



Airport stakeholder engagement strategy template

Airport stakeholder engagement strategy template

Deliverable 7.2

This model shows goals and methods of engagement at five engagement levels: Identify; Inform; Consult; Involve; Collaborate and Empower. For each method benefits and potential limitations are noted.

Individual airports should evaluate the methods described and select those that they feel would be most appropriate to their situation. It is unlikely to be necessary to use all methods. Also, this is not an exhaustive list, and if an airport has other methods that work for them then it is entirely sensible for those to be used too.

Produced in 2017 as part of the SPARA 2020 Project

PROJECT LEADER

Ranald Robertson (HITRANS)

WORK PACKAGE LEADER

David Gray (Robert Gordon University)

PROJECT MANAGER FOR WP7

Lyndsay Bloice (Robert Gordon University)

AUTHOR

Andy Grinnall (Robert Gordon University)

| | Goal | Method | Benefits | Limitations |
|----------|---|--|---|---|
| IDENTIFY | <p>To ensure all stakeholders are involved in the engagement process</p> <p><i>It should be noted that in many cases airports will be fully aware of their stakeholders and a formal method of identification will not be necessary, although it may be useful should there ever be a need to validate the airport's understanding of its stakeholders.</i></p> | <p>There are a number of documented methods of stakeholder identification, two of these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The "six markets" stakeholder model • The Future 500 stakeholder categories <p>See Note 1 for a description of these methods, and Note 2 for examples of airport stakeholders taken from a literature review of the topic.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offering all sections of the public an opportunity to become engaged with the airport reduces uncertainty and increases knowledge of the public's needs and the airport's plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of stakeholders does not necessarily mean they will be willing to become engaged |
| INFORM | <p>To provide balanced, objective, accurate and consistent information to assist stakeholders to understand the problem and identify alternatives, opportunities and solutions</p> | <p>Fact sheets</p> <p>Brief paper or online documents that summarise 'facts'</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple and efficient access to stakeholders • Can be targeted to specific groups • Can be provided in multiple languages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not be accessible to people with visual impairment or low literacy levels • May be costly to provide information in multiple languages |
| | | <p>Information sharing</p> <p>For example, emails, newsletters, circulars, websites, social media</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to large numbers of stakeholders • Can be targeted to specific groups | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written material may not be accessible to people with visual impairment |

| | Goal | Method | Benefits | Limitations |
|---------|--|--|---|--|
| CONSULT | To obtain feedback from stakeholders on analysis, alternatives and/or outcomes | Survey Online or paper based to gauge views, experiences and behaviours | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Straightforward • Focussed and specific • Can gauge a large number of opinions • Easily adapted | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to gather qualitative information • Answers may lack relevance • Delivery methods can affect results |
| | | Opinion polls Used to determine what people think about an issue and extrapolate results to a wider group | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quick and cheap • Provides a snapshot of opinions at a certain point in time • Straightforward and accurate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be too brief to allow full opinions to be given • Results may be influenced by wording of questions |
| | | Focus groups Facilitated event allowing attendees to provide views on a range of topics of interest to the organiser | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to interact with participants • Results may be easier to understand than complex statistics • Quicker to obtain information than individual methods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small sample size means group may not be fully representative • Group discussions can be difficult to control |
| | | Workshops Facilitated event allowing attendees to address an issue in greater depth than at a focus group | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complex issues may be discussed, competing options analysed and ideas generated • Encourages joint working • Builds ownership of results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of participants may make finding a suitable date for all difficult • Results may be skewed if certain groups are more easily able to attend |
| | | Expert panel Used to obtain specialised input and opinion on a particular issue | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intense focus on a specific subject • Produces in-depth analysis • Experts can often be subjective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process must be carefully focussed • Breadth may be limited • May be too 'exclusive' |
| | | Public meetings Open to all interested parties rather than by specific invitation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for the public to ask questions and raise issues • Able to gather support for new ideas and build relationships • Communication with large groups | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be chaotic if not controlled by the chair • Difficult to capture questions, comments and ideas if multiple people are speaking • Some issues may not be able to be raised in an open forum |
| | | Interviews Intensive face-to-face meetings or telephone conversations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent way to obtain qualitative information from individuals • Can produce highly accurate results • Adds a personal dimension | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires sensitivity • Many interviews needed to ensure accurate results • Advance preparation required |

| | Goal | Method | Benefits | Limitations |
|---------------|---------|--|--|---|
| CONSULT contd | | Social media and Web 2.0 tools Online facilities to allow stakeholders to contribute their views, for example, Facebook, Twitter, microblogs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful for diverse and extensive input • Offers access to views and feedback • Measurement of website visits can indicate stakeholder interest | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Careful design required to ensure valid data is collected • Cost to develop and maintain • May require closed groups or registration and password access, causing additional costs and administration |
| | INVOLVE | To work directly with stakeholders throughout the process to ensure that their concerns and needs are consistently understood and considered | Action research A set of research methods enabling exploration of issues and testing of solutions See Note 3 for further explanation and examples of this technique | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides good qualitative data • Inclusive • Flexible, allowing problem solving and solution testing during the process |
| | | Advisory committees Made up of expert representatives to provide detailed or specific information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows the input of a wide range of technical and other expertise • Enables wider distribution of information via stakeholder representatives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May fail to allow in-depth opinions to be given • Results may be adversely impacted by wording of questions |
| | | Open space technology A group process that supports positive transformation in organizations, increases productivity, inspires creative solutions, improves communication and enhances collaboration See Note 4 for more information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows development of a bottom-up agenda • Inspires ownership and action • Enables building of alliances | |

| | Goal | Method | Benefits | Limitations |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| COLLABORATE AND EMPOWER | To partner with stakeholders, including the development of alternatives, making decisions, and the identification of preferred solutions, if appropriate placing final decision making in the hands of stakeholders | Future search conference A participatory method often used to develop a shared future vision and plan around an issue See Note 5 for more information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can drive stakeholder and government action • Involves a broad range of relevant stakeholders • Develops stakeholder support and agreement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be carefully focussed • Breadth may be limited • May be too 'exclusive' |
| | | Participatory editing Stakeholders co-write reports and endorse the final version of documents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds ownership • Reflects informed views and contributes to quality of outputs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisational structures and resources for stakeholders need to be considered • May attract criticism if final result does not reflect input |
| | | Visioning A technique that is used to support stakeholders in developing a shared vision of the future. See Note 6 for more information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large numbers of the stakeholders can be involved • Builds relationships • Utilises knowledge and experience held by stakeholders • Generates forward planning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires multiple facilitators • Large amount of data generated needing subsequent analysis • Careful documentation and clarity of purpose required to ensure process links to concrete outcomes |
| | | Co-design Utilise the expertise and skills of stakeholders to jointly create products and services | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diverse contribution • Builds relationships • Increases commitment • Enables experimentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process needs to be carefully focussed |

Note 1: Methods for identification of airport stakeholders

The "six markets" stakeholder model

This approach was developed by Christopher, Payne and Ballatyne (1991) and its subsequent revision and use is described in a paper by Payne, Ballatyne and Christopher (2005). The model categorises six market domains:

1. Customer markets
2. Referral markets
3. Supplier and alliance markets
4. Influence markets
5. Recruitment markets
6. Internal markets

The Future 500 stakeholder categories

In this model (Gable and Shireman, 2005) five stakeholder categories are described:

1. Shareholders
2. Workplace
3. Communities
4. Marketplace
5. Environment

Adapted from: State of Victoria (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development) (2011). *Stakeholder Engagement Framework*. p. 14 and pp. 26-27.

Note 2: Examples of airport stakeholders

This list is compiled from a number of academic and other sources.

| Stakeholder | Referenced by |
|--|-----------------|
| Action groups | (2) |
| Air Carriers | (3)(4)(6)(7) |
| Airport Company | (1)(3)(5) |
| Airport Consultative Committee | (5) |
| Airport Employees | (1)(2)(3)(4) |
| Airport Service Partners | (1)(2)(3)(6)(7) |
| Airport Suppliers | (1)(2)(3)(6) |
| Ambulance service | (8) |
| Armed forces | (7) |
| Business, commerce, tourism, arts, sport and education organisations | (1)(2)(4)(7) |
| Concessionaires | (3)(6) |
| Domestic and international competing airports | (7) |
| General aviation users | (3) |
| International aviation authorities | (7) |
| Investors and bond-holders | (3) |
| Local Government | (1)(2)(3)(5)(7) |
| Media | (2)(4)(7) |
| National Government | (1)(2)(3)(4)(7) |
| NGOs | (1)(3)(5)(7) |
| Other employees | (3) |
| Parking operators | (3)(6) |
| Politicians | (2)(4)(7) |
| Providers of other local transport services | (1)(3) |
| Regional Government | (1)(2)(4)(7)(8) |
| Regulatory aviation authorities | (7) |
| Retailers | (2)(3)(6) |
| Service providers | (3)(6) |

Sources: (1) Amaeshi and Crane (2006): Table 2; (2) *ibid.*: Table 3; (3) Schaar and Sherry (2010); (4) Ruh (2014); (5) Rawson and Hooper (2012); (6) Jiminez, Claro and de Sousa (2013); (7) Avinor (2015); (8) Wilson Metcalfe (Personal correspondence 28 October 2016)

Note 3: Action Research

Action Research starts with a question and then proceeds through a 4 phase cycle.

Phase 1: PLAN. Develop a plan for the investigation of the question, consulting with the stakeholders who will be involved to explain what you intend to do and why.

Phase 2: ACT. Initiate the planned action, such as a new activity or a change to an existing one, ensuring that the involved group understand why the action is being taken. It may be necessary to check that good practice and ethical guidelines are followed.

Phase 3: OBSERVE. Make observations and recordings of the impact of the action on the group, noting any change to their behaviour, including any feedback that they wish to give.

Phase 4: REFLECT. Review the previous activities and reflect critically on the outcomes. Further questions may have been raised necessitating a repeat of the cycle.

An example of guidelines on Action Research developed by the Open University can be found at <http://www.open.ac.uk/cobe/docs/AR-Guide-final.pdf>

Note 4: Open Space Technology

A full description of Open Space Technology can be found on Wikipedia at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_Space_Technology. It can be used in settings ranging from small meetings of just a few people to very large ones attended by thousands. There are five basic mechanisms involved in its application:

- i. The organizer issues an invitation to potential participants setting out the purpose of the meeting
- ii. Attendees sit in a circle
- iii. The group as a whole decides the agenda from "bulletin board" posts made by individual participants
- iv. Many break-out spaces allow participants to learn about and contribute to different ideas and information sources
- v. There should be a rhythm between plenary and break-out sessions throughout the meeting

The meeting generally has a single facilitator, who ideally should be "fully present and totally invisible".

Note 5: Future Search conference

A full description of the Future Search conference process can be found on Wikipedia at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Future_Search#Future_Search_Conference. It is used for medium sized meetings of between 40 and 80 people and takes place in 4 or 5 half day sessions over 3 days. Facilitation is usually "hands-off", allowing participants to work collaboratively to arrive at their own solutions. There are four underlying principles:

- i. A cross-section of all parties with a stake in the outcome needs to be present
- ii. The whole system needs to be discussed before starting to search for solutions
- iii. The central aspect of the conference must be common ground between participants and a focus on the future, with problems and conflicts treated as information to enable solutions to be found rather than items to be acted upon
- iv. Attendees are encouraged to be responsible for actions before, during and after the conference

Note 6: Visioning

For an example of the techniques employed in Visioning (sometimes referred to as Stakeholder Visioning) see this article that is part of the Sustainable Sanitation and Water Management Toolbox at <http://www.sswm.info/content/visioning>.

References

- Amaeshi, K.M. and Crane, A. (2006). Stakeholder engagement: a mechanism for sustainable aviation. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 13(5), pp. 245-260. doi: 10.1002/csr.108
- Avinor (2015). *Annual and CSR report 2015*. Oslo, Norway: Avinor.
- Christopher, M., Payne, A. and Ballantyne, D. (1991). *Relationship marketing: bringing quality, customer service and marketing together*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann
- Gable, C. and Shireman, B. (2005). Stakeholder engagement: a three-phase methodology. *Environmental Quality Management*. 14(3), pp. 9-24. doi: 10.1002/tqem.20044
- Jimenez, E., Claro, J. and de Sousa, J.P. (2014). The airport business in a competitive environment. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*. 111, pp. 947-954. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.129
- Payne, A., Ballantyne, D. and Christopher, M. (2005). A stakeholder approach to relationship marketing strategy: the development and use of the "six markets" model. *European Journal of Marketing*. 39(7/8), pp. 855-871. doi: 10.1108/03090560510601806
- Rawson, R. and Hooper, P.D. (2012). The importance of stakeholder participation to sustainable airport master planning in the UK. *Environmental Development*. 2, pp.36-47. doi:10.1016/j.envdev.2012.03.013
- Ruh, F. (2014). Munich airport's third runway and stakeholder communications. *Journal of European Management & Public Affairs Studies*. 2(1), pp. 15-22.
- Schaar, D. and Sherry, L. (2010). Analysis of airport stakeholders. In *Integrated Communications Navigation and Surveillance Conference (ICNS) 2010*. J4-1 – J4-17. doi: 10.1109/ICNSURV.2010.5503233

