication with the sector about rules and why these rules exist. SARFAC was seen as needing to have a bigger role in conveying these messages.

As a stakeholder group, the conservation sector's views on sustainability focussed on protection of endangered species, growing the numbers of native stock, having more protected areas and closed fishing seasons, improving the environment through reduced industrial discharge and restoration of natural sea habitat such as sea grass, and the policing of regulations.

The forum participants were asked to identify where there was common ground and where there were key differences in understandings of sustainability and what it meant to the various stakeholder groups. There was a perception that across many of the stakeholders groups, there was a desire

for a healthy fishing environment, an ongoing fishing resource and an improvement in fish stocks. There was a shared view that information and education had an important role to play in achieving sustainability, that there needed to be better ownership of responsibilities and good management decisions being made. There was common agreement on the need for more compliance.

There was recognition that both the recreational and commercial sectors get satisfaction from fishing that is about more than just the money. However, that recreational anglers don't fish for a profit was seen to be a key differentiator between the sectors. There was also acknowledgement that both sectors compete for the fish stocks and this has an impact on sustainability.

The group perceived that the conservation sector wanted less fishing activity and were not interested in the business and economic aspects of sustainability. The different levels of interest in fishing amongst stakeholder groups and the different scales of impact from fishing practices were also thought to be key differences in understandings of sustainability.

The second issue that the forum considered was that of access to fish and fishing. This issue is about physical access to fishing spots, through structures such as jetties, boat ramps, artificial reefs and water impoundments, and through road and beach access points. Of concern to

anglers is the impact that marine parks, urban development, a lack of artificial reefs and poor maintenance of jetties have on people's capacity to go fishing.

Participants at the forum were asked to consider what the priority issues they believed needed to be addressed when it came to access for recreational anglers. Again they were asked to step into another stakeholder's shoes to consider that stakeholder group's needs and concerns about the issue of access. They were also asked to identify what they believed to be the obstacles to allowing access or sharing access.

A number of priorities were raised by the participants to issues of access. During the project, the Department for Environment and Natural Resources had been consulting with recreational fishers about zoning for marine parks and there was real concern about the impact the parks would have on access to fishing. Tension already existed between the fishers and conservationists and there was mistrust of the Environment Department. One of the key concerns the fishers had was that there would be an equal share of responsibility for environmental protection across the whole community, not just on recreational anglers and commercial fishers. They were also worried that the information they provided to the department would be used against them.

There was recognition of competition for access to the aquatic resource between recreational anglers, commercial fishers and aquaculture developments. The recreational fishers were keen to ensure that Fisheries

used a rigorous process to determine any shifts in the allocation of fish between the commercial sector and themselves. They also wanted access to be limited in known breeding areas through effective use of fishery closures in the relevant locations at the appropriate times.

Other issues related to the desire for more inland fishing opportunities, including access to reservoirs and impoundments. There were concerns about safety, vandalism and the quality of facilities and the need for more education.

The fishers recognised that achieving access to fishing locations involved a number of stakeholders other than Fisheries, including local government, the transport and water departments, industry, the military and national parks. The desire for more information sharing was also raised.

As with sustainability, there was awareness of the similarities and differences in stakeholder needs and concerns about access to fishing. This included an understanding of the importance of economic viability for those in the commercial sector and the potential that any changes in access could have in forcing commercial operators into more open water, leading to higher business costs and safety risks. In recognising Fisheries' need to satisfy conflicting stakeholder views, the recreational anglers acknowledged that a more effective relationship with Fisheries may lead to better results for all concerned.

The forum was a more challenging experience for some of the Fisheries facilitators than the workshops had been because of the mix of participants. A few participants had not attended the workshops and so had not had the previous opportunity to vent their frustrations about government's lack of support for recreational fishing. One or two did so in the forum and, at times their comments were extremely negative and critical of government. This, in turn, caused others who had been at the workshops to again air their frustrations. However, all the facilitators managed to maintain their non-defensive behaviour and enabled their table group to work through the questions we had posed.

The facilitators managed to effectively balance the need to give the participants time to share their views, while progressing through the activities. There was more structure in the forum in an effort to make progress on the key issues raised in the previous workshops. We didn't want to waste people's time by revisiting earlier discussions. However, it is easy to fall in to the trap of thinking that, because you have listened to people's frustrations and have acknowledged these, that all will be forgiven and forgotten and that the relationship can move on in a linear fashion. But relationships and past hurts generally don't work like that, particularly when frustrations have built up over a number of years.

The activities worked well. The participants moved from sharing their own perspectives, to stepping into another stakeholder's shoes, even though

occasionally they slipped back into their more familiar roles of recreational fishers.

The forum generated a considerable amount of information that set the stage for the strategic planning process between Fisheries and the recreational sector. More importantly, it enabled Fisheries, SARFAC and the recreational anglers to progress the development of their relationship by working together on issues that mattered to the sector. It also provided Fisheries with the opportunity to have the recreational fishers gain insight into some of the competing stakeholder agendas that Fisheries has to respond to as part of managing the aquatic resource in South Australia.

In the final session for the day, I asked the recreational anglers about the kind of relationship and engagement that they wanted to have with Fisheries beyond the forum. I proposed two different models of relationship between stakeholders and government for them to consider, that emerged from a discussion about the project with Julie Diamond, my Study Committee Advisor. The first model presented the role of the public as consumers of government programs and services, while the second portrayed the public as citizens who are actively participating in the management of the aquatic resource with Fisheries. There was unanimous support for the latter.

Based on this response, the Executive Director of Fisheries proposed that Fisheries establish an “engine room” group, as a mechanism for the participants to continue to collaborate with the division on recreational fishing

issues. There was also strong support for this concept and many of the participants indicated that were keen to be part of this group.

To conclude the day, I invited the feedback from the participants on what they had gained from the forum and the two themes that emerged included:

- An appreciation of Fisheries commitment to working with the sector on their issues
- Comments on the usefulness of getting into other stakeholder's shoes and seeing issues from their perspective.

### **Project Evaluation**

Several days after the forum, I conducted an evaluation session with the project team members. I also interviewed the Executive Director, Fisheries and the President of SARFAC to identify what they thought the project had achieved. I discuss these findings in the next chapter.



## CHAPTER 4

### WHAT THIS APPROACH TO STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ACHIEVED

In this section I discuss the outcomes of the project, the extent to which it achieved what it set out to do and what has changed as a result. In doing this, I share feedback I received about the project's effectiveness. I also reflect on the research approach and discuss insights about what helped to make the project successful and what could have been done differently.

The project set out to address two broad objectives:

- Develop an approach to engaging with the recreational sector
- Build the confidence and capability of Fisheries staff to facilitate conversations rather than driving their particular agendas in interactions with the recreational fishers.

With the focus of the engagement approach being about relationships, skill building and process work approaches, I have used anecdotal evidence rather than empirical data to measure its success. This includes drawing on how the people who participated in the project—Fisheries team members, recreational fishing stakeholders and the project sponsor—responded to the approach and how they changed. For expediency's sake I have also paraphrased, on occasion, what they related to me.

During the evaluation of the project, the Fisheries team members acknowledged that one of the benefits that they got from the project was developing facilitation skills, to help them get to the real issues concerning the

sector. They saw these skills as being transferable into a lot of areas of their work. One team member appreciated the tools in listening, using roles plays and working with accusations, and the opportunity to practice these, and valued the awareness I brought to the training: “The opportunity to practice those tools and the insight you brought to the conversation was really helpful.” (A.O’Brien, personal communication, December 16, 2010)

Another team member valued the facilitation training as a way for the group to get to know one another within the context of what the project was to achieve. He commented that it provided the participants with the opportunity to have conversations about the sorts of issues that were likely to be brought up in interactions with the sector. It then gave them a very safe place in which to prepare for and practice possible interactions with the fishers.

One team member believed that the project had an impact on the group’s capacity to relate to different people. He perceived that, in general, team members were listening more, rather than being immediately on guard or refuting views or resorting to the facts straight away, which had tended to just inflame the situation in the past.

Different members of the team responded to the project in different ways because of the nature of their work with the recreational sector. Those from a compliance role talk with recreational fishers almost every day. For them, the project highlighted how Fisheries needed to demonstrate that they had been actively listening to the sector by being able to explain why they were taking

certain actions on issues. They saw the really keen anglers as being hungry for knowledge and information and that Fisheries needed to be in a position to provide this to them. This was an important awareness for these team members, as they hadn't appreciated the level of need some recreational anglers had for more open, two-way communication about the actions Fisheries were taking to manage the aquatic resource.

Some team members who had less contact with the sector saw benefits from the project in the way it helped them to see the humanity in their stakeholders, rather than seeing them as adversaries. For others it was about developing more understanding of the recreational sector and having their eyes opened to the sector's diversity and dynamics. They gained a greater appreciation of the issues and what anglers saw as the future of fishing. Time spent with recreational anglers in the workshops, in particular, helped achieve these outcomes.

Another team member shared that the project had helped her to think about the importance of recreational fishing in ways that she hadn't thought about before and that this would influence her approach to decision making in the future.

Sometimes you don't really get why people do things, everyone's different, but I could really see something in why people go fishing now that I couldn't see before. And when people do have that passion, and the experience, you know that it's important that we listen to them

because, for all of what we do, it doesn't mean we're right. Just because we've got a report or something in detail, or understand the legislation, it doesn't mean that we know the right answer. That's why I think it's really important that we do listen to these people and, somehow, get them involved in the decisions that we make, so that they can be the best ones that we can have. (A.Fistr, personal communication, December 16, 2010)

One of the project team members, who worked closely with SARFAC, saw the project as having an impact on galvanising a “work together mentality” between Fisheries and the peak body that had not existed previously. He was noticing positive changes in behaviour in the interactions between the two organisations.

[before the project] it was literally two lots of butting heads that never the twain should meet. And they never met. So that to me is the subtle shift, the feeling that both groups are buying on to a change. Maybe it took us to admit our wrongs and make that step, but I think the feeling is mutual now; not from everyone, but it is starting to happen, and that's why I'm optimistic that it will continue on...There's a big change in working with SARFAC, even in the tone of some of the emails and in some of the interactions with them. (K.Rowling, personal communication, December 16, 2010)

In designing the research approach, it was important that the project pay attention to building a positive relationship with SARFAC. As the peak body for recreational fishing in South Australia, SARFAC has a significant influence on the attitudes recreational anglers have towards Fisheries. Through phone conversations and meetings, the project team, Executive Director of Fisheries and I were able to establish a relationship with the President and Executive Officer, and created the opportunity to address the frustrations and conflict between the two organisations. Having the President co-host the final forum acknowledged SARFAC's leadership role in the sector, and gaining the President and Executive Officer's participation in the design of this event strengthened the relationship.

One of the highlights in the feedback about the project came from one team member, who had to facilitate a regional public forum in December, 2010. The story he shared highlights the level of support the project generated amongst some of the recreational fishing participants:

I went to a public forum in Port Lincoln on Monday, which is always scary, and the recreational sector was very, very good. At the end of the forum a few issues were raised about PIRSA, and [one of the recreational fishing committee members] got up and said how great this [engagement] process has been and how they finally feel that they're having a voice again; that we're listening and things have changed and we're building momentum. He made a point of getting up and making these statements to everybody there. We've got

engagement with them and, because of that, the meeting was made so much easier; they were agreeing to things that I thought they wouldn't agree to and they were united. We got exactly what we were hoping to get, so that's as good an impact as you can have. (L.Triantafillos, personal communication, December 16, 2010)

He was asked by one of his colleagues what he thought was different about that meeting to other meetings that he'd had before and his response was:

They [the fishers] were open. The feeling wasn't like we've blown into town and we're telling them what to do...They felt involved, that we were serious about listening to them and hearing their concerns. The general vibe of the meeting became very positive and supportive. If we had had this forum six months ago, before we had this facilitation and engagement process, they would have thought 'Here come the city folk telling us what to do.' (L.Triantafillos, personal communication, December 16, 2010)

The impact of the facilitation training and the workshops was evident in one team member's feedback. He acknowledged how much the facilitation training and watching facilitation being modelled by others in a regional workshop helped him facilitate in the forum. He shared that his questions to the forum participants generated the feedback he needed and that he was able to remain aware of the need to try to give everyone the opportunity to speak so that all the viewpoints and stories could be heard.

He also talked about the preparation that he and a Fisheries colleague undertook prior to the forum. He recognised that this preparation had changed how he and a colleague approached the forum and, in turn, what happened in the forum. It helped them to tone down the language they used and consider how to raise the difficult issue of the potential closure of a fishery. They discussed the impact on anglers of a closure, which helped them to frame the issue in a different way. By asking the fishers to talk about the impact of not having access to the resource, they were able to take the confrontation out of their language and raise a difficult issue in a manner that allowed people to open up.

Having these positive experiences affirmed the approach we had taken in the training and emphasised the benefits that a more facilitative style of interaction can achieve in working with stakeholders.

One member of the team also commented that the level of support received at the Port Lincoln forum from a Recreational Fishing Committee member was considerable, given the limited time spent with the Committee during the project. She admitted that, over the year, the project had been a lot of work, but that the investment in building a relationship with this one person had made a real difference.

The project team also heard that positive feedback about the engagement process had been received from other stakeholders. A federal Member of Parliament attended the Port Lincoln forum and, at the end of the session,

acknowledged how great the process had been. This impressed the project team member who had facilitated the forum, particularly as it was said in front of commercial fishermen and people from the Natural Resource Management Board. Hearing this feedback reinforced for the team that the project was effective and was achieving positive outcomes.

The project team member who facilitated the forum at Port Lincoln also commented that the recreational fishers appreciated Fisheries holding the event in their regional area. This sentiment was echoed by members of the team, who believed that making the effort to go out into the regions to run some of the project workshops was seen as an important demonstration of Fisheries commitment to the engagement process and to getting to know the people involved in recreational angling.

In reflecting on the approach taken to implement the project, the Executive Director of Fisheries commented that the facilitation training had worked well. He had noticed improvements in the ability of Fisheries project team members to facilitate interactions in meetings. He was clear that team members were able to think about what was going on in meetings, to understand what they needed to do to facilitate the interactions to achieve a positive outcome. The Executive Director commented that, in bringing together project participants from across different groups in Fisheries, the training made the project a collaborative venture. It also helped to break down some of the perceptions amongst the policy group that they were the elite in the division and had all the answers. Since the training highlighted the strong knowledge and

experience the compliance group had of the recreational sector, it helped to address the perceived inequity in rank and put everyone on a level footing.

The Executive Director was also positive about the way the project approached building understanding of different stakeholder perspectives.

I think one of the stand-outs has been getting into other people's heads. Helping people see others' perspectives feels like one of the key aspects in the process. That's the stuff that I get feedback about from people saying, 'It's just great. Now I get it.' You know, we've got people in our team that don't fish recreationally, so it's pretty hard for them to get into the head of a rec fisher. So just having the opportunity to really hear the stories, so they can get into someone else's head, I think is one of the really strong components of the process.

(M.Smallridge, personal communication, April 18, 2011)

In evaluating the project, the Executive Director of Fisheries provided the following feedback:

In terms of how we got those [two broad objectives], I'm really comfortable with where we got to with the team. The team talks about how they use a facilitative approach more frequently, more often, in a whole range of groups. Some of them are even talking about it in their personal life, that things that they now do, they think about the learning...of how to be a facilitator and how to facilitate situations. So

in terms of that second objective, I think there's been an impact on them at an individual level. That goes beyond their work, but it certainly goes beyond just their work in the recreational sector; it's in their broader work role and work life.

In terms of the first objective, again, I think that it's enabled us to get into the head of the recreational sector. I think that it's set up a situation and an environment where there's a whole lot more trust and understanding between the stakeholders involved, which is us [Fisheries]—us in the broader sense that we've got three or four sectors just within the department [compliance, policy, research and administration] and I think the starting point of getting broader understanding across those three or four sectors was a great achievement. So just within those teams there's a much better understanding of each other's position and perceptions.

But that's clearly then gone further, to the team having a broader understanding of stakeholders' perspectives. And probably a key from our perspective is that the recreational sector itself has a broader understanding how government works, of our perception and perspective and the role that we play. So I think all of that clearly reflects the outcomes that we were shooting for at the start—and positions us well to take the next steps, which are now about actually doing some of content-based work, such as writing strategic plans, to

be more effective in managing the fishery. (M.Smallridge, personal communication, April 18, 2011)

The Executive Director believed that there had been a change in the relationship with SARFAC. He thought that SARFAC members now had a different perception of Fisheries and were willing to engage in the process that the project had started. His perception was that the recreational anglers and SARFAC finally felt that they were being listened to and that this was reflected in their behaviour towards Fisheries. He saw the project as having achieved clear outcomes and constructive and positive change. (M.Smallridge, personal communication, April 18, 2011)

The project occurred during a time of change for SARFAC, with a new President elected to head the organisation, and the Executive Officer declaring his intention to retire. The new President of SARFAC welcomed an open and informal communication style with Fisheries.

In providing feedback about the project outcomes, the President commented that, while he thought it was too early for any tangible outcomes from the project, the best thing he could see was that SARFAC was now talking more with PIRSA. He believed that there was better communication and better understanding of each other's position. He saw that the lines of communication were open, which he thought was most important.

(B.Schahinger, personal communication, April 29, 2011)

He also appreciated the approach the project took to getting stakeholders to see the other side and saw this as valuable in any discussion or negotiation about issues. He commented that the project did this very well. He believed that by seeing the other side you're better prepared for problems the other side might have with the project or issues you're trying to address, so you're ready for them. He saw this as a good and very effective technique.

(B.Schahinger, personal communication, April 29, 2011)

In talking with the project team about what hadn't worked so well in the project's implementation, one of the concerns raised was the length of time it took me to document the notes from the five workshops and get these out to the participants. One of the team commented that there was a sense that we hadn't delivered on a promise in a timely way and ran the risk that this could cause people to question our commitment to the engagement process.

Another team member thought that we had risked losing people's enthusiasm with the delay in the time between the workshops and the final forum. He would have liked to have seen us maintain the momentum more in the project and this would be something to consider in the future. He also thought we could have communicated the project time frames more clearly to the recreational fishers, so that they understood what to expect from the project.

Another team member would have liked to have been given a better understanding of the project objectives at the beginning of the process and would have appreciated more structure so that she knew what to expect during the implementation. She also thought the project more relevant to

some team members than others and suggested that it would have been better to try to tailor the project more closely to the specific areas of fisheries in which the team members were already working. This would also have given the team more opportunity to practice their facilitation skills and maintain their interest levels.

These comments provide guidance on the areas in which the project's implementation could have been strengthened. They also highlight the challenges inherent in undertaking experimental research, where you aren't completely clear about what the full design of the project will look like as this depends on how the project unfolds, and yet you need to give people enough confidence and clarity in what they are being asked to undertake. The feedback also speaks to need to juggle the design and development components of the project with the project's management and communication requirements.

When asked to comment on any aspects of the project that hadn't worked, the Executive Director admitted that he had hoped the project might have engaged with more individuals from within the recreational sector and had a broader reach than working with the established regional fishery committees. Although he didn't see this as one of the outcomes of the project, he acknowledged that he was interested in how to get a wider audience of recreational fishers to meetings or to engage. He saw applying the project approach to reach a wider network of anglers as an opportunity for future work.

A number of specific and important outcomes have happened as a result of the project. As agreed at the final forum, “engine room” workshops have been convened with recreational anglers to continue addressing the five issues of sustainability, access, leadership and representation, education, promotion and awareness and funding. These “engine room” sessions have become a focal point for recreational anglers and Fisheries to work together on strategies for taking action on the issues.

These workshops received some positive feedback on one of the fishing websites:

SARFAC and PIRSA have run many co-operative ‘workshops’ to mend the long time differences between them and some very positive outcomes have been derived from this including the very first ever meeting between PIRSA and SARFAC to form a Freshwater Recreational Fishery! (Tonyb, 2012)

Fisheries and SARFAC have collaborated in the development of a strategic plan for the sector. The plan is based on the five key issues mentioned above. As part of the planning process, Fisheries and the sector are working together to identify strategies that are needed to put the plan into action. One of the intended outcomes of the process is for Fisheries to support SARFAC in building their capacity and effectiveness in leading and representing the sector.

As a result of the project, Fisheries and SARFAC have instigated a structure of regular meetings to continue to build their relationship, share information and discuss issues. These include monthly meetings between the Senior Fisheries Manager and the President and Executive Officer of SARFAC and meetings every three months between the Executive Director of Fisheries and the President and Executive Officer.

Feedback from the Senior Fisheries Manager indicated that these regular and informal meetings help to strengthen relationships and build mutual understanding of issues. This has allowed better outcomes to be achieved in formal Fisheries processes. With a strengthening of the relationships has also come a greater understanding of the personalities involved, and more resilience. “There is more capacity to talk to each other and a greater ability to call people on their behaviour and know that it won’t end the relationship.” It also has allowed people to be brought in on issues who might not normally contribute, but who are known to add value. (K.Rowling, personal communication, April 16, 2012)

Another significant outcome of the project has been a decision by Fisheries to change the internal leadership structure within the policy group by creating a Community Fisheries Program Leader position. This restructure will strengthen the group’s commitment to manage the recreational fishing sector in a more intentional way and symbolises the increased importance Fisheries places on their work with the sector.

To support the contribution of recreational sector expertise in key fisheries forums, an additional recreational fisher has been appointed as a member of the Fisheries Council of South Australia. The Council's main purpose is to provide advice to the Minister on the management of fisheries, whether for commercial or recreational use, or for Aboriginal traditional fishing purposes; prepare and review management plans; promote the co-management of fisheries; and promote research, education and training.

The project has also had a beneficial impact on the day-to-day work of Fisheries. As a result of the strengthened relationship with both SARFAC and the recreational sector, both the Minister and Fisheries receive fewer letters criticising the department's actions, which has reduced the amount of time spent by Fisheries staff replying to this correspondence. The improvement in the relationship is also evident in the positive way in which Fisheries talk about their interactions with SARFAC and the sector.

In reflecting on the feedback and having had the opportunity to hear from Fisheries about progress made in working with the sector during the writing of this paper, it is clear that the approach we took to engaging the sector was largely successful.

### **My Personal Overview**

In reflecting on the research approach, I want to make some final observations about the factors that contributed to achieving the project's outcomes, including the role I played.

The size of the project team worked well. It allowed a sufficient number of the team to be available to implement each phase of the project, despite all the competing commitments that I and the team members had. In addition to everyone's full-time work loads, some significant personal events occurred during the project, including one team member getting married overseas and others on the team joining her for the wedding. I needed to be flexible and fluid to support the team's participation and the project's implementation.

Through the facilitation training, the project team was supported as they grappled with how they communicated and interacted with stakeholders, and they were quick to grasp the impact that genuine listening could have on their relationships. The team members wanted to be effective, and became open and receptive to hearing stakeholder perspectives on issues, as a way of improving their understanding of why different issues were important to different stakeholders. They were also able to listen to views being expressed passionately without becoming anxious or defensive, even when these perspectives differed from their own.

The training went beyond building skills to developing awareness. Although I provided a structure for the sessions, the key to the training's success was that it combined skill building with the team's experience of stakeholder viewpoints to give the participants new ways to contextualise their knowledge. I knew, through my background as a facilitator and my awareness of the Process Work model, that the diversity within the group and the inherent

tension between the policy and compliance roles were critical ingredients to work with during the training and throughout the project.

I tried to hold an awareness of the group's process, such as the flow of the conversations, the energy with which they approached tasks and the ways in which they responded to questions, activities and each other to gauge what needed to happen in the sessions. I made every effort not to force my training agenda and timing on them.

I also had to be conscious of my rank as the project leader and as a facilitator. Through years of practical experience, I have built skills and an increasing ability to hold compassion for the diversity of roles that people represent in interactions. I am more aware of the places in which I am one-sided or triggered by participants and am able to keep working with these or admit when I am not able to continue. This rank allows me to be more confident in working with strong emotions and heated exchanges. By using my rank with the team, I was able to encourage and support the group to use role plays to bring out any tensions between the stakeholder roles, which also enabled them to bring out tensions between their own roles and work with these. I was able to model ways of listening and responding in their interactions with each other and coach them to build their skills. They were not a group to hold back and tested each other in the role plays, which was important, as it helped to give them practice and build their confidence in handling verbal attacks.

I also used my rank to support the participants to understand the different ways in which Fisheries hadn't been listening to the recreational sector. The adversarial nature of the relationship with SARFAC at the beginning of the project made the group cautious about admitting any mistakes they had made with the recreational sector. So, too, did their sense of responsibility in working for government. They were concerned that if they acknowledged that they hadn't done as well as they could have, that this would be used against them and may even be used politically to embarrass the department and the Minister.

I was able to introduce the group to the rank and power they had through their different policy and compliance roles. We discussed how they had the power to influence the legislation and set regulations that defined what the fishers were and weren't able to do. They could influence whether a fishery remained open or was closed. Some could fine people for behaving outside the law, and recommend cases for investigation and prosecution by the police. The team were able to see that, despite their common experience of being derided in the media for being public servants, they indeed had power and rank because of their roles. Building understanding of their rank helped the project team to appreciate the frustration experienced by the recreational anglers and that the inequity in power could result in letters to the Minister and negative publicity in the media.

During the training, we were able to talk about the dynamics of conflict and the importance of acknowledging the "two percent of truth" in an accusation.

This is an important concept in Process Work's approach to facilitating conflict. It is based on the idea that a key step in addressing conflict is to have the accused side acknowledge, to their accuser, at least some aspect of the accusation, and demonstrate an understanding of the impact that their behaviour has had on the accuser. Otherwise the accuser doesn't feel listened to or taken seriously and the conflict will stay in the forefront of the relationship. This way of thinking about conflict resonated with the group, and supported their experience of the capacity a genuine apology has in helping to diffuse people's frustration and anger. The facilitation training gave the group more confidence in their ability to handle conflict and it sharpened their desire to break down the divisive aspects of their relationship with parts of the sector. It also presented the team with a way of reducing the criticism they were getting in the media and politically from the sector. For these reasons, the team was able to acknowledge, both in person and in writing that they hadn't been listening as effectively as they could have to the recreational anglers.

I feel that it's ok to join with someone when they're saying how angry they are at PIRSA or an issue; to be able to say 'that must be really frustrating' and know it's not a weak thing to do or it doesn't take anything away from the agency; it's just how someone has felt about it.  
(A.Fistr, personal communication, December 16, 2010)

This acknowledgement, coupled with the team's capacity to listen to the stakeholders was a critical factor in the success of the project and is testament to the maturity and commitment of the project team. As indicated

previously, when you apologise for behaviour that has been happening for a number of years, you have to be able to manage people's need to express how frustrating the experience has been for them, and know that this may happen more than once. The debriefing conversations that I held with team members helped them talk about how uncomfortable or difficult this was at times, and supported them to remain non-defensive in their interactions with the sector, even when they felt that parts of the accusations being put to them were untrue.

Another key factor in the project's success was the passion and generosity of the recreational anglers who participated in the project. Their desire to see a future for recreational fishing saw them welcome the opportunity to work with Fisheries in a new way, particularly when they witnessed that Fisheries' behaviour had changed. Inevitably there were setbacks along the way, such as the breakdown in communication with SARFAC prior to the forum. However, even then, when invited to meet to work through the conflict, the SARFAC President and Executive Officer appreciated the invitation and came and participated and affirmed their continued commitment to the relationship.

Building engagement with the recreational fishers through a series of workshop and the forum was also an effective approach. The workshops with the recreational fishers played an important role in enabling Fisheries staff to start to connect with the sector on multiple levels. They covered different regions in the State and both salt and fresh water fishers. They also engaged SARFAC and the Champions Group in a different kind of conversation. By

applying their facilitation skills, the team members demonstrated that they genuinely wanted to listen and used a very simple set of questions to gain an enhanced understanding of the sector and the issues that were important to them.

By starting the process with members of the regional recreational fishing committees, the peak body for recreational fishing, and a network of opinion leaders in the Champions Group, the project also acknowledged the existing formal and informal leadership structure in the sector. Despite limited support from Fisheries, many of the members of the fishing committees had been attending meetings for over a decade. That is a significant commitment to recreational fishing in their region.

The final forum built on the key issues raised in the workshops and again gave the recreational anglers the opportunity to share their perspectives with Fisheries. The forum also asked the sector to start to consider other stakeholder roles and their perspectives on the issues. It also resulted in a commitment from both Fisheries and the sector to develop an “engine room” group to enable them to keep working together.

The capabilities and confidence of the project team to facilitate constructive interactions with recreational anglers grew throughout the project, as they moved from training into practical application of their facilitation skills during the workshops and the forum. They have since gone on to co-designed a

workshop for the “engine room” group with me, which they facilitated, to continue to address issues of concern to the fishers.

Through my research and practice, I have a much better understanding of the ways in which I can apply process work concepts and tools in facilitation. The group also found concepts, such as ghost roles and rank useful in understanding some of the background issues and feelings present in interactions with stakeholders.

In reflecting on the feedback about what didn’t work so well and thinking about what we might have done differently, the gap between running the workshops and getting the notes back to people was too long for some of the participants. I was overwhelmed by the richness of the material that we had heard in the workshops and wanted to make sure this was reflected in the notes they received. I wanted the notes to demonstrate just how much we had listened. I set unnecessary and unrealistic expectations for myself. In hindsight the participants from the workshops were happy with a typed up copy of the material that we recorded on the butchers’ paper and the notes I took.

There was also a gap of three months between the end of the workshops and forum. Some of this was because I was still travelling overseas to study, some of it was about my workload and that of the project team, and some of it was about personal commitments within the team. Were I to undertake such an initiative again, I would pay more attention to maintaining communication

throughout the project, even if this was provide short and simple updates for the recreational fishing participants about what was happening with the project. I would also keep all of the project team up-to-date with the progress of the project, since not all team members were participating in the project at the same level. To do this, I would have needed to draw on members of the Fisheries team more, and I was reluctant to do this. Despite all the assurances that the project was a priority for Fisheries, it was hard for me not to feel responsible for the work that the project had generated for the team, and I was unable to ask for more help from the team. However, having heard the feedback from the project team about their concerns about managing expectations and delivering on promises, I would enlist the support of the team to manage expectations of delivery in a more timely manner.

One member of the project team would have appreciated a better understanding of the project objectives from the beginning and more structure throughout the project. I am not surprised by the request for some more structure as, although we knew what the three phases of the project were to be, I felt like we were designing every step of the project as we were going along. I had not undertaken an initiative like this previously and, in many ways, wasn't clear about how we would implement each of the phases. However, once again, maintaining more consistent communication with all members of the project would have helped provide more structure.

I am also aware that, although I gave the project team the opportunity to talk about what recreational fishing meant to them, we did not, as a group, discuss

what future they wanted for the recreational sector, nor what they thought government's role could be. We also did not talk about the role of the recreational sector or other stakeholders in achieving that future. These were all questions we asked the recreational sector. In hindsight, I could have utilised these questions within the facilitation training, to support the group to have the conversation, while practicing their facilitation. This would have helped the team to gain a better understanding of what we were trying to achieve with the project and how I hoped to implement it.



## **CHAPTER 5**

### **WHERE TO NEXT?**

In this section I discuss possible next steps to continue the work that the project has begun. I also share some of the opportunities the project approach might offer to Fisheries and the department more broadly in improving stakeholder engagement.

Five issues emerged during the project as key issues for the recreational sector. These were sustainability, access, leadership and representation, education, promotion and awareness, and funding. It is important that Fisheries continue to engage with the sector so that together they can determine what can be done to address these issues. This isn't a simple thing. While the project supported recreational fishers to consider another stakeholders' perspective, it only touched on the issue of competing stakeholder agendas. As a first step, Fisheries will need to continue to develop an understanding of the issues from the recreational perspective and help the sector to understand other stakeholder viewpoints, so that together they are able to identify possible strategies for action. It will only be by working through the issues with each other that the real impact of the issues on each of the stakeholders, including government, can be understood.

However, this still leaves Fisheries in the role of arbitrating between the recreational fishers and other stakeholders. The greatest chance of achieving a sustainable fishery will come from all the stakeholders being able to work

together to determine what a fair share of the resource is for each of them and the most appropriate management options for the fishery in South Australia.

My hope is that Fisheries will begin to work with the commercial and Aboriginal traditional sectors in similar ways to their work with the recreational anglers. In doing this, they have the potential to build relationships with each of the sectors that are based on trust and mutual understanding. The final step would be for Fisheries to bring all the stakeholders together to begin to build their relationships with each other, so that ultimately they can collaborate on solutions.

Fisheries have started down a path of engagement that has increased the recreational sector's expectations of a fair share in their relationship with Fisheries. They want to be treated equally with the commercial sector, in particular. The division will need to continue to demonstrate leadership in their approach to working with all of the sectors.

While a huge amount of listening occurred during the project, inevitably some voices were still missing. The fish are largely a ghost role in the conversations that occur about fishing. There is tension between fishing and conservation that is based on different perceptions about how sustainable current fishing practices are. This also leads to competing views between Fisheries and the environment department over how effectively the aquatic resource is being managed. The opportunity is there for the project team to work together, utilising their facilitation skills and capacity to work in roles, to

gain a deeper appreciation for the conservation perspective. In doing so, they will hopefully be able to find some common ground from which to build a better relationship with this sector.

The project has given Fisheries an established foundation for future engagement with the recreational fishing sector and other stakeholders and opens up opportunities for further work. The Executive Director of Fisheries acknowledged this when he commented that he is keen to apply the project's approach to engagement with five or ten times as many people in the sector. He is also interested in tapping into more of the existing networks within the sector to gain a broader base of engagement, particularly with individual anglers who aren't part of an established group. He is aware that members of the project team, who themselves are passionate recreational fishers, have networks in the sector that Fisheries has yet to tap into and that Fisheries needs to continue to collaborate with SARFAC in helping to extend the network of recreational fishers that both organisations can engage with.

While working on the project, I became aware of the popularity of some of the online fishing forums. Members of the project team already utilise these forums to engage with the sector. There may be opportunities for Fisheries to explore other forms of online engagement with recreational anglers.

The Executive Director sees opportunities to cascade the core facilitation skills developed by the Fisheries team, out into members of the recreational sector, including the "engine room" members and anglers in the regions. He

also recognises the need for ongoing collaboration with SARFAC to address the issues facing the sector.

The Executive Director also believes that a number of areas within Primary Industries and Resources South Australia would benefit from the facilitation training, as there will be an ongoing need for a more facilitative approach in working with colleagues and with stakeholders. He sees the potential for this role-based approach to facilitation to be utilised to address tensions and build understanding and relationship between different groups who need to collaborate on projects. This would give groups the capacity to work through difficult issues with each other. (M.Smallridge, personal communication, April 18, 2011)

To support their ongoing capacity, the project team spoke about having more clarity about Fisheries' position on key policy issues, such as shark fishing. They identified the need to establish a mechanism that would help them identify some of the key policy issues for Fisheries and then have a process to work through, as a group, and with stakeholders, to determine an appropriate policy position. They acknowledged that, in the past, they hadn't had the confidence to deal with the diversity of stakeholder views on some issues, but they had more confidence in being able to do this now.

These comments highlight the extent to which the facilitation approach that formed the basis of the project could be used in a number of ways to achieve

more effective policy and project outcomes for Fisheries, for PIRSA and for government agencies more broadly.



## CONCLUSION

This research project has given me the opportunity to utilise Process Work's approach to facilitation and roles to bring about a different kind of stakeholder engagement, based on Fisheries really listening to the recreational sector.

The concepts and tools that I used have enabled the participants in the project to begin to join with the "other," seeing them as more than adversaries, or thorns in their side. They are more open to being changed by what they hear and have a much greater capacity to see stakeholders as more than one fixed role or position on an issue. Fisheries capacity to engage with stakeholders to identify the real issues will play a key role in bridging the conflict between the myriad of stakeholders involved in fishing, and will help to build a sustainable resource for the future.

Fisheries staff know that two of the critical issues they face in achieving a sustainable aquatic resource are mistrust of government and the strong competition between different stakeholder groups for access to the fishing resource. The division recognises that it is time to move on from models of governance, where government acts as the referee, arbitrating between competing stakeholder interests, to one in which government facilitates engagement and interaction with and between the stakeholders themselves. This will take a commitment by all the stakeholders to really listen to each other's stories and perspectives and be willing to let go of past mistrust and antagonism. It will require leadership and courage to build the depth of relationships needed for everyone to work together to find common ground,

build a shared vision and agree to the strategies needed to make that future a reality.

A sustainable fishery is a question of engagement and social policy as much as it is a question of economics and of rational, scientific approaches to management practices. The level of stakeholder commitment to working with government and each other in grappling with the often contradictory needs of the environment, economics, people, culture and politics will be the ultimate determinant of sustainability. Fisheries know that gaining this commitment is no easy task, but through this project they have made a significant start.

On a personal note, writing this paper has been one of the most challenging tasks that I have ever undertaken. I am an experienced facilitator, with over twenty years of professional practice in working with groups and individuals. Implementing the three phases of the project took me out of my comfort zone and stretched me in a myriad of ways. It also changed how I understood recreational fishing. However, in trying to write about what we did, and why we did it, and what it achieved, I had to dig deeply into what for me is an intuitive process of knowing and grapple with issues that felt like they were at the core of my being. This helped me to find the inner voice that wanted to be heard; that wanted to make my way of understanding this work conscious; that wanted me to find the words to describe concepts and tools from Process Work's approach to facilitation, and how we used them, in ways that others could understand.

I have realised, through this project, that I have a deep and abiding appreciation for the role as a facilitator. I love how it can create opportunities for ideas, feelings and dreams to be shared; for past hurts to be acknowledged and grieved and, sometimes, put to rest; and for common ground to be reached when problems are seemingly intractable. This project has reaffirmed the power of listening, when it is done with as much care and attention as we can muster, and the positive affect this can have on our relationships with each other.

As I struggled to write, I became increasingly aware that the role of facilitator has been a convenient place for me to hide. It stops me from having to put my views out into the public arena and risk having them shot down. I, like many others of my generation, hold memories of growing up in a Western world where the education systems of the day focused on answers being right or wrong. It is easy to forget, that for many of us, speaking out in public forums is a daunting experience. It can conjure up a host of ghost roles, such as past teachers or strict parents or scornful peers. The role of facilitator is a powerful one. It can be a gate-keeper; just as it can help to create the space for voices to be heard, it too, can chop them down. So, as in any role with power, it is important to continually build awareness of self and also of the dynamics of the system of which we are a part, if we are to learn to use that power well.

This project has been a journey of learning for me. I am much more aware that, just as much as I want to listen to others, I, too, can yearn to be in

environments where I am heard. I am much clearer that there are times when I am not able to listen, when all my energy and focus is taken up with trying to catch hold of something I want to understand about myself or I want to say. I also know that, just like the work we did in the facilitation training, the more conscious I am of the diversity of views and beliefs and values I have, the more able I will be to listen to others.

I was inspired to undertake this research project because of the possibilities I sensed that Process Work's approach to group facilitation could offer organisations, communities, groups and individuals to interact in more useful ways, about the issues that matter to them. In this project, we explored using roles and role plays to build the project teams' capacity to listen to diverse and sometimes difficult stakeholder views. In building this capacity, the Fisheries participants were able to move beyond the surface messages they were hearing, to listen to people's hopes, frustrations and concerns. In doing so, they changed the nature of their relationships with the recreational fishers with whom they were interacting. At times they were changed themselves.

This work has been the beginning of a different kind of engagement between PIRSA Fisheries and the recreational fishing sector in South Australia. It has been about a genuine desire for relationship, borne out of a common goal to see a sustainable future for fishing in South Australia. It has been a privilege to be part of this project and, while there is a lot more work to be done, and a long way to go, in the words of Kev Carmody and Paul Kelly (1991), I am hopeful that: "from little things big things grow."

## REFERENCES

- Australian Public Service Commission. (2007). *Tackling Wicked Problems: a Public Policy Perspective*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Bell, S & Hindmoor, A. (2009). *Rethinking Governance: The Centrality of the State in Modern Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Bourgon, J. (2008). The Future of Public Service: A Search for a New Balance. Paper presented at IPAA National Conference. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 67(4), 390–404
- Bourgon, J. (2009). *New Governance and Public Administration: Towards a Dynamic Synthesis*. Canberra.
- Denhardt, R.B. & Denhardt, J.V. (2000). The New Public Service Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 549-559.
- Fung, A. & Wright, E.O. (2001). Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance. *Politics & Society*, 29(1), 5-41.
- Gains, F. & Stoker, G. (2008). *How Politics Works: Understanding the New Realities of the Political Process in Public Management* The Work Foundation
- International Association for Public Participation. (2004). *IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum*. Retrieved February 3, 2012, from <http://www.iap2.org.au/sitebuilder/resources/knowledge/asset/files/36/iap2spectrum.pdf>
- Lord Blackbilly (2010, August 18). *PIRSA Listening to Rec Fishers*. Message posted to <http://www.strikehook.com/forum/74-pirsa-fisheries/115473-pirsa-listening-to-rec-fishers>
- Lukensmeyer, C.J. & Torres, L.H. (2006). *Public Deliberation: A Manager's Guide to Citizen Engagement*. IBM Centre for the Business of Government
- Mackay, H. (1994). *The Good Listener: Solving the Communication Problem*. Sydney: Pan Macmillan.
- Mindell, A. (1995). *Sitting in the Fire: Large group Transformation Using Conflict and Diversity*. Portland: Lao Tse
- Mindell, A. (2002). *The Deep Democracy of Open Forums: Practical Steps to Conflict Prevention and Resolution for the Family, Workplace, and World*. Charlottesville: Hampton Roads.
- Rittel, H.W.J. & Webber, M.M. (1973). Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155-69.

Stoker, G. (2006). Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36, 41-57.

tonyb (2010, August 18). *PIRSA Listening to Rec Fishers*. Message posted to <http://www.strikehook.com/forum/74-pirsa-fisheries/115473-pirsa-listening-to-rec-fishers>

tonyb, (2012, February 19). *Out of there depth?* Message posted to <http://www.strikehook.com/forum/98-sarfac/196362-out-of-there-depth?>

Waterboy (2010, August 18). *PIRSA Listening to Rec Fishers*. Message posted to <http://www.strikehook.com/forum/74-pirsa-fisheries/115473-pirsa-listening-to-rec-fishers>

Yankelovich, D. (1999). *The Magic of Dialogue: Transforming Conflict into Cooperation*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Australian Public Service Commission. (2007). *Tackling Wicked Problems: a Public Policy Perspective*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Bell, S. (2004). 'Appropriate' Policy Knowledge, and Institutional and Governance Implications. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 63(1), 22-28.
- Bell, S & Hindmoor, A. (2009). *Rethinking Governance: The Centrality of the State in Modern Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Bourgon, J. (2007). Responsive, responsible and respected government: towards a New Public Administration Theory. *International Review of Administrative Services*, 73(1), 7-26.
- Bourgon, J. (2008). The Future of Public Service: A Search for a New Balance. *Paper presented at IPAA National Conference. The Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 67(4), 390–404
- Bourgon, J. (2009). *New Governance and Public Administration: Towards a Dynamic Synthesis*. Canberra.
- Burke, B.F. (2007). Adaptive Leadership as a Facilitator of Public Engagement on Environmental Sustainability Issues. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 29(3), 412-431.
- Carson, L. (2008). The IAP2 Spectrum: Larry Susskind, in Conversation with IAP2 Members. *The International Journal of Public Participation*, 2(2), 67-84.
- Christie, M.J., Rowe, P.A. & Pickernell, D. (2009). Unpacking a Wicked Problem: Enablers/Impediments to Regional Engagement. *The Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 68(1), 83-96.
- Chhotray, V & Stoker, G. (2008, June). *Investigating Governance Practice: the Value of a Cross-Disciplinary Approach*. Paper 1 for Euroloc–Summer School in Local Government, UPRC, Ghent University Association, Ghent
- Cornwall, A. & Gaventa, J. (2001, June). *From Users and Choosers to Makers and Shapers: Repositioning Participation in Social Policy*. Brighton, UK: Institute for Development Studies.
- Denhardt, R.B. & Denhardt, J.V. (2000). The New Public Service Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6), 549-559.
- Denhardt, R.B. & Denhardt, J.V. (2001). The New Public Service: Putting Democracy First. *National Civic Review*, 90(4), 391-400.

- Diamond, J. (2001). A Democracy Dialogue. Getting to the Essence of Freedom. *The Journal of Process Oriented Psychology*, 8(2), 66-74.
- Diamond, J. & Jones, L.S. (2004). *A Path Made by Walking: Process Work in Practice*. Portland: Lao Tse Press.
- Fung, A. & Wright, E.O. (2001). Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance. *Politics & Society*, 29(1), 5-41.
- Gains, F. & Stoker, G. (2008). How Politics Works: Understanding the New Realities of the Political Process in Public Management. *The Work Foundation*
- Hay, C, Stoker, G & Williamson, A. (2008, November). *Revitalizing Politics: Have We Lost the Plot?* Paper presented at the Revitalising Politics Conference, London.
- International Association for Public Participation. (2004). *IAP2 Public Participation Spectrum*. Retrieved February 3, 2012, from <http://www.iap2.org.au/sitebuilder/resources/knowledge/asset/files/36/iap2spectrum.pdf>
- Irvin, R.A. & Stansbury, J. (2004), Citizen Participation in Decision Making: Is It Worth the Effort? *Public Administration Review*, 64, 55-65.
- King, C.S., Feltrey, K.M. & Susel, B.O. (1998). The Question of Participation: Towards Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4) 317-326.
- Lukensmeyer, C.J. & Torres, L.H. (2006). Public Deliberation: A Manager's Guide to Citizen Engagement. *IBM Centre for the Business of Government*
- Mackay, H. (1994). *The Good Listener: Solving the Communication Problem*. Sydney: Pan Macmillan.
- Mindell, A. (1989). *The Year 1: Global Process Work. Community Creation from Global Problems, Tensions and Myths*. London: Arkana.
- Mindell, A. (1992). *The Leader as Martial Artist: An Introduction to Deep Democracy*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Mindell, A. (1995). *Sitting in the Fire: Large group Transformation Using Conflict and Diversity*. Portland: Lao Tse
- Mindell, A. (2002). *The Deep Democracy of Open Forums: Practical Steps to Conflict Prevention and Resolution for the Family, Workplace, and World*. Charlottesville: Hampton Roads.

- Nutley, S. (2003), 'Bridging the Policy-Research Divide: Reflections and Lessons from the United Kingdom', *Canberra Bulletin of Public Administration*, 108, 19-28.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. & Wanna, J. (2007). The Limits to Public Value, or Rescuing Responsible Government from the Platonic Guardians. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 66(4), 406-421
- Rittel, H.W.J. & Webber, M.M. (1973). Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4(2), 155-69.
- Stoker, G. (1998). *Governance as Theory: Five Propositions*. UNESCO. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stoker, G. (2006). Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance? *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36, 41-57
- Yankelovich, D. (1991). *Coming to Public Judgment: Making Democracy Work in a Complex World*. New York: Syracuse University Press
- Yankelovich, D. (1999). *The Magic of Dialogue: Transforming Conflict into Cooperation*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

## APPENDICES

**SESSION ONE FACILITATION PLAN**

<b>TIME</b>	<b>WHAT</b>	<b>WHO &amp; RESOURCES</b>
<p><b>1.00pm</b> 15 mins</p>	<p><b>WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>Welcome to the first facilitation training session in the series of four sessions that will be run over the next two months</p> <p>Introduction to the Project – Invitation to participate in 4 sessions to build facilitation skills that will support effective engagement with stakeholders in the recreational fishing sector</p> <p>Overview of the 4 sessions – content and format</p> <p>Session 1 – The Human Context in Sustainably Managing the Resource; focuses on establishing the context for facilitation</p> <p>Session 2 Building your facilitation toolkit – listening skills &amp; taking the other side</p> <p>Session 3 Building your facilitation toolkit – standing in the heat &amp; handling attack; dealing with exaggerated statements and outrageous claims</p> <p>Session 4 Planning and Preparing for effective stakeholder engagement</p> <p>Workshops – invited to participate in co-facilitating a series of workshops with industry stakeholders leading to a Forum with Stakeholders in October/November</p> <p>Session 1 Outline and format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Setting the scene - Why a project on stakeholder engagement?</li> <li>▪ A stakeholder perspective</li> <li>▪ The participants' perspective</li> <li>▪ PIRSA Fisheries - Who are we and what do we stand for?</li> <li>▪ Building your facilitation toolkit</li> </ul> <p>A recreational fisher is going to join the group for the segment on A Stakeholder Perspective</p> <p>Interactive format and we will have a break for afternoon tea.</p> <p>Format: I will present some of the art and science in contemporary facilitation practice, some key ideas, thinking, frameworks and tools for exploration and discussion. As a group we will grapple with these ideas from a practical perspective, based on your experiences working with recreational fishers. We will examine the challenges you face in dealing with recreational fishers and build a toolkit of practical skills that will support you in working with the recreational fishing sector.</p> <p>Administration &amp; Housekeeping – toilets, mobile phones, OHS&amp;W</p> <p>Any questions?</p>	<p>AF, RL</p>

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
<p><b>1.15pm</b> 10 mins</p>	<p><b>SETTING THE SCENE</b></p> <p><b>Why a Project on Stakeholder Engagement?</b></p> <p><i>What is the purpose of the project and what outcomes are PIRSA Fisheries wanting the project to achieve? (What are we doing and why is it important)</i></p> <p><i>How is facilitation and stakeholder engagement relevant to the future of PIRSA Fisheries?</i></p> <p>Executive Director to set the scene by outlining the purpose of the project and the strategic and operational need for Fisheries managers to develop facilitation skills.</p> <p><b>Notes for Executive Director</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Need to engage in a different way. This project is broader than the Recreational Sector. It will strengthen PIRSA Fisheries engagement skills and process across all sectors.</li> <li>▪ There is a strategic and operational need for Fisheries managers to develop facilitation skills so that they can support industry to get to an agreed solution on issues rather than staying in the role of the technical expert with the answer.</li> <li>▪ Want to build people’s understanding of the difference between facilitation and technical expertise; between a facilitated session and a formal structured meeting; and that in a facilitated session there is 2-way conversation, where people participate and feel engaged and have joint understanding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Purpose of the Project</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To identify key stakeholders in the Recreational Fishing Sector and engage them in the development of a Recreational Fishing Strategic Plan for the sector.</li> <li>2. To explore the potential for a deeper level of democracy in PIRSA Fisheries’ approach to stakeholder engagement in policy development, in the hope of deepening the level of engagement with stakeholders.</li> </ol> <p>The project will experiment with the capacity for a group facilitation approach to be utilised by a government organisation to facilitate stakeholder engagement in policy development that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enables a deeper, more comprehensive and compassionate understanding of multiple stakeholder perspectives and positions on policy issues and directions</li> <li>▪ Supports government workers to become more aware of the impact policy decisions have on the lives of industry and community stakeholders</li> <li>▪ Enables policy decisions and program strategies to be identified that more effectively address policy issues.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project Methodology</b></p> <p>The project seeks to answer the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What does PIRSA Fisheries need to do to effectively engage with the Recreational Fishing Sector?</li> <li>▪ How does PIRSA Fisheries identify who to engage with to build a credible plan with the sector?</li> </ul>	<p>MS, RL</p>

APPENDIX 1

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How does the Recreational Fishing Sector decide who engages with PIRSA Fisheries?</li> <li>▪ What future does the Recreational Sector want to build for the industry?</li> <li>▪ How does PIRSA Fisheries engage with the Recreational Fishing Sector to foster greater participation in decision making about the sector?</li> <li>▪ What capacity building do members of this sector/the stakeholders need?</li> <li>▪ What are the things that are stopping or blocking an effective engagement process?</li> <li>▪ What are the core elements of an effective engagement process?</li> </ul> <p>Any questions or comments?</p>	
<p><b>1.25pm</b> 10 mins</p>	<p><b>SETTING THE SCENE</b> <b>The Recreational Fishing Sector in South Australia</b></p> <p>AF to provide an overview of: (5 mins)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What does the Recreational Fishing Sector look like?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>What are the challenges in engaging with the sector?</i></li> </ul> <p>Group discussion (5 mins):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What do you think the sector looks like?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>What do you think some of the current challenges are?</i></li> </ul>	<p>AF, RL</p>
<p><b>1.35pm</b> 10 mins</p>	<p><b>SETTING THE SCENE</b> <b>How are we managing the Recreational Fishery now?</b></p> <p>AF to give an overview of the ways in which PIRSA Fisheries is currently managing the Recreational Fishery(5 mins)</p> <p>Group discussion (5 mins):</p> <p><i>What might be missing from the current ways we are managing the recreational fishery?</i></p>	<p>AF, RL</p>
<p><b>1.45pm</b> 5 mins</p>	<p><b>SETTING THE SCENE</b> <b>Dealing with Type III Problems and Adaptive Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Understanding the difference between technical problems and adaptive challenges</li> </ul> <p>Bec to briefly set the scene – Masters Project – changing paradigm and role of government based on shifting community expectations, resource pressures and the complexity of resource access, use and management issues. Need additional capabilities (and awareness) in how we work with industry and the community. Need to move from consultation to ongoing relationship and engagement with industry and community stakeholders.</p>	<p>RL</p>

APPENDIX 1

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
<p><b>1.50pm</b> 10 mins</p>	<p><b>SETTING THE SCENE</b></p> <p><b>Building skills and expertise in facilitation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The role of facilitation in working with the fishing industry</li> </ul> <p>Group discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>What would you like to learn and what skills would you like to gain from this project?</i></li> </ul>	<p>RL</p>
<p><b>2.00pm</b> 60 mins</p>	<p><b>A STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE</b></p> <p>Beginning to build a picture of what it means to be a Recreational Fisher. What things are important to recreational fishers? What are some of their experiences of engaging with PIRSA Fisheries and government?</p> <p>Recreational fisher and member of the project team to share their perspectives on the following questions: (20 mins each)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What does recreational fishing mean to you?</li> <li>▪ What future do you want for the Recreational Fishing Sector?</li> <li>▪ What is it like to work and interact with Fisheries and government?</li> <li>▪ What impact can government decision-making have on people's lives in the fishing industry?</li> <li>▪ What responsibility does the recreational fishing industry need to pick up in working with Government?</li> </ul> <p>Any questions? (5 mins)</p> <p>Group discussion – what were the key messages you heard from our speakers? (15mins)</p>	<p>RL</p>
<p><b>3.00pm</b> 15 mins</p>	<p>AFTERNOON TEA</p>	
<p><b>3.15pm</b> 20 mins</p>	<p><b>THE PARTICIPANTS' PERSPECTIVE</b></p> <p>Group discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What does recreational fishing mean to each of you? What connection do you have to fish and fishing?</li> <li>▪ What is it like to work and interact with the Recreational Fishing Sector?</li> </ul> <p>Summarise any key themes</p>	<p>RL</p>

APPENDIX 1

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
<p><b>3.35pm</b> 30 mins</p>	<p><b>PIRSA FISHERIES – WHO ARE WE AND WHAT DO WE STAND FOR?</b></p> <p>Group discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What do you believe PIRSA Fisheries stands for?</li> <li>▪ Is there anything in particular that drew you to working in Fisheries?</li> <li>▪ What is some of the history of Fisheries? What are some of the stories, myths and legends that are told in Fisheries that have shaped the way PIRSA Fisheries is today?</li> <li>▪ What do these stories tell us about the way things get done in Fisheries?</li> <li>▪ What do they tell us about the significant changes in Fisheries?</li> <li>▪ How do you find working in Government? What are some of the benefits and some of the challenges to working in Government?</li> </ul> <p>Summarise any key themes</p>	<p>RL</p>
<p><b>4.05pm</b> 15 mins</p>	<p><b>BUILDING YOUR FACILITATION TOOLKIT</b></p> <p><b>Agendas, Stereotypes and Biases</b></p> <p><b>Agendas</b></p> <p>We need to know our agendas and what we stand for. This allows us to listen to other people’s agendas.</p> <p>Dual roles to Fisheries Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing and setting policy</li> <li>• Engaging stakeholders</li> </ul> <p>Need to be able to listen to the views and concerns of the stakeholders and approach policy development in a collaborative way</p> <p>Group discussion:</p> <p><i>From all that we have covered today and based on your own experiences what do you think is PIRSA Fisheries agenda?</i></p> <p><i>What do you think the Recreational Fishers think is your agenda?</i></p>	<p>RL</p>
<p><b>4.20pm</b> 15 mins</p>	<p><b>SUMMARY &amp; CLOSE</b></p> <p>We have covered a lot of ground today in understanding the context for facilitation training and in beginning to strengthen our skills and processes in engaging with stakeholders</p> <p>Are there any questions or comments?</p> <p>Going round the group what is one thing that has stood out for you from today?</p>	<p>RL</p>
<p><b>4.35pm</b></p>	<p><b>SESSION CLOSE</b></p>	

## **Facilitation Training with PIRSA Fisheries Session One – Setting the Scene**

### **Purpose of the Facilitation Training Program**

- Provide a context to the stakeholder engagement project
- Build understanding of the purpose and role of facilitation in stakeholder engagement
- Build understanding of the difference between facilitation and other forms of engagement
- Build participants capability and confidence to facilitate engagement with stakeholders, including:
  - Increase capability in listening to and understanding stakeholder views, concerns and positions on issues
  - Increase capability to join with stakeholder positions and respond empathically to their concerns
  - Build capability and confidence in handling verbal accusations and attacks
  - Building capability and confidence in deal with exaggerated statements and outrageous claims
- Build participants capacity to plan and prepare for effective engagement with stakeholders

### **Session 1 Objectives**

- Provide a context to the stakeholder engagement project
- Build understanding of the purpose and role of facilitation in stakeholder engagement
- Build understanding of the difference between facilitation and other forms of engagement
- Share some Recreational Fishing Sector stakeholder perspectives and Fisheries' perspectives of each other
- Build understanding of who is PIRSA Fisheries and what the group stand for
- Identify agendas, stereotypes, biases and power dynamics in working with the recreational fishing sector

## **Session Details**

**Date:** Monday 24 May 2010  
**Time:** 1-4.45pm  
**Venue:** Level 3, 101 Grenfell St, Adelaide  
**Participants:** Project Team  
**Guests:** Executive Director, Fisheries  
Recreational Fisher  
  
**Facilitator:** Rebecca Lang

## **Session Outline**

1. Welcome – Manager Fisheries Policy and Bec Lang
2. Setting the Scene
  - Why a Project on Stakeholder Engagement – Executive Director Fisheries
  - The Recreational Fishing Sector in South Australia – Manager Fisheries Policy and Bec Lang
  - How are we managing the Recreational Fishery now? – Manager Fisheries Policy and Bec Lang
  - Dealing with Type III Problems and Adaptive Challenges – Bec Lang
  - Building skills and expertise in facilitation – Bec Lang
3. A Stakeholder Perspective – Recreational fisher, Project Team Member and Bec Lang
4. PIRSA Fisheries – who are we and what do we stand for? – Bec Lang
5. Building your Facilitation Toolkit
  - Dealing with Agendas, stereotypes and biases
  - Understanding the power dynamics of working in government and engaging with stakeholders

## Facilitation Training Program with PIRSA Fisheries Evaluation Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide me with feedback about the extent to which the Facilitation Training Program has met your needs, and the extent to which the stated outcomes for the program have been achieved.

1. Overall, what were the strengths of the sessions and what did you find most useful?

2. Please rate the extent to which the training has helped you to achieve the following learning outcomes

Learning Outcomes	not at all	(please circle)				fully
Provide a context to the stakeholder engagement project	0	1	2	3	4	5
Build understanding of the purpose and role of facilitation in stakeholder engagement	0	1	2	3	4	5
Build understanding of the difference between facilitation and other forms of engagement	0	1	2	3	4	5
Build your capability and confidence to facilitate engagement with stakeholders, including:						
▪ listening to and understanding stakeholder views, concerns and positions on issues	0	1	2	3	4	5
▪ joining with stakeholder positions and respond empathically to their concerns	0	1	2	3	4	5
▪ handling verbal accusations and attacks	0	1	2	3	4	5
▪ dealing with exaggerated statements and outrageous claims	0	1	2	3	4	5
Build your capacity to plan and prepare for effective engagement with stakeholders.	0	1	2	3	4	5

**Any comments?**



## Recreational Fishing Workshop – Pt Lincoln 27th July 2010

### Facilitation Guide

#### Purpose of the Recreational Fishing Workshop

PIRSA Fisheries recognises that in the past we haven't been as effective as we can be in terms of building the relationships and networks to engage with the recreational fishing sector and we want this to change.

The purpose of the workshop is to:

- Give recreational fishers a voice to help shape the future of the sector
- To get to know who the recreational sector is and how to engage with them
- To identify the networks needed for the recreational sector to work together with Government

This workshop is part of strategy to build ongoing relationships and communication channels to foster a vibrant recreational fishing sector and jointly address the issues that impact the sector.

Some of the things we'll be asking you are:

- What future do you want for recreational fishing?
- How could we work together to make this happen?

#### Workshop Objectives

- Provide an overview of the stakeholder engagement project
- Build understanding of the ways in which fishing is important to recreational fishers
- Build understanding of the range of fishing experiences recreational fishers want in the future
- Gain an understanding of who needs to be involved if South Australia is to provide people with great recreational fishing experiences into the future
- Identify the roles recreational fishers and other key stakeholders need to play in building the future of recreational fishing in South Australia
- Identify ways in which all stakeholders need to work together to make this future happen

#### Session Details

**Date:** Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> July  
**Time:** 7 – 9.30pm  
**Venue:** RSL, Hallett Place, Pt Lincoln  
**Participants:** Recreational fishers

**Facilitators:** R Lang and members of Fisheries Project Team

## Session Outline

- 7.00pm Welcome and introduction – AF & Bec
- 7.10pm What does recreational fishing mean to you? – AF
- 7.40pm What future do you want for the recreational fishing sector? – Bec
- 8.00pm If we are to have great future for recreational fishing, who needs to be involved in making this happen? – AM
- 8.20pm Tea & coffee break
- 8.35pm How could we work together to make this happen? – MB
- 8.55pm What part could you play in making this future happen? – AF
- 9.15pm Where to from here? – Bec
- 9.30pm Workshop close

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
<p><b>7.00pm</b> 10 mins</p>	<p><b>WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>Welcome to the workshop. Introductions.</p> <p>PIRSA Fisheries recognises that in the past we haven't been as effective as we can be in terms of building the relationships and networks to engage with the recreational fishing sector and we want this to change.</p> <p>The purpose of the workshop is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Give recreational fishers a voice to help shape the future of the sector</li> <li>▪ To get to know who the recreational sector is and how to engage with them</li> <li>▪ To identify the networks needed for the recreational sector to work together with Government</li> </ul> <p>This workshop is part of strategy to build ongoing relationships and communication channels to foster a vibrant recreational fishing sector and jointly address the issues that impact the sector.</p> <p>We have five questions that we'd like to ask you and we'll work through these as a group, taking a break for tea or coffee.</p> <p>Administration &amp; Housekeeping – toilets, mobile phones, OHS&amp;W</p> <p>Are there any comments or questions before we get started?</p>	<p>AF &amp; Bec</p>
<p><b>7.10pm</b> 30 mins</p>	<p><b>THE STAKEHOLDERS PERSPECTIVE – What does rec fishing mean to you?</b></p> <p>We want to build a picture of what it means to be a Recreational Fisher and understand what things are important to recreational fishers.</p> <p>Committee Chair to start by talking about the following question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What does recreational fishing mean to you?</li> </ul> <p>Each of the rec fishers to share what rec fishing means to them. (20mins)</p> <p>Group discussion – what were the key messages you heard? (10mins)</p>	<p>AF <i>MB to record</i></p>
<p><b>7.40pm</b></p>	<p><b>THE FUTURE – What future do you want for the rec fishing</b></p>	<p>AF</p>

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
20 mins	<p><b>sector?</b></p> <p>We want to hear your views about the future you want for the rec fishing sector.</p> <p>As a group let's brainstorm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What future do you want for the Recreational Fishing Sector?</li> </ul> <p>There are no right or wrong views. This is about everybody sharing their picture of the future.</p> <p>Facilitator to summarise any key themes, common ground, points of difference</p>	<i>MB to record</i>
<b>8.00pm</b> 20 mins	<p><b>WHO ARE THE STAKEHOLDERS – If we are to have a great future for the rec fishing sector, who needs to be involved in making this happen?</b></p> <p>We want to hear who all the key people and groups are who need to be part of making this future for the rec fishing sector.</p> <p>As a group let's brainstorm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If we are to have a great future for the rec fishing sector, who needs to be involved in making this happen?</li> </ul> <p>There are no right or wrong views. This is about everybody sharing their picture of who needs to be involved.</p> <p>Facilitator to summarise any key themes, common ground, points of difference</p>	AM <i>MB to record</i>
<b>8.20pm</b> 15 mins	TEA AND COFFEE BREAK	
<b>8.35pm</b> 20 mins	<p><b>HOW DO WE MAKE THIS HAPPEN – If we are to have a great future for the rec fishing sector how could we work together to make this happen?</b></p> <p>To make this future happen, all the key people and groups are going to need to work together.</p> <p>As a group let's brainstorm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If we are to have a great future for the rec fishing sector how could we work together to make this happen this happen?</li> </ul> <p>There are no right or wrong views. This is about everybody sharing their picture of how we make this happen.</p> <p>Facilitator to summarise any key themes, common ground, points of difference</p>	MB <i>AM to record</i>

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
<p><b>8.55pm</b> 20 mins</p>	<p><b>WHAT ROLE COULD YOU PLAY – What part could you play in making this future happen?</b></p> <p>Everybody will need to play a part in making this future happen.</p> <p>As a group let's brainstorm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What part could you play in making this future happen?</li> <li>▪ How does Government work more effectively with the rec fishing sector?</li> </ul> <p>There are no right or wrong views. This is about everybody sharing their perspective on the role of the rec fishers.</p> <p>Facilitator to summarise any key themes, common ground, points of difference</p>	<p>AF <i>AM to record</i></p>
<p><b>9.15pm</b> 15 mins</p>	<p><b>WHERE TO FROM HERE?</b></p> <p>Facilitator to summarise what we have covered in the workshop and key themes, messages, common ground, points of difference</p> <p>We will write up the notes that we have taken during the workshop and send these to each of you.</p> <p>We are running similar workshops around the state and are running a forum for rec fishers towards the end of the year. Next year PIRSA Fisheries will start working with rec fishers to build a strategic plan for the sector. In 2013 this will be followed by a management plan for the sector.</p> <p>PIRSA Fisheries recognise that they can't achieve a sustainable fishery for South Australia on their own. All the different sectors will need to be willing to work together to make this happen. It is critical that Fisheries find a way of engaging with the rec sector that works for the sector and for government. This is a first step in working out how who the key players are in the sector and how we can work together.</p> <p>Any questions?</p> <p>Thank you very much for your time tonight.</p>	<p>Bec <i>AM to record</i></p>
<p><b>9.30pm</b></p>	<p><b>WORKSHOPCLOSE</b></p>	

## Recreational Fishing Workshop – Pt Lincoln 27 July 2010

### Purpose of the Workshop

PIRSA Fisheries recognises that in the past we haven't been as effective as we can be in terms of building the relationships and networks to engage with the recreational fishing sector and we want this to change.

The purpose of the workshop is to:

- Give recreational fishers a voice to help shape the future of the sector
- Get to know who the recreational sector is and how to engage with them
- Identify the networks needed for the recreational sector to work together with Government

This workshop is part of strategy to build ongoing relationships and communication channels to foster a vibrant recreational fishing sector and jointly address the issues that impact the sector.

Some of the things we'll be asking you are:

- What future do you want for recreational fishing?
- How could we work together to make this happen?

### Session Outline

7.00pm	Welcome and introduction
	What does fishing mean to you?
	What future do you want for the recreational fishing sector?
	If we are to have a great future for recreational fishing, who needs to be involved in making this happen?
	Tea & coffee break
	How could we work together to make this happen?
	What part could you play in making this future happen?
	Where to from here?
9.30pm	Workshop close

**MASTER OF ARTS IN CONFLICT FACILITATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE**

**CONSENT RELEASE FORM**

As part of my research project for the Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organizational Change, I, Rebecca Lang (student/researcher) will be conducting Recreational Fishers Workshops in July and August 2010. I wish to film these workshops as part of the learning and assessment requirements of these studies. The material filmed or photographed is to be used for study purposes only and will only be viewed by research project participants, and student colleagues and members of the research faculty as part of the final project presentation.

I seek your consent to use these images for study purposes

**I:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(please print name)

**Of:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(address – please print)

1. Consent to video footage/photos of myself being taken by the student/researcher for use in research studies for the Master of Arts in Conflict Facilitation and Organizational Change, for an undefined period of time
2. acknowledge that any recording made by the student/researcher of any performance of myself in connection with the research project is an authorised use of my performance for the purposes of the Copyright Act 1968
3. agree that my participation in the research project activities may be edited at the sole discretion of the student/researcher
4. release the student/researcher from any claim by me or anyone on my behalf arising out of my appearance in research project activities
5. acknowledge that there is to be no payment or further consideration paid for my performance.

Signed by:

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

**Thank you very much for supporting this research project.**

## Recreational Angling Workshop

8 December 2010

The Boardroom, Adelaide Shores Function Centre  
Corner Hamra Ave & Military Rd, West Beach

### Purpose of the Workshop

PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture is keen to continue building their relationships and engagement with the recreational angling sector to jointly address issues of concern to the sector.

The purpose of the workshop is to:

- Work with the members of the recreational angling sector to address key issues identified in the recreational fishing workshops held in July and August 2010
- Explore a range of stakeholder positions on issues to identify areas of common ground and opportunities to build workable solutions and strategies
- Give recreational anglers a voice in shaping the future of the sector
- Identify the approaches and networks needed for the recreational sector to engage and work together with Government

This workshop is part of strategy to build ongoing relationships and communication channels to foster a vibrant recreational angling sector and jointly address the issues that impact the sector.

### Session Outline

9.30am	<i>Tea and coffee will be provided prior to workshop start</i>
10.00am	Welcome and introduction
	The key messages PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture heard from the recreational fishing workshops held in July and August
	Stakeholder expectations
	Issue 1 – Sustainability
12.30pm	Lunch
	Issue 2 – Access
	Ongoing engagement strategy
	Reflections from the day and next steps
3.00pm	Workshop close

## Recreational Angling Workshop – 8 December 2010

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
<p><b>10.00am</b> 15 mins</p>	<p><b>WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>The Executive Director and President, SARFAC to welcome participants to the workshop and set the scene.</p> <p>ED to outline the context for the workshop and its role in the broader engagement strategy with the recreational fishing sector.</p> <p>ED to mention the amalgamation of Fisheries and Aquaculture, to help participants understand the name change.</p> <p>BS to outline SARFAC's commitment to the workshop and the broader engagement strategy.</p> <p>ED to introduce Bec Lang as one of the facilitators for the day.</p> <p>Bec to get people to introduce themselves; outline purpose of the workshop.</p> <p><b>Purpose of the Workshop</b></p> <p>PIRSA Fisheries is keen to continue building their relationships and engagement with the recreational angling sector to jointly address issues of concern to the sector.</p> <p>The purpose of the workshop is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Work with the members of the recreational angling sector to address key issues identified in the recreational fishing workshops held in July and August 2010</li> <li>▪ Explore a range of stakeholder positions on issues to identify areas of common ground and opportunities to build workable solutions and strategies</li> <li>▪ Give recreational anglers a voice in shaping the future of the sector</li> <li>▪ Identify the approaches and networks needed for the recreational sector to engage and work together with Government</li> </ul> <p>This workshop is part of strategy to build ongoing relationships and communication channels to foster a vibrant recreational fishing sector and jointly address issues that impact the sector.</p> <p><b>The format for the Workshop</b> – Following a short overview of the key messages PIRSA Fisheries heard from the rec fishing workshops held in July and August, we will work in table groups and as a large group to consider three topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustainability; Access; Ongoing Engagement</li> </ul> <p>We have a series of questions that we'd like to ask you to discuss at your tables and then feedback to the larger group. Each table will have a facilitator and a recorder.</p> <p>We will take a break for lunch.</p> <p><b>Administration &amp; Housekeeping</b> – toilets, phones, OHS&amp;W</p> <p>Are there any comments or questions before we get started?</p>	<p>Exec Director and President, SARFAC; Bec Lang</p>

APPENDIX 8

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
<p><b>10.15am</b> 15 mins</p>	<p><b>KEY MESSAGES FROM THE WORKSHOPS</b> AF, KR and RD to share the key messages that they took away from the workshops. Also any insights or changes they have made following the workshops.</p>	<p>AF, KR and RD</p>
<p><b>10.30am</b> 5 mins</p>	<p><b>STAKEHOLDERS EXPECTATIONS</b> In the previous workshop PIRSA Fisheries set out to hear the views of people in the rec angling sector about what fishing means to you, your hopes for the future and the issues that concern you that are impacting on recreational angling. There were a number of issues that were raised repeatedly in these workshops including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sustainability</li> <li>▪ Access</li> <li>▪ Leadership, representation, co-management – continued listening by Government, openness to ideas.</li> <li>▪ Education and promotion</li> <li>▪ Funding</li> </ul> <p>Today we are going to consider two of these key issues both from a recreational angling perspective and also from the perspective of other key stakeholders. Why we are doing this? In all of the workshops we ran, three stakeholder groups were mentioned because their activities have a direct impact on recreational angling in South Australia. These include the commercial sector, PIRSA Fisheries and conservation groups. One of the keys to determining workable solutions to successfully address the issues of sustainability and access is to spend some time stepping into the shoes of these stakeholders to understand their needs and concerns about these issues. Bec to use the stakeholder diagram to discuss the role of stakeholders in achieving workable solutions. Any questions or comments?</p>	<p>Bec <i>Diagram of stakeholders</i></p>
<p><b>10.35am</b> 115 mins</p>	<p><b>ISSUE 1 – SUSTAINABILITY</b> In this activity, the groups will be asked to respond from their perspective as recreational anglers. Each table group will then be asked to respond from another stakeholder group’s perspective.</p> <p>1. In groups at your tables, discuss the following question: <b>(15 mins)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What does sustainability mean for you? <i>What are the characteristics of a sustainable fishery?</i> <i>How do you know when a fishery is sustainable?</i></li> </ul> <p>Record responses on butcher’s paper</p>	<p>AF, KR, RD, AM to facilitate at tables <i>TH, GD, MB &amp; MN to record</i> <i>Activity sheets</i> <i>Butcher’s paper</i></p>

APPENDIX 8

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
	<p>Remember with brainstorming: There are no right or wrong views. This is about everybody sharing their perspective in response to the questions.</p>	
<p><b>10.35am</b> 115 mins</p>	<p><b>ISSUE 1 – SUSTAINABILITY (continued)</b></p> <p>2. Each table is asked now to discuss the same question but from the perspective of their allocated stakeholder group. In other words, you are asked to step into the shoes of these stakeholders and represent their views when responding to the question: <b>(20 mins)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What does sustainability mean for you? <i>What are the characteristics of a sustainable fishery?</i> <i>How do you know when a fishery is sustainable?</i></li> </ul> <p>Stakeholder Groups to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The commercial sector – RD (facilitator); TH (recorder)</li> <li>▪ Conservation groups – AM (facilitator); GD (recorder)</li> <li>▪ General community – KR (facilitator); MB (recorder)</li> <li>▪ PIRSA Fisheries – AF (facilitator); MN (recorder)</li> </ul> <p>Record responses on butcher's paper</p> <p>3. Where is there common ground and where are there key differences? <b>(15 mins)</b></p> <p>Each group is asked to then consider where there is common ground and where there are key differences between the rec sector and the other stakeholder group</p> <p>Record responses on butcher's paper. Each group is to identify a spokesperson for the group who will give the feedback to the larger group.</p> <p>4. Feedback (35mins)</p> <p>Each group to feedback to whole group (7-8 mins per group)</p> <p>As a large group, we will draw out the areas of common ground and the differences across all stakeholders and record.</p> <p>5. What needs to happen to build more common ground? (30mins) <i>What would make PIRSA Fisheries and SARDI more believable?</i></p> <p>As a large group, discuss and record responses.</p> <p>Remember with brainstorming: There are no right or wrong views. This is about everybody</p>	<p>AF, KR, RD, AM to facilitate at tables <i>TH, GD, MB &amp; MN to record</i></p> <p>Bec</p> <p>Bec</p>

APPENDIX 8

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
	<p>sharing their perspective in response to the questions. Facilitator to summarise any key themes, common ground, points of difference</p>	
<p><b>12.30pm</b> 45 mins</p>	<p>LUNCH</p>	
<p><b>1.15pm</b> (50mins)</p>	<p><b>ISSUE 2 – ACCESS</b> A number of sub-issues emerged in the workshops with rec fishers that fit under the topic of access. These include:</p> <p><b>Physical access issues</b>, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ marine parks</li> <li>▪ artificial reefs</li> <li>▪ jetties and boat ramps</li> <li>▪ road and beach access</li> <li>▪ urban development</li> <li>▪ SA Water impoundments</li> </ul> <p><b>Sharing access</b> to the resource with other sectors</p> <p><b>Table Group Activity</b> Each table group is to discuss their needs and concerns about the issue of access by asking the question: <b>(5mins)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What are the priority issues that need to be addressed when it comes to access for recreational anglers?</li> </ul> <p>Then, once again, each table is asked to step into the shoes of different stakeholders, to discuss the following questions, representing the views of that stakeholder group: <b>(20mins)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What are your needs (wants) and concerns about access? (Why is the issue of access important to you?)</li> <li>▪ What do you believe are the obstacles to allowing access or sharing access?</li> <li>▪ What are some of the things we can do to address these obstacles?</li> <li>▪ Who needs to be involved?</li> </ul> <p>Often participants will jump to solutions when asked about their needs or wants. If this happens, ask them to explain why their solutions are important to them as this will help to identify their underlying need. Use active listening to check what you have heard or recorded about their needs.</p> <p>Record responses on butcher's paper</p> <p>Stakeholder Groups to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Recreational anglers – GD (facilitator); DP (recorder)</li> </ul>	<p>AF, KR, RD, AM &amp; GD to facilitate at tables <i>TH, JB, MB, MN &amp; DP to record</i> <i>Activity sheets</i> <i>Butcher's paper</i></p> <p>Bec</p>

APPENDIX 8

TIME	WHAT	WHO & RESOURCES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The commercial sector – RD (facilitator); TH (recorder)</li> <li>▪ Conservation groups – AM (facilitator); JB (recorder)</li> <li>▪ General community – KR (facilitator); MB (recorder)</li> <li>▪ PIRSA Fisheries – AF (facilitator); MN (recorder)</li> </ul> <p>Feedback <b>(15mins)</b></p> <p>Each group to feedback to whole group (5 mins per group)</p> <p>As a large group, we will draw out the areas of common ground and the differences across all stakeholders and record. <b>(10mins)</b></p>	
<p><b>2.05pm</b> (40mins)</p>	<p><b>ONGOING ENGAGEMENT – WHERE TO FROM HERE</b></p> <p>Over the past eight months PIRSA Fisheries has been working to build a relationship with the recreational angling sector. This has focused on understanding what recreational fishing means to you, building a picture of the future you want for the sector and identifying the issues that are important to you.</p> <p>Today’s workshop has enabled us to continue to build our understanding of each other and of the complexity of stakeholder positions that surround the issues we are trying to address.</p> <p>What we now need to ask is what sort of relationship and engagement do you want with PIRSA Fisheries from here?</p> <p><b>Activity:</b> If you were to work in partnership with PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture what would you want from this partnership and what do you think PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture can expect from you?</p> <p><i>What behaviours can people expect to see to make the partnership a success?</i></p> <p>How do the partners need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interact with each other?</li> <li>▪ Engage with the broader recreational sector?</li> </ul> <p>What will give this partnership credibility?</p>	<p>MS &amp; Bec Lang <i>Activity sheets</i> <i>Butcher’s paper</i></p>
<p><b>2.45pm</b> (15mins)</p>	<p><b>NEXT STEPS AND REFLECTIONS FROM THE DAY</b></p> <p>Bec to summarise what has been achieved through the workshop. Martin to summarise what are proposed as the next steps.</p> <p>Bec to ask the participants to share one thing that they have found useful from the day.</p> <p>Martin and Bec to thank everyone for their participation.</p>	<p>MS &amp; Bec Lang</p>
<p><b>3.00pm</b></p>	<p><b>WORKSHOP CLOSE</b></p>	

## Recreational Angling Workshop

### 8 December 2010

#### ISSUE 1 – SUSTAINABILITY

##### Question 1

In groups at your tables, as a recreational angler, discuss the following question:

- What does sustainability mean for you?  
*What are the characteristics of a sustainable fishery?*  
*How do you know when a fishery is sustainable?*

##### Question 2

Discuss the same question but from the perspective of your allocated stakeholder group. In other words, you are asked to step into the shoes of these stakeholders and represent their views when responding to the question:

- What does sustainability mean for you?  
*What are the characteristics of a sustainable fishery?*  
*How do you know when a fishery is sustainable?*

##### Question 3

In your table group reflect on your responses to Questions 1 and 2 and identify:

- Where is there common ground and where are there key differences?

##### Feedback

Each group to feedback to whole group their responses to Question 3

##### Question 4

As a whole group we will discuss the following:

- What needs to happen to build more common ground?

# Recreational Angling Workshop

## 8 December 2010

### ISSUE 2 – ACCESS

A number of sub-issues emerged in the workshops with recreational anglers that fit under the topic of access. These include:

**Physical access issues**, such as:

- marine parks
- artificial reefs
- jetties and boat ramps
- road and beach access
- urban development
- SA Water impoundments

**Sharing access** to the resource with other sectors

#### Question 1

Each table group is to discuss their needs and concerns about the issue of access by asking the question:

- What are the priority issues that need to be addressed when it comes to access for recreational anglers?

#### Question 2

Then, once again, each table is asked to step into the shoes of different stakeholders, to discuss the following questions, representing the views of that stakeholder group:

- What are your needs (wants) and concerns about access? (Why is the issue of access important to you?)
- What do you believe are the obstacles to allowing access or sharing access?
- What are some of the things we can do to address these obstacles?
- Who needs to be involved?

#### Feedback

Each group to feedback to whole group

#### Common ground and differences

As a large group, we will draw out the areas of common ground and the differences across all stakeholders

# Recreational Angling Workshop

## 8 December 2010

### ONGOING ENGAGEMENT – WHERE TO FROM HERE

Over the past eight months PIRSA Fisheries has been working to build a relationship with the recreational angling sector. This has focused on understanding what recreational fishing means to you, building a picture of the future you want for the sector and identifying the issues that are important to you.

Today's workshop has enabled us to continue to build our understanding of each other and of the complexity of stakeholder positions that surround the issues we are trying to address.

What we now need to ask is what sort of relationship and engagement do you want with PIRSA Fisheries from here?

#### Questions:

1. If you were to work in partnership with PIRSA Fisheries what would you want from this partnership and what do you think PIRSA Fisheries can expect from you?

*What behaviours can people expect to see to make the partnership a success?*

2. How do the partners need to:
  - Interact with each other?
  - Engage with the broader recreational sector?
3. What will give this partnership credibility?