

Călimani National Park, Romania: Stakeholder analysis

Lars T. Soeftestad^{1/}

Supras Papers, no. 1, May 2011

This report, together with the data that are presented and analyzed, is prepared for a development project in Romania that addresses ecotourism and alternative energy. It presents stakeholder analysis as a tool for understanding the relations between key stakeholders that, in one way or another, have an interest in the management of a protected area.

The report consists of the following sections: (1) The project and the CNP, (2) Methodology, (3) Stakeholder analysis: procedures and sequencing, (4) Administration of the stakeholder survey, (5) Discussion, and (6) Conclusions. Two appendixes include, respectively, lists of the members of the two Councils attached to the Călimani National Park (CNP), and the stakeholder analysis survey forms.

1 The project and Călimani National Park

1.1 The project

The development project is “Ecotourism in Tara Dornelor – An instrument for sustainable development” (the Project). Prepared in the latter half of 2008, in early 2009 it received funding from Norway Grants, via Innovation Norway. The Project’s partners were: Speleological Foundation Bucovina, the Community-Based Natural Resource Management Network (CBNRM Net, Norway) and the Association of Ecotourism in Romania (AER).^{2/} Implementation began in early 2009 and the project closed in April 2011.

The project area, Tara Dornelor, is situated in the northeastern part of Romania. It consists of the township of Vatra Dornei and the administrative units (*communes*) of Dorna Arini, Dorna Candrenilor, Neagra Sarului, Panaci, Poiana Stampei, and Saru Dornei, each of which include a

^{1/} Supras Consult Limited (Norway UK Bulgaria) at www.supras.biz and www.supras.tel. Postal address: PO Box 1600, NO-4688 Kristiansand, Norway. Email: lars@supras.biz. Mobile: +47 908 23 006. Skype: supras-lars. The report is sponsored by the Community-Based Natural Resource Management Network (CBNRM Net).

^{2/} Website addresses: Norway Grants – www.norwaygrants.org, Innovation Norway – www.innovasjonnorge.no, Speleological Foundation Bucovina – www.speo.org.ro, CBNRM Net – www.cbnrm.net, AER – www.eco-romania.ro.

number of villages. The population of Tara Dornelor constitutes the Project's target group. The Project's general objective is to "develop and implement an approach to sustainable development through responsible tourism, with a focus on ecotourism and renewable energy for biodiversity conservation" (Speleological Foundation Bucovina 2008).

The present report is prepared in connection with the project component that addresses development of ecotourism in and around the CNP. It aims to do a stakeholder analysis centered on the CNP. It is, however, not an original task or activity of the Project. Rather, it was added in the course of the implementation. Originally a suggestion by me, the idea was that such an outside analytical look into the relations between key individuals and organizations involved in the Project might provide valuable insights that would prove useful for the successful implementation of the Project, as well as the continuity of the actions and activities implemented by the Project. As such, this is not an analysis of the CNP per se; rather it is an analysis of the key stakeholders that have an interest in the Park and its management.

1.2 The Călimani National Park

The Călimani Mountains are part of the Eastern Carpathian Mountains in northern Romania, and cover approximately 2000 km². The CNP covers part of these mountains, that is, approximately 240 km². It lies on the territories of the counties of Suceava, Mureş, Bistriţa and Harghita, and is located immediately to the south of Tara Dornelor. A unique feature of the Park is its geology, in that a large part consists of the remnants of an old *caldera* (volcanic crater). The unique geological formation found here has resulted in special natural landscape elements. The Park is also noticeable for a broad spectrum of ecosystems, natural and man-made. Local people in several Tara Dornelor villages had a long history of utilizing the Park area for grazing, farming, forestry and gathering of diverse natural products

The CNP was established in 2004.^{3/} The process around its establishment was such that there was little or no public information or involvement of the local people that owned the land in the process. After the Park was established it was illegal to exercise these activities, and the implications of the overall process and the prohibitions have been an important issue in Tara Dornelor. The Park's administration (CNPA) is located in Vatra Dornei. It is administrated by the National Forest Administration (RNP, or Romsilva).

2 Methodology

Four methods are used in this work: (1) Reading relevant documents, (2) Participant observation, (3) Stakeholder analysis, and (4) Network analysis. These are all qualitative methods. They are also separate in that they have different merits and usages, and are accordingly in principle employed independently of each other, as well as in a specific sequence or order.

2.1 Documentation

This involves reading available project documentation. All project documentation is in Romanian, together with almost all other relevant documentation, and this limits the usefulness of this method.

^{3/} Website address: www.calimani.ro.

2.2 Participant observation

As the name implies, this is a method for gathering information and insights that relies on the researcher being part of and observing activities and interactions between the persons being studied. The ideal is to be a part of (i.e., participate), while at the same time observe. As will be abundantly clear, the combination of such insider and outsider roles is in practice hard to achieve (maybe even impossible). Nonetheless, participant observation can yield useful and interesting insights and understandings.

Furthermore, while participant observation is an independent and separate method, it at the same time informs stakeholder analysis. That is, participant observation is helpful in framing and constructing a stakeholder analysis.

2.3 Stakeholder analysis

Below stakeholder analysis is presented by means of brief answers to specific questions. That is, the what, when, how and why of stakeholder analysis are addressed.^{4/}

What is a stakeholder? Stakeholders are persons, groups, organizations or institutions which are likely to impact or be impacted by a project. They may be affected by a project (either negatively or positively). As well, they can affect the outcome of a project (either negatively or positively).

What is stakeholder analysis? It is a systematic methodology that uses qualitative data to determine the interests and influence of different groups. It provides external insights into relations and channels of communication.

Why do stakeholder analysis? There are three main reasons: (1) Identify stakeholder's interests in, importance to and influence over a project, (2) Identify local institutions and processes upon which to build, and (3) Provide a foundation and strategy for participation. Stakeholder analysis provides a foundation and structure for the successful implementation of the project, including participation and collaborative approaches, participatory planning, implementation and monitoring. Specifically, stakeholder analysis can help in understanding conflicts and in addressing conflict resolution. Stakeholder analysis is often done in connection with a planned change, for example, development project that aims to make changes or reforms.

What can stakeholder analysis be used for? It can be carried out for any type of planned change or reform. However, it is particularly amenable to structural and sectoral reforms. Basic stakeholder analysis should precede reform design and should be consistently deepened as reform elements are finalized.

What does stakeholder analysis tell us? Once different types of stakeholders have been identified and listed, matrices and other illustrative devices can be developed that map: (1) The nature of their interest in policy reform (whether positive or negative), (2) The extent to which stakeholder interests converge or overlap, (3) Their importance to the reform in question, and (4) Their influence over the reform onto four quadrants (see Table 1). Finally, stakeholder analysis is critical for informing an end-of-exercise assessment of the risks of policy reform.

^{4/} Further information on stakeholder analysis, including procedures and sequencing, is available in Section 3.

Key elements and methods. Stakeholder analysis is best done in collaboration with key stakeholders. It is ideally iterative, that is, a process repeated at regular intervals in order to assess relevant aspects of the implementation of a project. It usually proceeds through the following activities and methodologies, together with associated data, to reach final conclusions:

1. Background information on, among others, constraints to effective government policy making.
2. Key informant interviews, focus groups and group workshops that identify specific stakeholders relevant to the sustainability of a policy reform. When working with groups, participants should be drawn from diverse groups of interest in order to limit bias.
3. Participatory analysis of the data.
4. Verification of assumptions about stakeholder influence and interest through survey work and quantitative analysis of secondary data.

Requirements. There are three main requirements to be noted, namely: (1) Data/information, (2) Time, and (3) Skills:

1. *Data/information.* The interests of stakeholders are seldom explicitly spelled out in existing sources, in other words, as a rule information has to be gathered specifically for the purposes of such an analysis. The main sources of information are: (1) Key informant interviews and group workshops, and (2) Secondary political economy analysis in academic and journalistic media.
2. *Time.* If integrated with ongoing key informant interviews, stakeholder analysis can be conducted in a single week. In cases where there is no significant qualitative work planned, a thorough exercise would involve two to four weeks of research. However, analysis that is meant to predict the positions and influence of stakeholders in different reform scenarios is not a one-off piece of work and should emerge from the findings of other analytic work. Ensuring a complete and updated picture may require that specialists conduct the analysis over several months.
3. *Skills.* Sociological or anthropological training is helpful, as is a background in political science. Local knowledge, including contacts with local experts is crucial. Those carrying out the analysis must also thoroughly understand the reform and the recent history in the sector.

Limitations. Stakeholder analysis relies on qualitative data and perceptions and preferences. The absence of statistical representativeness places greater onus on careful selection and triangulation of data and key informants.

Complimentary tools. These include, among others, knowledge (management) tools, political mapping, network analysis (see Section 2.4), participatory consultation, political mapping, social analysis, and social assessment. Qualitative stakeholder analysis can also be combined with mathematical models of stakeholder preferences.

2.4 Network analysis

By the term “network” is here understood interpersonal relationships and the manner in which these are arranged to form a pattern which is termed “social network”. A social network can be understood as a series of linkages between individuals which may form the basis for mobilization of people, for specific purposes, and under specific conditions. It follows that networks may overlap

with specific institutions, that is, standardized action of behavior linked to a set of complex and inter-dependent norms and roles. Network analysis is the study of such networks. In this, stakeholder analysis can provide important information and insight.

3 Stakeholder analysis: procedures and sequencing

Below two ways of organizing or sequencing a stakeholder analysis is presented. The former can be understood as a boiled down, simple and perhaps more intuitive approach, while the latter is more logical, stringent and applied in nature.^{5/}

3.1 Stakeholder analysis, Approach no. 1

The steps involved are: (1) List and categorize stakeholders, (2) Describe and/or score variables for each stakeholder, and (3) Map selected variables onto a bivariate matrix or table.

3.1.1 Step 1 – Listing and categorizing

Small focus groups are established and the purpose of the exercise explained. Next, these groups compile initial categorized lists of stakeholders.

3.1.2 Step 2 – Describing and scoring

The selected stakeholders can now be listed in a table, where group members (themselves stakeholders in the relevant reform) score each other comparatively, according to selected criteria or variables. These variables can be:

1. *Influence*. The power a stakeholder has to facilitate or impede policy reform design and implementation.
2. *Importance*. The priority given to satisfying the needs and interests of each stakeholder.
3. *Interest*. The perceived level of interest that each stakeholder has in the policy reform, along a continuum from commitment to status quo to openness to change.
4. *Impact*. The degree to which the policy reform will impact each stakeholder.
5. *Power*. The level of resources that stakeholders possess and are able to bring to bear in the policy process.
6. *Resources*. The level of resources that stakeholders possess and are able to bring to bear in the policy process.
7. *Legitimacy*. The degree of legitimacy of each stakeholder's interest, meaning the extent to which the stakeholder's claims are seen as appropriate by other stakeholders.
8. *Urgency*. The urgency that should be attached to the competing claims of each stakeholders.

3.1.3 Step 3 – Mapping

Once this categorized table has been developed, the groups can map their relationships with the reform process onto various forms of bivariate analysis matrix, or table, drawn from the listed and scored variables.

^{5/} The presentation of stakeholder analysis in this section is adapted from a number of sources, among them: ActionAid USA and ActionAid Uganda (2004); Bianchi and Kossoudji (2001); Chevalier (2001); Crosby (1991); IFC (n.d.); MindTools (2010a, 2010b); OECD (2005); PRCDP (2005); Rietbergen-McCracken and Narayan (1998); Robson (2004); Schmeer (1999); Soeftestad (1998); UNDP Romania (1997); World Bank (1995, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2006, 2009); WWF (2005).

One such matrix can consist of two dichotomized variables, namely “interest” and “influence” (see Table 1). The variable “interest” (also called “importance”) measures a stakeholder’s degree of importance or priority, as seen from the point of view of the project, or, put differently, the degree to which achievement of project objectives depends on the interest and active involvement of a given stakeholder. Stakeholders who are important to the project are generally those whose needs the project seeks to meet as well as those whose interests converge with the objectives of the project. The variable “influence” measures a stakeholder’s degree of ability to influence the project, or put differently, it refers to the power that stakeholders have over a project. It can be exercised by controlling the decision-making process directly and by facilitating or hindering the project’s implementation. Such control can come from a stakeholder’s status of power, or from informal connections with leaders. Both these variables – that is, interest and influence – can be ranked along simple scales and mapped against each other, as an initial step in determining appropriate strategies for their involvement.

The four cells or quadrants refer to four different categories of stakeholders, as follows (see Table 1):

- (A) *Low influence and Low interest*. Here we find stakeholders who do not stand to lose or gain much from the project, and whose actions cannot affect the project’s ability to meet its objectives. They may require limited monitoring or informing of progress but are of low priority. They are unlikely to be the focus of project activities or involved in project management. These stakeholders are not key and can be effectively ignored in project design and implementation.
- (B) *High interest and Low Influence*. Stakeholders who stand to lose or gain significantly from the project, but whose actions cannot affect the project’s ability to meet its objectives are located here. The project needs to ensure that their interests are fully represented. These stakeholders are the project’s beneficiaries, and the strongest of these stakeholders should also be actively involved in the project.
- (C) *High influence and Low interest*. Stakeholders who do not stand to lose or gain much from the project, but whose actions can affect the project’s ability to meet its objectives belong in this category. These stakeholders may be a source of risk, and it will be necessary to devise means of monitoring and managing such risk project. It may be wise to build and nurture relationships with the most influential stakeholders in this category.
- (D) *High interest and High influence*. The stakeholders who stand to lose or gain significantly from the project, and whose actions can affect the project’s ability to meet its objectives are found in this category. The project needs to ensure that their interests are fully represented. Overall impact of the project will require good working relationships to be developed with these stakeholders. These are the project’s most important stakeholders, and their interest should be represented in the project.

Table 1: Stakeholders - Interest versus influence

	High	(C)	(D)
Influence	High	(C)	(D)
	Low	(A)	(B)
		Low	High
		Interest	

Note: The four quadrants A - D are discussed in Section 3.1.3.

3.2 Stakeholder analysis, Approach 2

Stakeholder analysis aims to determine and understand the interests that specific stakeholders have on a particular project, task or activity. There are four steps involved are: (1) Identification, (2) Determine interest, (3) Determine power and influence, and (4) Participation strategy.

3.2.1 Step 1 – Identification of stakeholders

In this step the focus is on narrowing the field of relevant and key stakeholders, from those that potentially affect or are affected by a development project to the stakeholders whose active involvement in the project is sought. Relevant stakeholders include those that are affected – negatively or positively – by the activity, as well as those that can impact the activity, negatively or positively. To achieve this, the answers to the following questions will serve well:

- Who are potential beneficiaries?
- Who might be adversely impacted?
- Have vulnerable groups been identified?
- Have supporters and opponents been identified?
- What are the relationships among stakeholders?

When seeking answers to these questions several categories of stakeholders should be considered, including the borrower, beneficiaries, affected groups, other interested groups and the donor. It is important to remember that stakeholders can be individual persons, communities, social groups and organizations.

3.2.2 Step 2 – Determine interests

In this step the *interests* of stakeholders are assessed, together with the potential impact of the project on these interests (see Section 3.1.3). Some stakeholder interests are more obvious than others. Also, many interests are difficult to define, especially if they are ‘hidden’, multiple, or in contradiction with the stated aims or objectives of the organization or individual. In order to focus the inquiry, each stakeholder should be related to the activities and objectives of the project. The

following questions and considerations should guide the inquiry into the interest of each key stakeholder or group:

- What are the stakeholder's expectations of the project?
- What benefits are there likely to be for stakeholders?
- What stakeholder interests conflict with the project/policy goals?
- What resources might the stakeholder be able and willing to mobilize?

In some cases, the above questions can be answered through review of secondary information. Often, however, some degree of social analysis or participatory consultation will be necessary in order to determine the answers.

3.2.3 Step 3 – Determine power and influence

In this step the *power* and *influence* of stakeholders are assessed. This analysis addresses the stakeholders' ability to influence the activities, together with their importance for the activity. Power and influence refer to the effect that stakeholders can have on a project or a policy, for example, to control what decisions are made or to facilitate or hinder its implementation (see Section 3.1.3). In addition to the stakeholders' individual relationships to the project or policy, it is important to consider the relationships between the stakeholders. For each stakeholder, use the following questions to organize information about social, economic, political and legal status, authority, control and relative negotiating positions among stakeholders:

- What are the power and status?
- Which is the degree of organization? How can that organization be influenced or built upon?
- Who has control over strategic resources?
- What is the informal influence (for example, via personal connections)?
- What are the power relations with other stakeholders? Who has power over whom? Who is dependent upon whom?
- What is the importance to the success of the project?
- Who has control of/over information?

The answers to these questions reveal the kind of support that is needed for a given project or policy, and which stakeholders are in the best position to provide that support. In a table showing interest and influence together, group members can identify those stakeholders that are key stakeholders in the process (see Table 1).

3.2.4 Step 4 – Participation strategy

The results from the above steps feed into the preparation of a strategy for stakeholder participation. This strategy or plan should take into account:

- Interests, importance and influence of each stakeholder.
- Particular efforts needed to involve important stakeholders that lack influence.
- Appropriate forms of participation throughout the project cycle.

4 Administration of the stakeholder survey

4.1 Background

There were several reasons why I proposed that a stakeholder analysis be prepared. They relate to my background and training as well as to my perceived understanding of the kind of inputs that were needed in the project, in particular in the component that address ecotourism.^{6/} The rationales and considerations that led to doing this stakeholder analysis were the same as for any stakeholder analysis (see Section 2.3).

The traditional methods (see Section 2.3), including inviting all stakeholders to participate in a number of workshops and focus groups, would have been a logistical exercise of some complexity and magnitude that would have required several days, and required substantial organizational effort by number of persons. Moreover, there was not a budget for this. Also, given the language problems on my part, it would not have been practical for me to participate in much of this work. Accordingly, regarding the organization of this analysis, including the associated data collection exercise, the following considerations figured prominently:

1. It should be participatory.
2. It should be as less costly as possible.
3. It should be easy to administer.
4. The data should be collected in a structured way.
5. It should make comparisons possible, between data collected within the project over time, and between data collected for other projects.
6. It should function as training for the CNPA, including administering such a data collection exercise, as well as how its output could potentially inform the actual management of the Park.
7. It should be organized and presented as a complete and finite approach, including relevant survey forms, in order that the CNPA could administer the survey forms in the future.

The AER, on behalf of the CNPA, has a specific rationale for why a stakeholder analysis would be useful. This is that it would be an important input into preparing a final management plan for the Park.

Based on this, I set about to organize and prepare a stakeholder analysis, consisting of a number of survey forms to be administered in a specific order. In doing this the second of the approaches outlined above were utilized (see Section 3.2).

4.2 The approach

The plan called for, first, administering the survey forms to the CNPA. That is, the stakeholder survey would focus on this office and its staff. In a second step, the survey forms would be administered to those stakeholders identified by the CNPA, or to a sample of these stakeholders. In this way, data would be available from both parties to a relationship, and these data can then be compared with each other.

^{6/} At the same time it was evident that I had a number of days of planned input into the project, while there were no suggestions forthcoming from the other partners, specifically AER, as to what I should use my time on.

Preparations for the survey of stakeholders were done in connection with visits to the project area in late July and again in late August and early September 2010. On these occasions I met with staff at the CNPA, that is, Basarab Barladeanu (Director, CNPA), Cristi Ortanu (Community outreach and responsible tourism, CNPA) and Elena Cenusu (Biologist, CNPA), and partly also Liviu Huțanu (IT responsible, CNPA), to identify available stakeholders in the project area. Alina Ioniță, (President, Ecotourism Association of Tara Dornelor, AETD), a local person intimately familiar with the Park and its management, participated in several of these meetings.^{7/} The focus was on identifying all relevant and potentially important stakeholders, as seen from the point of view of the CNPA, independently of the nature and strength of these stakeholders' relationships with the Park and its administration. Images from these sessions are available, including of several overhead charts that were prepared.^{8/} I also met with representatives of some of the stakeholders, namely: Pasquale Amitrano and Nicoleta Avadanel (Owners, Guesthouse Amfora, Neagra Sarului Commune), Vasile Cozan (Mayor, Panaci Commune), Cătălin Iordache (Mayor, Saru Dornei Commune), Gheorghe Iordache (Director General, SC Min Bucovina SA), Christian Tăranu (Manager, Association for Wildlife Conservation) and Adrian Todasca (Chief, Forestry District, Vatra Dornei). In Bucharest I met with Dragos Mihai (Director, National Forest Administration). These meetings were brief, unstructured and informal in nature, and operated at a general level. It follows that they did not represent optimal occasions for administering the survey forms. Images from several of these meetings are available (see Footnote 7).

Administration of Survey Forms 1-2 took place largely in September-October 2010. The remaining Survey Forms 3-7 were administered in December 2010. The work took place at the offices of the CNPA. Basarab Barladeanu functioned as the respondent in administering all survey forms. I had not requested the aid of anybody in administering the survey due to lack of funds. As well, it was not possible to find trained persons locally, with the exception of Alina Ioniță who volunteered to take part in several of the interviews.

Stakeholder analysis is often used in conjunction with complementary social science-inspired methods, including, in particular, social analysis and social assessment. Stakeholder analysis in such cases often functions to inform these other methods in order to focus and target them better. For the present exercise such supporting methods were not employed, with the exception of network analysis.

4.3 The survey forms

The survey forms are as follows:

1. *Timeline of key events.* This is a preparatory survey form to the actual stakeholder analysis. It aims to identify the main events in the history of the Park, including the process of establishment. The emphasis is on events that address all aspects of the Park, including legal, managerial and financial issues, as well as relations with relevant groups and individuals at local, regional, national and international levels.

^{7/} AETD is identical with the network that was created as a direct result of the present project. Alina Ioniță at times also functions as a consultant to AER.

^{8/} Website address: www.flickr.com/supras/collections. On this page, locate the link "2008-11: Romania, ecotourism project". On this page, access the following two links: "10/7: Calimani, stakeholder analysis 1" and "10/8: Calimani, stakeholder analysis 2". As will be seen, these are a large number of additional images available from the planning, preparation and implementation of the project, covering the period September 2008 - December 2010. This amounts to an important visual process documentation of the overall work on the project, including the preparation phase.

2. *Issues.* This is a preparatory survey form to the actual stakeholder analysis. It aims to get at the main events in the history of the Park, from the time it was set up. The emphasis is on events that address all aspects of the Park, including legal, managerial and financial issues, as well as relations with relevant groups and individuals at local, regional, national and international levels. Focus is on issues that are contentious and that involve disagreement, potential or outright conflict.
3. *Stakeholder analysis, Step 1: Identification of stakeholders.* This survey form lists the main stakeholders in relation to the Park. Stakeholders in public sector, private sector and civil society, and as located at local, regional and national levels, should be included. Relevant international stakeholders should also be included. As some stakeholders will be difficult to place in anyone category, pro et contra arguments should be included, together with justification for the final choice.
4. *Stakeholder analysis, Step 2: Determine interests.* This survey form addresses the stakeholders' interests in relation to the Park. In order to focus the inquiry, each stakeholder should be assessed in relation to the objectives and activities of the Park.
5. *Stakeholder analysis, Step 3: Determine power and influence.* This survey form focuses on the power and influence, in relation to the Park, of the identified stakeholders, that is, the effect or impact that stakeholders can have on the Park. Relationships between stakeholders are as critical to consider as their individual relationships to the Park. Information among stakeholders pertaining to social, economic, political and legal issues, as well as status, authority, control and relative negotiating positions among the stakeholders should be considered.
6. *Network analysis, Step 1: Determine collaborating stakeholders and prioritization.* In connection with determining stakeholders' power and influence, it is important to understand how they relate to each other through the network that they create or become part of. This is done through the method of network analysis. In the present form all stakeholders are identified and prioritized (for a general presentation, see Section 2.4).^{9/}
7. *Network analysis, Step 2: Determine relative and absolute influence.* In this survey form, answers to specific questions posed to each of the stakeholders (see Survey Form 6), together with the relations between them, are addressed.

As can be seen, Survey Forms 1-2 focus on the broader picture, including history and the issues in connection with the management of the Park that engage stakeholders. These two survey forms are accordingly preliminary to the actual stakeholder analysis forms, namely Survey Forms 2-5.

4.4 The stakeholder data

Below the data collected by means of the survey forms are presented according to the respective survey forms in which the data were collected.

4.4.1 Timeline of key events (Survey Form 1)

The key events in the history of the Park and its making are:

1. 1971. Establishment of two nature reserves.

^{9/} Network analysis, and the data collected by means of Survey Forms 6-7, will not be addressed in the present report. These data will be analyzed in the context of a forthcoming paper.

2. 1971. Decision to establish CNP issued.
3. 1973. First Environment Law.
4. 1975. Scientific data collected.
5. 1990. Order for national parks to be established issued.
6. 2000. CNP established.
7. 2000-today. Forest restitution.
8. 2005. First meeting of the Scientific and Consultative Councils.^{10/} Management Plan, 1th draft.
9. 2007. Management Plan, 2nd draft. New regulations for management of protected areas.
10. 2007. The 2nd tourism map (funding from GTZ).
11. 2009-2011. Ecotourism project (funding from Norway Grants).
12. 2010. Management Plan, 3rd draft.

4.4.2 Issues (Survey Form 2)

The main issues, in the sense of events or positions that have caused discussion, debate or conflict, in the history of CNP are:

1. 2004. Establishment of the CNP.
2. 2004. Land compensation.
3. 2004-today. Road access inside the CNP.
4. 2004-today. Picking of rhododendron flowers.
5. 2004-today. Gathering of wild produce.
6. 2006. Proposal to establish a windmill farm.
7. 2006. Closure of the sulfur mine.
8. 2007. Proposal to start a water bottling plant.
9. 2009-2011. Ecotourism development.

4.4.3 Identification of stakeholders (Survey Form 3)

This corresponds to Step 1 of the stakeholder analysis. The CNPA identified a number of stakeholders, located in public sector, private sector and civil society, as important (see Table 2).

Of the universe of relevant and potentially relevant stakeholders, the respondent was requested to identify a smaller subset. Guidance was provided on how to identify and prioritize stakeholders. The criterion was that the stakeholders should be “main” or “important”. Furthermore, it was stated, among the stakeholders initially identified, the “most important ones (corresponding to around 50% or maximum 20-25 stakeholders)” should be selected for further work.^{11/}

^{10/} For details about these two bodies, see Section 5.2.2. For lists of the members, see Appendix 1.

^{11/} This was done in order to arrive at a manageable universe of stakeholders to deal with in the survey. This was important especially given the original plan to administer the survey forms to all the main stakeholders identified by CNPA. The quotes are taken from Survey Form 3 (see Appendix 2).

Table 2: Identification of stakeholders

Sl. no.	Public sector	Private sector	Civil society
	Local level	Local level	Local level
1	* Communes (Local Councils, Mayors) [21]	Logging companies [?] Fruit/mushroom collectors [?]	Local people [?]
2	Local Action Group (GAL)		Farmers [?]
3	Schools [?]	Guesthouses [?]	Asociatia Proprietarilor de Padure Panaci, Saru Dornei, Dorna Arini
4	Police	Tour operators [?]	
5	Gendarmerie [2]	Tourism agencies [?]	* Dorna EcoActiv
6	* Mountain Rescue Teams (Salvamont) [5]		Foundation for Mountain Agr. (FAMD)
7	Forestry Districts (OS) [13]		Asociatia pentru Conservarea Vietii Salbatice in Calimani
8	* Museums [?]		
9	* SC Min Bucovina SA		Ass. Of Ecotourism in Tara Dornelor (AETD)
10	Training and Innovation Center in the Carpathians (CEFIDEC)		Romania-Ukraine-Rep. of Moldova, Cross-border Cooperation (ROMONTANA)
11	Agency for Payments and Interventions in Agr. (APIA)		
	County level		
12	* Prefectures [2]		
13	* County Councils (CC) [3]		
14	Forest Control Bodies (ITRSV) [2]		
15	*# Local Env. Agencies (APM) [3]		
16	* County Inspectorates for Ed. [3]		
17	* County Public Forestry Dts. (DS) [3]		
18	* Env. Control Bodies (GNM) [3]		
19	Private forestry districts [?]		
	Regional level		
20	# Regional Env. Agencies (ARPM) [3]		Tasuleasa Social
21	Regional Env. Control Bodies (GNM) [3?]		Speleological Foundation Bucovina
22	Regional Dev. Agencies (ADR) [3?]		
	National level		
23	* Min. of Env. and Forests (MMP)	# Ass. of Ecotourism in Romania (AER)	
24	*# National Forest Adm. (RNP)		ProPark
25	* Min. of Reg Dev. and Tourism (MDRT)		WWF Romania & WWF-DCP
26	* Min. of Agric. and Rural Dev. (MADR)		
27	*# Universities [4]		

Source: Adapted from Survey Form 3 (see Appendix 2).

Notes: (1) N = 48 (many of these stakeholders actually consists of a large number of individual stakeholders), (2) The stakeholder "Municipalities" identified also Vice Mayors and Secretariats as stakeholders, (2) The order in which stakeholders are listed is chosen by the respondent, and may carry significance, (4) some stakeholders represent several like-minded stakeholders, numbers are given in parentheses, (5) Members of the Consultative Council and the Scientific Council are marked, respectively, with '*' and '#'.

4.4.4 Determine interests (Survey Form 4)

This corresponds to Step 2 of the stakeholder analysis. The most important stakeholders that were identified in Survey Form 3 are further addressed in order to determine their interests (see Table 3).

Table 3: Stakeholders – Interest

	Interest		
	No interest	Interest	
		Negative	Positive
Stakeholders	Farmers, Gendarmerie, Forest Control Body (ITRSV), Local Env. Agencies (APM), Env. Control Body (GNM), Regional Env. Control Body (GNM)	Local Councils, Mayors, Logging companies, Private forestry districts, SC Min Bucovina SA, Agency for Payments and Interventions in Agr. (APIA), Forestry Districts (OS), County Public Forestry Districts (DS)	NGOs, Schools, Local Councils, Mayors, Mountain Rescue Team, Guesthouses, Tour operators, Local Action Group (GAL), Universities, National Forest Adm. (RNP), Min. of Env. and Forests (MMP)
Totals	6	8	11

Source: Adapted from Survey Form 4 (see Appendix 2).

Notes: (1) N = 23 (two stakeholders are listed under both “Negative” and “Positive” interest, observe also that the stakeholder category “NGOs” contains several stakeholders, but which ones are not detailed), (2) The variable values in Survey Form 4 have been aligned with the dichotomized variable values used in this report (see Table 1), (3) From the point of view of the present argument, whether the interest is potentially negative or positive is not relevant, (4) The order in which stakeholders are listed is determined by the respondent, and may carry significance.

4.4.5 Determine power and influence (Survey Form 5)

This corresponds to Step 3 of the stakeholder analysis. The same stakeholders that were selected in Survey Form 4 are involved also in determining their power and influence (see Table 4).

Table 4: Stakeholders – Power and influence

	Influence				
	Little/none	Some	Moderate	Significant	Crucial
Stakeholders	Schools, Local Councils, Mayors, Gendarmerie, Mountain Rescue Team, Tour operators, Local Action Group (GAL), Logging companies, Private forestry districts, SC Min Bucovina SA, Universities, County Public Forestry Districts (DS)	Farmers, NGOs, Guesthouses, Forest Control Body (ITRSV), Local Env. Agencies (APM)	Forestry Districts (OS), National Forest Adm. (RNP)	Agency for Payments and Interventions in Agr. (APIA), Env. Control Body (GNM), Regional Env. Control Body (GNM), Min. of Env. and Forests (MMP)	
Totals	12	5	2	4	0

Source: Adapted from Survey Form 5 (see Appendix 2).

Notes: (1) N = 23, (2) The order in which stakeholders are listed is determined by the respondent, and may carry significance.

4.4.6 Relating stakeholder interest and influence

This corresponds to Step 3 of the stakeholder analysis. It is now possible to analyze jointly, on the one hand, the stakeholders’ interests, that is, the degree to which achievement of the Park’s

objectives depends on their interest and active involvement of a given stakeholder, and, on the other hand, the stakeholders' influence, that is, the power that they have over the Park (see Table 5).^{12/}

Table 5: Stakeholders – Interest versus influence, in relation to the CNP

Influence	High	(C) Environment Control Body (GNM), Regional Environment Control Body (GNM) (N = 2)	(D) Agency for Payments and Interventions in Agr. (APIA), Forestry Districts (OS), Min. of Environment and Forests (MMP), National Forest Adm- istration (RNP) (N = 4)
	Low	(A) Farmers, Forest Control Body (ITRSV), Local Environment Agencies (APM), Mountain Gendarmerie (N = 4)	(B) County Public Forestry Dis- tricts (DS), Guesthouses, Local Action Group (GAL), Local Councils, Logging companies, Mayors, Mountain Rescue Team, NGOs, Private forestry districts, Schools, SC Min Bucovina SA, Tour operators, Universities (N = 13+)
Interest		Low	High
Interest			

Sources: Tables 3-4.

Notes: (1) N = 23, (2) The values of variable "interest" have been realigned to fit the present schema (see Table 3, Footnote 2), (3) The variable "influence", which has 5 values (see Table 4), has been dichotomized as follows: (i) The values "Little/none" and "Some" are coalesced and (ii) the values "Moderate" and "Significant" are coalesced, (4) The stakeholder category "NGOs" contains several stakeholders, but which ones are not detailed, (5) Within quadrants stakeholders are listed in alphabetical order.

4.4.7 Participation strategy

This corresponds to Step 4 of the Stakeholder analysis. This step was not included in the present stakeholder analysis. This is partly because it would have entailed further time-consuming, complex and costly sets of activities, for which neither funding nor staff time was available. And even if funding and staff time had been available, the other partners and the stakeholders would likely not have seen the merit or use in performing this step.

5 Discussion

Before turning to a discussion of the data, some preliminary arguments are in place. These address some pertinent issues of methodology related to interpretation of the past and present cultural and societal situation in Romania, as well as to reliability and validity.

5.1 Methodological considerations

Stakeholders are, in Western Europe and beyond, understood as organized in three commonly identified societal sectors, namely public sector, private sector and civil society. These three categories

^{12/} For a description of each of the four quadrants and their content, see Section 3.1.3.

were utilized in implementing this survey, and this represents two main problematic issues: (1) How to understand the identified stakeholders, and (2) How to categorize them.

5.1.1 Societal sectors and the relationships between them

The division between these three societal sectors in Romania, and in transition economies more generally, is anything but clear. As regards civil society, under the earlier regime it would be difficult to argue that there was a civil society, and certainly not in the sense that this term and societal category exists and has evolved in the rest of the world. As has already been argued, today we are witnessing a gradual change, and a civil society is slowly coming into being.

This leaves the relationship between the public and private sectors to be addressed. This is a vague relationship, in that a private sector entity may well be part of a *bona fide* public sector entity, or be considered to be part of the public sector on its own merit. And, in the latter case it may be under some sort of oversight or control by the public sector. The available data would seem to provide an example in that the mining company SC Min Bucovina SA is located in the public sector (see Table 2).

Today, under the new economic-political realities – that is, after the fall of the communist regimes, and further supported by the accession to the EU – there are two key tendencies operating, in Romania and throughout Eastern Europe and in transition economies more generally. This is, first, that the relationship between the public and private sectors is becoming clearer, as the roles of and rationales for these two sectors gradually separate. Second, civil society, the third societal category, is gradually emerging, in relation to either of the other two societal categories. However, as both these tendencies have only recently gotten underway, it is safe to say that there is a substantial way to go.

In the project area there is, according to some informants, a feeling that there is a civil society existing as a separate societal category. However, the communication and collaboration between these civil society stakeholders appears to be little, which goes to say that while there are stakeholders that may belong in civil society, the focus of their activities are as a rule focused and limited in terms of topic and geography. It accordingly is difficult to argue that an integrated and aware civil society as such exists. A somewhat similar argument goes for the private sector, where there are a few large private companies. In addition there are, according to some informants, a substantial number of small-scale private enterprises. This is apparently a reference to people engaged in picking berries and mushrooms and gathering plants and herbs, and selling the produce at small seasonal markets and along the roads.^{13/} Such activities should instead be considered as part of the household- or family-based economy. It follows that it is not correct to locate these subsistence-based activities in the private sector.

5.1.2 Civil society as a societal category

As a general statement, following from the somewhat vague relationships between civil society and the public sector, it is sometimes not clear whether a stakeholder listed as belonging in civil society instead is part of the public sector.^{14/} There are several possible explanations for the uncertainty as to where a stakeholder “belongs”, including that it: (1) is indirectly governed by the public sector,

^{13/} By extension, this argument would presumably apply also to farmers selling their agricultural produce in the same markets and along roads.

^{14/} The opposite scenario, that is, a stakeholder in the public sector that instead may belong in civil society, is not realistic.

(2) receives funding from the public sector, (3) functions according to a top-down management model, (4) does not have a (local) membership per se, and/or (5) elects, appoints and/or hires office holders and approves work programs and budgets in a less transparent way than in the case of NGOs.

There are two parallel processes that can explain the growth and increased clout of civil society: (1) new organizations are founded based on international principles of what defines NGOs and their role in society, and (2) existing organizations are “re-classified” (from the public sector) as NGOs, with or without parallel efforts at reforming them accordingly. The situation with two such organizations will prove to exemplify:

1. *Foundation for Mountain Agriculture (FAMD)*. This NGO provides an instructive example of how the evolution of a viable civil society in Romania takes time. It was founded in 1993 as a farmers association (with funding from GTZ), and received NGO status according to a relevant 1924 law. However, given the intricate complexities of the existing legal and bureaucratic system it has found it difficult to function and perform the tasks it was established to do (UNDP 1997). The experiences of this and other organizations clearly speak to the need for legal and regulatory reform of the NGO sector in Romania.
2. *ROMONTANA*. This would seem to be an example of a stakeholder that has been located in civil society but that more correctly belongs in the public sector.

New NGOs are largely working on environmental and ecological issues. This is a corollary of the fact that these issues are not prioritized in terms of finance, while Romania at the same time has accessed a number of EU / international policy instruments and laws that deal with protection and management of natural resources, biodiversity and the environment in general. This has resulted in a situation where several international NGOs have entered the scene. They engage and involve a new generation of citizens, many of which in turn set up or join local NGOs. In the project area, AER and WWF are examples of this. Also, when local persons travel outside, including internationally, studying and receiving training, they return home with new ideas and outlooks. In the project area Alina Ioniță represents an example of this.

An important question is whether existing organizations can – or should be sought reformed – or whether it is best to break with the past and set up new organizations. The best argument in favor of the former position is that they represent continuity and have members and staff with needed expertise. Accordingly, trying to reform such organizations from within is the preferred option. Of course, if such organizations do not proclaim to have become NGOs overnight, but accept to remain in the public sector, this is not an issue.

These are times of great change in Romania, and at all levels of society. These processes of change are to a large and increasing extent guided, influenced and/or mandated from outside of Tara Dornelor, and even outside of the country. Thus it is perhaps only natural that the understanding of these three societal categories, together with the classification of stakeholders in them, at the present time is somewhat in flux.

Finally, given the past history and current situation with regards to how stakeholder understand and define their role in relation to society and other stakeholders, and furthermore given the cultural lag that operates, it should be considered whether the situation in Romania will move towards the

reality as it is perceived and accepted elsewhere. In this situation it may be opportune to discuss whether the tri-partite division of society that is considered the norm elsewhere should or could apply to Romania and other transition countries. Perhaps, given these realities, this tripartite model should not be taken for granted, and, so to speak, imposed. After all, the important issue is how stakeholders relate and interact with each other, independently of in which societal sector they are located. Accepting such a view means, of course, that this model cannot be applied uncritical, and instead necessitates a deeper study and understanding of exactly how these three sectors and the relationships between them are understood and function in Romania today.

5.1.3 Reliability and validity

Due to lack of time, as well as the fact that the main respondent did not speak or read English well, it is necessary to consider the fact that the reliability and validity of the survey may be questionable. Reliability refers to repeatability, including interpersonal replicability, or scientific observations. In interview procedures, which is what this survey relied on, reliability means the extent to which the same range of responses on repeated trials will be produced. In this survey, where there effectively was one interviewer and one respondent active in a formal interview setting, reliability is (*not*) a relevant consideration (*but one that cannot be tested*).

Validity refers to the extent to which scientific observations actually measure what they purport to measure. In the present survey, given that little time was available for *discussion* the survey, and where the main respondent did not master English well *at all*, was not familiar with taking part in surveys, and also did not understand well the purpose behind the survey, the validity of the survey clearly is an issue to be considered. During analysis of the data, it did strike me whether some of the responses, specifically what might be termed inconsistencies in the responses, could be the result of a lower than hoped for validity.

5.2 The stakeholder survey

Two facts limit the usefulness and predictability of this stakeholder analysis. First, there was little time to discuss with the main respondent, both before and during the interviews.^{15/} Accordingly, I had many questions on specific data that there was no time to ask. Second, save for a few informal interviews, the original plan to formally interview the key stakeholder recognized by NCPA was not possible due to time constraints.^{16/} This means that the available data on the character of the relationships between CNPA and these stakeholders all originate with the CNPA.

The list of stakeholders that are identified – in the first inclusive list (see Table 2) as well as the following smaller list (see Tables 3-4) – is broad and includes stakeholders from across the societal spectrum. Specific comments on the various steps in the stakeholder analysis follow.

^{15/} All interviews took place during regular office hours, and were cut short when, for example, the telephone or cell phone rang, a staff member needed to discuss something, a person from the outside visited, or some urgent business that needed immediate attention.

^{16/} This was partly because I had a limited number of days at my disposal, partly because the work on administering the survey forms took longer time than I had expected, for reasons given above (see Footnote 15), and partly because this would have required the input of trained assistants.

5.2.1 Timeline of key events and issues

The purpose of Survey Forms 1-2) was to identify key background information in a systematic way: (1) Events in the preparation and history of the CNP, and (2) Issues that have engaged and continue to engage the stakeholders.

In hindsight, it seems that, among the data in these two Survey Forms (see Appendix 2), there is also information that seems less relevant. Regarding Survey Form 1, it is noticeable that all information pertains to bureaucratic and management issues with no reference to events concerning relations between the CNPA and key local stakeholders. In Survey Form 2, the small list of issues contain two, namely establishment of a windmill farm and plans to set up water bottling plant. Neither of these issues came up in other discussions, and I accordingly wonder how important these two issues are.

5.2.2 Identification of stakeholders

The very broad character of the stakeholders that were identified speaks to the broad engagement that CNPA has with the surrounding society. The purpose of Survey Form 3 was to identify all stakeholders that were relevant for CNPAs work. In this connection two separate issues warrant attention: (1) Some stakeholders were not included in the first list (see Table 2), and (2) Several stakeholders were omitted in the following steps (see Tables 3-4).

Most importantly, the Consultative Council and the Scientific Council that are part of CNP's management structure are not included on the list of stakeholders (see Table 2). These two bodies are possibly understood to be part and parcel of CNP's legal and administrative set-up, which would be incorrect. The two Councils are clearly separate from and external to the CNPA – and quite intentional so – in that they consist of and represent CNP stakeholders. In other words, the two Councils are important, partly because they represent a number of identified stakeholders, but more correctly sp because they are *bona fide* stakeholders in their own right. The Consultative Council consists of 85 institutions and organizations located in public sector, private sector and civil society, as available at local, county, regional and national levels, while the Scientific Councils consist of 15 institutions and organizations located in public sector and civil society, as available at local, country, regional and national levels (Călimani National Park 2010).^{17/} The two Councils meet twice annually, with CNPA being responsible for secretariat functions.

Some public sector stakeholders that are members of the Consultative Council and/or the Scientific Council were not identified as stakeholders (see Table 2):

1. *The Consultative Council.* Academia Română, Fauna administration (AJVPS), Forest Research Institute (ICAS; Bistrita Năsăud), Forest Research Institute (ICAS, Câmpulung Moldovenesc).
2. *The Scientific Council.* Forest Research Institute (ICAS; Câmpulung Moldovenesc).

While these two Councils, in one sense, is part of the CNP legal and administrative set-up, they are also separate, in that the members represent stakeholders in public sector and civil society (some of which are listed separately as stakeholders). This raises the question of why stakeholders that are important enough to be appointed as members of the two Councils are not considered important enough to enter the list of relevant stakeholders (see Table 2) (not to mention being excluded from the following steps in the stakeholder analysis, see Tables 3-4)?

^{17/} For lists of the members of the two Councils, see Appendix 1.

Several other key stakeholders were not identified by the CNPA. This includes both the Consultative and the Scientific Council. Furthermore, Norway Grants, the Project's donor, represented through the Norwegian Embassy and Innovation Norway, located in Bucharest, is clearly a stakeholder. Another stakeholder that was not mentioned is Speleological Foundation Bucovina; this may or may not be a case of it being subsumed under the broad and not detailed category of "NGOs".

A number of stakeholders that are identified in Table 2 were determined to be of less importance, and were accordingly left out of the later survey forms. They are:

1. *Public sector.* County Councils, County Inspectorates for Education, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Regional Development and Tourism, Museums, Police, Prefectures, Regional Development Agencies, Regional Environment Agency, Secretariats, Training and Innovation Center in the Carpathians, Vice Mayors.^{18/}
2. *Private sector.* Fruit and mushroom collectors, Tourism agencies.
3. *Civil society.* Local people.

I am concerned that "Fruit and mushroom collectors" and "Local people" have been left out. Some considerations: (1) Granted, this is a broad, vague and unwieldy category, and includes persons that are interested in the CNP as well as those that are not, (2) There may be overlaps with other stakeholders, including "NGOs" (but as only the broad term "NGOs" is used this is not possible to determine this), (3) "Fruit and mushroom collectors" should be understood as a sub-category of "Local people",^{19/} and (4) "Local people" can be understood to be indirectly represented through "Farmers", "Local Councils" and "Mayors". Nonetheless, there are good reasons for why more emphasis should be given to the local people in Tara Dornelor:

1. The CNP should interact with the local people, that is, the citizens, directly. While it is not possible to interact directly with all members of such a complex category, it is possible to identify sub-categories with clear internal consistency, including the farmers that lost access to natural resources and those that are interested in collecting berries, herbs and mushrooms (whether they will have a common external voice is probably more doubtful).
2. Mayors and Local Councils have a number of agendas and considerations to make, some of which will be in conflict with each other, and may accordingly come across as not necessarily always representing the interest of the citizens.
3. The local people, that is, specific groups among them, were deprived of access to substantial natural resources because of CNP, and it would be in the Park's interest to make good on this through taking the initiative to develop a close and direct relationship.
4. The "Fruit and mushroom collectors" (which likely include people that had ownership and use rights in areas that now are part of the Park, except that these collection activities take place in a much larger area) is a stakeholder category that today has problems and grievances with the Park, because of what they perceive as a strict interpretation of access and use rights.
5. The Project, under which mandate this stakeholder analysis has been prepared, identified the citizens of Tara Dornelor as the target group (see Section 1.1).
6. Although "Farmers", as a sub-category of "Local people", are included, this is not particularly comforting (see Section 5.2.4).

^{18/} It can be argued that the Secretariats and the Vice Mayors are represented through their respective Mayors.

^{19/} To exclude "Local people" implies that "Fruit and mushroom collectors" are automatically excluded.

It follows from the guidance given (see Section 4.4.3) that all identified stakeholders (see Table 2) should be understood as being listed along a continuum from low to high relevance, where the most important ones were selected for further scrutiny. It would be interesting to understand the details behind this selection process, including how the guidance provided was understood and acted upon.

5.2.3 Categorization of stakeholders

In addition to discussing which stakeholders are identified, it is necessary to look at in which societal sector they have been located (see Table 2). General and more specific considerations on this have been addressed in some detail above (see Section 5.1).

In some cases it would seem that the stakeholders are incorrectly located, or at least that there is room for discussion and interpretation. This concerns SC Min Bucovina SA, Mountain Gendarmerie, and Salvamont that are located in public sector, and ROMONTANA that is located in civil society. It would likely be more appropriate to locate SC Min Bucovina SA in the private sector, ROMONTANA in the public sector, and Mountain Gendarmerie and Salvamont in civil society. These are relevant corrections in that the location of stakeholders sets a broad context for assessing them within a stakeholder analysis.

5.2.4 Determining stakeholder interest

The categorization of stakeholders into those with an interest in CNP and those with no interest in CNPA seems on the whole to make sense (see Table 3). A possible exception to this concerns "Farmers", which have been assessed as having no interest. In other words, from the point of view of CNP the local farmers are not interesting, or, put differently, achievement of CNP's objectives does not depend on the local farmers. This may make sense given the objectives of the Park in relation to a macro-level rationale that does not involve local people.^{20/} At the same time, given the history of the Park's establishment, perhaps this should be viewed differently?

The division of stakeholders in those that have real/potential negative interest and positive interests is interesting. CNPA should consider targeting the stakeholders with real/potential interests specifically, in order to learn more about why they might have a negative attitude, and how to turn that around to a constructive relationship.

Among the members of the Consultative Council and the Scientific Council that are assessed as important enough, three were stated as having no interest in CNP. They are: Environment Control Body, Local Environment Agencies, and Regional Environment Control Body (see Tables 2-3). Conversely, only the following limited number of the members of these two Councils is assessed as having an interest in the CNP: AER, County Public Forestry Districts, Local Councils, Mayors, Ministry of Environment and Forests, National Forest Administration, and Universities.^{21/} It is not clear why the Local Action Group was stated as having a high interest in the CNP.

All the stakeholders identified in civil society are coalesced under the blanket term of "NGOs" (see Tables 3-5). It is unclear whether this composite category covers all the stakeholders listed in Table

^{20/} This follows from the fact that the local citizens in Tara Dornelor, in particular the farmers who lost access to natural resources, were not involved in the decision to establish the Park in the first place.

^{21/} AER is not listed separately in Table 3; instead it is likely subsumed under the broad stakeholder category "NGOs".

2.^{22/} NGOs are seldom alike, in terms of capacity, resources, aims, goals and relationships with other stakeholder, and this diversity would likely have been reflected in the available data as regards both interest and influence (see Tables 4-5). One NGO, in particular, namely AER, should certainly have been listed separately because of its very strong interest in CNP (through its membership in the Scientific Council and being responsible for the Project's ecotourism component).^{23/} Likewise, it would seem to make sense to list AETD separately due to the close formal and informal connection between it and the CNPA.^{24/}

5.2.5 Determining stakeholder power and influence

Some of the arguments presented regarding stakeholder interests (see Section 5.2.3) apply also here (see Table 4). Regarding the members in the Consultative Council and the Scientific Council, it is noticeable that the Local Councils and Mayors are assessed as having little or no influence. Given the position of these stakeholders in Tara Dornelor, if this is indeed the case it should be discussed how these local stakeholders can gain more influence.

Farmers and NGOs are assessed as having some influence. As the only representatives of civil society assessed as being important, these stakeholders should have more influence on the management of the Park. The fact of civil society stakeholders being subsumed under the category of "NGOs" is another issue that repeats itself (see Section 5.2.3). Here there is one NGO that stands out, namely AER. This NGO has both formal influence (through membership in the Scientific Council) and informal influence through the Project. Based in participant observation together with discussions with a number of persons, it would seem that AER's informal influence by far supersedes its formal influence, and AER should more correctly have been listed as having a crucial influence on CNP (see Table 4).

5.2.6 Computing stakeholder interest versus influence

This is the step where it all comes together, that is, stakeholders' interests and influence presented in relation to CNPA (see Table 5). In a somewhat simplified way this makes it possible to understand better how the CNPA assesses its relationship with the selected stakeholders. For starters, the essence of this table is that there is a movement from Quadrant A diagonally up to the right to Quadrant D, that is, from stakeholders that score low on both interest and influence, to stakeholders that score high on both interest and influence. On either side of these two central quadrants are the two Quadrants B and C which contain stakeholders that score low on one of the two variables and high on the other one. The least important stakeholders are located in Quadrant A; the most important stakeholders are in Quadrant D, with Quadrants B and C in intermediary positions.

Among the members of CNP's two Councils, the Local Environment Agencies is located in Quadrant A. This stakeholder, a member of both Councils, apparently has no interest in the CNP while having only some influence on it. In Quadrant C two members of the Consultative Council, namely Environ-

^{22/} Given that several of the familiar stakeholders have been excluded, and that the list of NGOs include several stakeholders that was never mentioned (see Table 2), my guess is that the category "NGO" includes only a limited number of these civil society stakeholders.

^{23/} Given the close collaboration between AER and WWF Romania and WWF-DCP, outside and in the project (the latter represents AER on the project's Management Committee), also these two NGOs should probably have been listed separately.

^{24/} CNPA is a member of AETD, CNPA staff member Liviu Huțanu is on AETD's Board, and AETD's President Alina Ioniță works closely with the CNPA, either directly or through AER.

ment Control Body and Regional Environment Control Body, are located, which have no interest in CNP while having significant influence on it. Influence aside, I would have thought that a key criteria for – as well as purpose of – membership in the two Councils would be to have an interest in what CNP is doing?

The majority of stakeholders have a high interest in CNP, which is what one would expect. On the other hand, the number of stakeholders that are recognized as having a high influence is *lower than* lower than expected, especially considering that only four of these stakeholders also have a high interest in CNP, namely those located in Quadrant D. What is noticeable with the stakeholders in this quadrant is that the guidance, control and resources are located removed from Tara Dornelor (presumably with the exception of Agency for Payments and Interventions in Agriculture). In other words, the Park's management paradigm, including control and supervision and finance, is largely located in Bucharest. This is what one would expect given the rationale for the Park's existence. What is somewhat striking, though, is that there are no civil society and public sector stakeholders – locally based or not – in this quadrant. There is, however, as argued above, one exception to this, namely AER, that has attained a seemingly very important informal role in relation to CNPA (in addition to the formal role as a member of the Scientific Council), and for this reason should have been listed in Quadrant D (instead of in Quadrant B, subsumed under the category "NGOs").

6 Conclusions

This section is divided in four: (1) Methodology, (2) Stakeholder analysis, (3) Management considerations, and (4) Broader implications. There is some overlap between Sections 6.2 and 6.3, where the latter may be understood as approaching more practically oriented conclusions.

6.1 Methodology

Stakeholder analysis aims to identify the stakeholders that are relevant in connection with a specific development project or other intervention. Furthermore, the purpose is to assess their situation, their views, and their needs in relation to this activity. Stakeholders can influence the activity positively or negatively, they may or may not have an interest in it, and they may stand to – or expect to – benefit from it. Stakeholder analysis can be used to inform decisions and actions, and it can also be used to predict outcomes better.

6.1.1 *The stakeholder analysis model – pro et contra*

The stakeholder analysis presented and utilized in this report is a combination of the available approaches to stakeholder analysis. More importantly, it is also a simplification of these approaches. This is dictated by an effort present a very simply approach or tool that can be readily understood, and invites to participation and involvement by stakeholders and respondents. At the same time it is adaptable, in that it can be tailored to specific local circumstances regarding the Project, available staff and stakeholders. Furthermore, it aims to be simple, meaning that it can be done in a short time, and that is not costly. Finally, it is a goal that the Project's management can learn the method – if necessary given further training – and use it themselves, and that it can be applied in other similar projects, and, because of its structured approach, lend itself to comparative analyses. The dichotomized variables used (i.e., interest and influence) may make for a somewhat crude way of compu-

ting, analyzing, understanding, and presenting the available data.^{25/} On the other hand, the strength of stakeholder analysis, understood as an analytical tool and a model, lies exactly in its simplicity: within the four quadrants produced by the interaction of the variables interest and importance (see Table 5) it becomes possible to understand essential aspects of the relationships between stakeholders, in this case specifically the relationships between CNPA and its stakeholders.

The drawback with the stakeholder analysis that is presented here is that it – exactly because it is quick and simplified – is less detailed and accordingly less able to throw light on some aspects of the relationships between stakeholders. This means that it may leave something to be desired in terms of predictability as well as possibilities for generalization.

6.1.2 Administration of the survey

The differential societal set-up of Romania, as in all transition countries, especially as regards the position of civil society, and the several crucial implications of this, represents an issue that needs to be addressed when implementing tools like stakeholder analysis in these countries. How to understand civil society, including NGOs, and accordingly how to assess them relative to the variables interest and influence, can be difficult, as it was in the present survey.

Some further potentially complicating – as well as linked – facts: the survey was implemented by me alone. Apart from one local person **who** was present at several respondent interviews I had no support of dedicated local support/field staff during fieldwork and subsequent analysis. Against the original plans, it was not possible to administer the survey forms to the stakeholders identified by CNPA as key stakeholders. These issues mean that the validity of the survey likely is less than optimal.

6.2 Stakeholder analysis

The output of the stakeholder analysis is a list of stakeholders that are categorized as belonging in specific sectors, and have certain interests and influence in relation to the CNPA.

6.2.1 Identification and categorization

Stakeholders and beneficiaries. An essential part of identifying stakeholders is to detail who the beneficiaries are (see Section 3.2.1). The beneficiaries are those stakeholders whose situation and need often is the rationale for the project or investment operation. They will, as a rule, have a high possibility for winning or losing (significantly) from the project, while at the same having little chance of affecting the project's ability to meet their needs. In other words, the beneficiaries are characterized by having a high interest in the project while at the same time having a low influence on it (see Table 1, Quadrant B).

This Project does not identify specific stakeholders as beneficiaries. Arriving at this instead has to be done indirectly, through interpretation of the Project's objective. This refers to the goal of "sustainable development", to be realized through (1) Responsible tourism, specifically ecotourism, and (2) renewable energy, to benefit biodiversity conservation. The former refers to the project component that is discussed here. The Project's objective does not refer to specific stakeholders. Instead it

^{25/} This use of dichotomized variable values is a characteristic of stakeholder analysis in general, and is not a simplification introduced as part of the simplified approach presented here.

refers to tourism as a means, which, through employment generation, will eventually aid some among the local population. Such employment generation will, it is assumed, support further local stakeholders, including the relevant *communes*.

A typical development project will aim to target local people that either have been affected negatively previously (e.g., through an earlier project, an activity, or a natural catastrophe), and to identify these as key stakeholders, that is, as beneficiaries. In the context of the CNP, where the establishment of the Park, and especially the way and manner in which it was created, left a large number of local farmers in several communes and villages without access to several key natural resources located inside the CNP. This presumably affected their income earning capabilities and consequently their ability to generate the former income stream. The Project has, however, not addressed this, and to the extent it has, this is only indirectly. One way of understanding this is that few people would be helped in this way, and that it would have not been a sufficient rationale for the Project. Instead, the Project addresses this in much broader way, through focusing on ecotourism, a tertiary economic sector.

In view of the hardships that creation of the Park has brought on local farmers, it would perhaps be the case that the CNPA had an eye towards this in their work. Given the legal position of the CNP it is moreover not a likely scenario. As for AER, it would appear that it defines CNPA staff, together with members of the AETD, as project beneficiaries. This is, however, an even smaller category of persons than the farmers that lost access to resources in the Park, and there is likely little if any overlap between these two categories.

From my perspective, as an outsider, it would seem like a commendable approach to address the situation of the farmers that lost access to resources in the Park. Also, given that the state's imposition in Tara Dornelor through creating the CNP and the resentment against the state that is caused, it would seem to be correct as well as useful to address these stakeholders. That it has not been done, in this Project and in general, may have to do with the fact that some years has passed since this happened, and there is now a realization that these are new times that require different, forward looking and broader approaches. Certainly at the level of the **commune, and their Mayors**, this seems to be the case. They have accepted that the establishment of the Park is the result of a completely new rationale – to remove land and resources from the ownership and control of local people in the name of nature protection and sustainable development – that brings with it also incentives and opportunities. It is only to be hoped that the local farmers are beginning to see this themselves, and that they are able to benefit from the new opportunities that are being made available, including through the Project.

In spite of the above arguments, is it possible to identify stakeholders that are, or would have been, especially deserving of the special status of being beneficiaries of the Project? Consider the stakeholders listed in Quadrant B: the available stakeholder data does not bear out who in this quadrant CNPA might consider as beneficiaries. Subtracting those stakeholders that have been classified as having a potentially negative interest, as well as those stakeholders that belong in the private sector (with the exception of Guesthouses) (see Table 3), we are left with the following stakeholders: Guesthouses, Local Action Group (GAL), Local Councils, Mayors, NGOs, Salvamont, Schools, and Universities. Of these, GAL, Salvamont, Schools, and Universities cannot be understood as beneficiaries. This leaves Guesthouses, Local Councils, Mayors, and NGOs, were the first three are directly targeted

by AER and by extension also CNPA, in one way or another. Regarding the category NGOs, as it was not made clear what it refers to it becomes difficult to be very specific.^{26/}

In conclusion, the lack of: (1) a clear understanding of the idea that some stakeholders, understood as beneficiaries of the Project, should be targeted specifically, and (2) clear agreement as to whom these stakeholders are (within this component as well as within the Project as a whole), presents some problems for interpreting the results of the stakeholder analysis.

Identification of stakeholders. There are two issues to be concerned with: (1) the stakeholders that were not included in the first and broad list, and (2) the stakeholders that were excluded from the actual stakeholder analysis. In the case of the first list, no guidance was given as to whom or how many should be mentioned. For the second smaller list there was a clear guidance in terms of number of stakeholders to be included (it follows that all stakeholders should be understood as listed along a continuum where only some could be included). The former list did not include members of one or both of the two Councils attached to the CNP, and Norway Grants, and whether Speleological Foundation Bucovina is included remains unclear as the category “NGOs” is not detailed. The latter list excluded members of one or both of the two Councils, together with several stakeholders at various levels in the public sector, some private sector stakeholders, and some civil society stakeholders. The unfortunate use of the broad category “NGOs” complicates the analysis substantially. But even so, while there are some NGOs listed they represent very special and limited interests and concerns, and it follows that civil society is hardly represented among the stakeholders that CNPA identifies as important.

Categorization of stakeholders. This issue concerns cases of stakeholders that were located in the public sector, and where it probably would be more correct to locate them in, respectively, private sector and civil society. This is not a mundane issue. In which societal sector a stakeholder is located contributes to determining its roles and allegiances versus other stakeholders, and more indirectly, its position as regards interests and influence.

6.2.2 Interest and influence

Interest. Among the stakeholders that are assessed as having no interest in CNP are the local farmers. This category includes the farmers that lost access to several natural resources upon the establishment of the Park. Given this I find it strange that they would have no interests in the Park, whether directly in relation to CNPA or channeled via their respective *communes* (the former is less likely as they do not have their own lobby group, for example, in the form of an NGO). This position on the part of the CNPA must be understood on the basis of the primary allegiance that the Park has to macro-level public sector stakeholders. Regarding the stakeholders that are assessed as having real or potential negative interests the CNPA should target these stakeholders directly and work with them. When it comes to stakeholders that are members of the two CNP Councils it is noteworthy to observe that some are assessed as having no interest, while only a few are listed as having an interest. Among those listed as having an interest, it is not clear why this includes the Local Action Group (GAL), especially given that its business model and activities are so little advanced. Finally, the broad and undefined stakeholder category of “NGOs” makes it difficult to conclude with much detail

^{26/} Given the CNPAs record of activities, as I was able to observe it, good candidates for membership would be the Association for Ecotourism in Tara Dornelor (AETD) and Association for Ecotourism in Romania (AER). This, given the role of AER in relation to the CNP, is one reason why it is difficult to conclude clearly with regard to this category.

concerning the position of civil society as regards interest in the CNP. Two stakeholders that presumably are included in this category, namely AER and AETD, should, because of their very close and intimate collaboration with the CNPA, have been listed separately.

Influence. Some of the arguments presented for the variable interest apply also here. The Local Councils and the Mayors, both stakeholders that are members of the Consultative Council, have little or no influence on the CNP. This makes sense given the primary macro-level allegiance of the CNPA. At the same time it means that civil society stakeholders, whether organized or unorganized, and including farmers and people that collect berries, herbs, and mushrooms, can probably not count on the *communes* to represent them vis-à-vis the Park. The problem with stating very clearly with regard to civil society enters here as well, because of the un-specified category of “NGOs”. However, it is clear that the AER stands out also here. It should have been listed separately, and more correctly have been identified as having a crucial influence on the CNPA.

Interest versus influence. Following from the discussion above, the position of some of the members of the two Councils are noteworthy. While it is not to be expected that these members all should have an influence on the CNP, it would seem natural that they all had an interest in CNP. Furthermore, a couple of Council members are identified as having no interest while at the same time having significant influence – these stakeholders should be targeted specifically by the CNPA. The few stakeholders that are identified as having both high interest and high influence are located outside of Tara Dornelor. While this is understandable given the rationale for CNP’s existence, it is striking that no locally (or even regionally) based stakeholders are identified as having both high interest and high influence. Given its strong informal influence on the CNPA, it would seem correct to place the AER here. Finally, in order for CNP to reflect the fact of its location in Tara Dornelor better, and the views of the many local stakeholders, it would seem to be correct to accord broad-based local civil society stakeholders an increased influence on the Park’s management.

6.3 Management considerations

This section addresses some possible implications of the results of the stakeholder analysis, and the concomitant participant observation, for the CNP and the way it manages its business.

6.3.1 General

Some basic or fundamental consideration and comments on CNP and CNPA:

1. *CNP as a reform activity.* Stakeholder analysis is usually performed in connection with development projects or other activities, where the latter is often referred to as “reform”, that is, an activity that aims to change some fundamental aspects of how a public sector institution or agency performs or implements its mission and reaches its goals (including possible revision of what that mission or those goals is). The CNP is not a project, but can be understood as a reform activity. This would entail how relevant stakeholders engage with and are involved in managing the Park. This means that the reform activity is understood not as the actual establishment of the Park but as the ongoing process of managing it. In other words, reform would be understood as an institutionalized process. One implication or option with this understanding of a reform approach to management could be to search for an optimal management arrangement that accorded more involvement of local civil society in a way

that marries the need for nature protection with the need to create local employment opportunities.

2. *Timing of stakeholder analysis.* This is the first stakeholder analysis to be done for this Park (and likely for any Park in Romania). To be optimally useful, this tool should have been implemented immediately upon establishment of the Park, and repeated at regular intervals.
3. *Conflict versus consensus.* The CNPA's approach to management is one of consensus and not conflict. This is clearly the more optimal and successful management model.^{27/}
4. *Parks versus people.* An early approach to management of protected areas, especially as found in Southern Africa, was to assume that the local people were responsible for environmental damages and destruction. Accordingly, it became necessary to remove people from protected areas (if they resided there), and for the rest put massive resources into preventing them from entering. This approach was increasingly criticized and challenged, hence the label "Parks versus people". In CNP this is partly avoided and addressed through establishing a tiered system of zones with differential rights of access and use, including two core zones where no or very little activity is allowed and a buffer zone where some activities are allowed. This system notwithstanding, annually there are issues and heated debates involving local people that engage in illegal activities inside the Park, among them picking berries (including using special tools), herbs (specifically rhododendron flowers) and mushrooms. It would seem that the CNP formally is located closer to the "Park" than to the "people" side of this dichotomy. At the same time CNPA understand the local situation very well, but often their hands are tied, both given the legal regimes that dictates management, and the Scientific Council that has a very restrictive approach to managing the Park.
5. *Local people and the CNP.* Available literature on CNP (e.g., Min. of Transports, Constructors and Tourism 2007, National Forest Administration 2005) focus on environmental protection, biodiversity conservation, wildlife preservation, etc. This is natural given the rationale for establishing the Park. At the same time it is noticeable how there are no references to the mode in which the Park was established, the trauma implanted on many local people because of both lost access to the resources in the Park and to the way in which it happened. The largest and still far from resolved – and accordingly very contentious – issue concerns compensation to farmers for lost access to, specifically timber resources, made further complicated and unacceptable because of the way in which it is tied in with the zones the Park is divided into.^{28/} The abandoned mine is understood as a problem, and rightly so. That so-called "uncontrolled shepherding" is also seen as a problem makes sense when viewed from within the same rationale, while local people strive hard to understand this.
6. *Management: purpose and characteristics.* Management of CNP is perhaps less an issue management as in following and implementing laws and regulations, than an issue of strategic management in a contested space. In other words, this is the difference between blueprint management and process management. In the latter, management and strategic considerations/communication goes hand in hand. As far as can be judged, CNPA is becoming proficient in process management.

^{27/} According to some informants, CNP is set apart from other protected areas in Romania, where a higher occurrence of conflicts are found, with increased difficulties in management as a result.

^{28/} Farmers who lost access to forestry resources in the core zone are satisfied with the compensation they have received, that is, individual owners are satisfied; not collective owners. Owners in the buffer zones are not satisfied.

7. *Staffing profile and human capacities.* One clear implication of the stakeholder survey is that it would be important to invest more resources in outreach to stakeholders. Some are more important to address than others, including those that may have potentially negative interests as well as civil society in general. It seems clear that CNPA does not have the correct staffing profile to address such outreach activities. Among the present staff there are none with specific expertise and training in outreach. Furthermore, the pros and cons of using local staff should be problematized (apart from the Director all staff members are from the Tara Dornelor region) – on the one hand they are locals and know the context and history well, on the other hand they may not be able to be objective in difficult situations. These problems, together with other issues like a narrow mission statement and lack of financial resources, are external to CNPA, and reside above all with Ministry of Environment and Forests, and National Forest Administration.

6.3.2 The Consultative and Scientific Councils

The two Councils are relevant in the context of a stakeholder analysis, partly because several of the members are separately identified by CNPA as important stakeholders, and partly because these Council in their own right are important stakeholders.

The Consultative Council. This purpose of this body is presumably to engage and involve a broad spectrum of the Park's stakeholders in the management of the Park. The role of bodies like this is essential in a democratic governance structure. They represent a vital and often only link between the organization in question and the surrounding society. In this way they can perform essential functions related to governance and transparency. If provided enough and relevant powers of decision-making, such consultative bodies can function as important arenas for discussion between stakeholders about key issues in the management (meaning overarching and policy-related issues and not day-to-day management issues). It is not clear to what extent this is the case with the Consultative Council. It seems, however, that it is not especially active and does not play an important role in the management of the Park. This may be owing to several factors, among them: (1) Low frequency of meetings (two times per year), (2) Members are not especially interested, (3) Too many members with too many conflicting agendas, (4) Not enough will and emphasis on building bridges and agreements between members, and (5) A charter or terms of reference that may not provide a role for the Council that is understood as meaningful or relevant by members. The relatively speaking small representation from civil society is noteworthy. Of the NGOs that are members, only one was identified by CNPA as an important NGO, and I am doubtful as to whether this NGO actually was considered for the stakeholder analysis. Furthermore, several of the members score low on influence or interest, or both, and especially the low score on interest seems somewhat strange.

The Scientific Council. The role of this body is to uphold the state's rationale for establishing the Park, that is, support the CNPA in its work to protect the environment in the Park. In this, this Council can be understood to represent – in practice, function as the extended arm of – the two key stakeholders, namely the Ministry of Environment and Forests and the National Forest Administration. The Council meets twice a year. In comparison with the Consultative Council it has a small membership and represents an agenda that is focused, internally consistent and clear. These factors, together with factors detailed for the Consultative Council, would seem to contribute to creating a situation where the Scientific Council in practice, if not according to the constitution, has a stronger influence on the management of CNP in regards of overarching policy issues in comparison with the Consulta-

tive Council. The important informal role that the Scientific Council member AER has in relation to CNPA – partly within the context of the Project – would seem to add to this. Is the relatively more important role of the Scientific Council deliberate? Has the Consultative Council over time fallen behind in activity and influence? Or maybe the Consultative Council was not very active from the beginning? Could it be that its creation was understood to be more of a conditionality than a necessity? These are questions that I am not able to answer, given the data and insight at hand. Finally, some stakeholders are members of both Councils. These stakeholders may have a higher possibility to present their views, and accordingly to have them adopted and realized. If so, and from the point of view of democratic governance, is this correct? Given the much broader representation of stakeholders in the Consultative Council, would it be correct that it was as important as the Scientific Council?

General arguments. The CNPA is listed as a member of the Consultative Council, while two CNPA staff members are listed as members of the Scientific Council. Along with membership come rights to speak and to vote. These Councils are advisory and decision-making bodies to the CNPA, and this practice is accordingly highly unorthodox and not an acceptable democratic practice. The correct and only acceptable role for CNPA in relation to the two Councils is to function as a Secretariat, including, *inter alia*, preparing meetings, chairing meetings and preparing and distributing minutes. The two Councils can meet more often than twice yearly, but as CNPA has to pay members for participating out of their regular budget, this effectively limits the frequency of Council meetings. An effective functioning of the Consultative Council is limited by the fact that all decisions have to be reviewed and clear with the Scientific Council. That is, the Scientific Council is the more important one. There is talk about reviewing and revising the CNP's management set-up, including in particular the relation between the two Councils, and transferring some tasks from the Scientific Council to the Consultative Council. This would be a welcome change.

6.3.3 Relations with the stakeholders

In the following are some more specific comments on CNPA's relationships with its stakeholders:

1. *Understanding of stakeholders.* The CNPA does not have a well developed view on the differences between stakeholders. This applies, in particular, to stakeholders in civil society. That is, how differences in terms of location in societal sector, and of interest and influence in relation to CNPA determines its degrees of freedom and actions, including how these variables represents both constraints and incentives for action and involvement. Many stakeholders in public sector, but especially in civil society, are understood as entities that have to be dealt with, and kept at bay, so to speak. Notions that stakeholders can be utilized and can be allies seem to be lacking. The general argument is that a better understanding of where stakeholders come from can translate into differential strategies for engaging with them.
2. *Stakeholders as beneficiaries.* Understanding that some stakeholders should be recognized as beneficiaries does not seem to exist for CNPA. One explanation for this is perhaps that CNPA considers this to be a difficult balancing act, and is afraid to take sides? But the fact is that CNPA does take sides, in fact, it is bound by law to represent the state, including especially the Ministry of Environment and Forests and the National Forest Administration.^{29/} The

^{29/} Responsibility for CNP was transferred from Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development to Ministry of Environment and Forests in 2010.

position of the Scientific Council, as compared with that of the Consultative Council, would seem to underline and support this. For example, the Scientific Council is responsible for the local interpretation of macro-level laws and regulation that prevents local peoples from engaging in the traditional tasks of gathering berries, herbs and mushrooms.

3. *The role of Association for Ecotourism in Romania.* The EAR seems to have developed a close working relationship with CNPA. This began in connection with AER's appointment to become a member of the Scientific Council, and has deepened **and** through AER's – as well as CNPA's – involvement in the Project. This is in and of itself not a concern. At the same time, given what appears to be a close informal relationship, it does raise the question of the implication of this for the governance structure of CNP. One aspect of this is AER's role within the Scientific Council, and another aspect is the potential implications for the relative roles of the Consultative Council and the Scientific Council.

6.3.4 Călimani National Park and the Project's ecotourism component

So far the component of this Project managed by the AER has been discussed. At this point it will be useful to address briefly the role of this component in relation to the whole project.

1. *Role of the Călimani National Park.* The **CNP and the** CNPA was not involved in the project from the beginning. Instead, early on in the implementation it was agreed to involve it formally. That is, the CNPA did not become a formal partner, but it was nonetheless appointed to the Project's Management Committee.^{30/} In practical terms, CNPA has interacted **largely** with AER, and only indirectly and to a much smaller extent with the other project partners. This is perhaps one explanation for why the Project is not mentioned on CNP's website.
2. *Project target group.* The Project's target group is defined as the people that live in Tara Dornelor. This means that the people in Tara Dornelor as a whole, including the few organized civil society groups that represent a small fraction among them, are stakeholders. To what extent the term "target group" overlaps with the term "beneficiary" introduced through the present stakeholder analysis remains to be ascertained. Given the number of people in the region, and their lack of internal unity and consistency, the overlap is likely not very large.^{31/} This means that the term "target group" of necessity would have to be operationalized. In the alternative energy component, this operationalization involved targeting those that attended various demonstration activities (the so-called "Green caravans"), and that participated in training on how to build alternative energy applications. In the ecotourism component this operationalization involved citizens that participated in training and those that joined AETD.^{32/} In addition, CNPA staff has been key stakeholders. This means that the number of citizens in Tara Dornelor that were involved in the activities in this component is very small.^{33/} Moreover, a major part of the input has been devoted to the CNPA staff, which I believe cannot be said to be part of the Project's target group, and this means that the target group has been reached only indirectly through these activities. Neither of the

^{30/} The Management Committee is deserving of a more detailed discussion, but this would fall outside of the focus of the present report.

^{31/} In sociological terms, to denote this lack of internal coherency, the citizens of Tara Dornelor are best referred to as a "category" and not as a "group".

^{32/} The AETD is deserving of a more detailed discussion, but this would fall outside of the focus of the present report.

^{33/} This may also be argued for the alternative energy component. However, this lies outside of the focus of this report and will accordingly not be addressed further.

persons and groups that have been directly targeted by the project, in both components, can be identified as beneficiaries, in the sense that this term is used here.^{34/}

3. *The Management Plan.* This is the document that will provide the final guidance on how the CNP should operate in order to succeed in its mission statement. Several drafts for this document have been prepared; the most recent one in 2008. The AER has stated clearly that its interest in the present stakeholder analysis is to use it as an input into preparing the final version of the Management Plan. To contribute to the CNP's Management Plan does not seem like an obvious or even natural task for the Project.^{35/} At the same time, if CNPA and AER can argue that training activities for CNPA staff (including both office staff and rangers) together with other activities like preparing the Management Plan, serve the overall goal with the Project, these activities would be acceptable.

6.4 Broader implications

The main rationale for doing this stakeholder analysis is to contribute to understanding the complexities of managing a project of this nature. I hope that the conclusions that this little analysis has led to can prove useful when it comes to understanding the outputs, outcomes and impacts of this project. Furthermore, this analysis will prove to be useful for developing a general model for how to do stakeholder analysis that can be used in and adapted to national parks and protected areas elsewhere in Romania; and in Eastern Europe and transition countries more generally.^{36/} As a model it can be adapted to local circumstances in term of how complex and detailed it is implemented. Moreover, through its structured approach it lends itself to comparative analyses between the situation in different protected areas and national parks.

This report aims to throw light on some aspects of the management of protected areas in Romania that are perhaps less focused upon, including stakeholders' relative situation of power and influence, strategic communication, unforeseen consequences of the management of protected areas, conflict resolution, and necessary conditions for constructing protected area management models that are successful **but** on the short and the longer term. While I am critical of aspects of the way the Park is managed, I trust that it is clear that this is directed less at the CNP, including the CNPA staff, then at the overall system, including legal, bureaucratic and managerial aspects, of protected area management in Romania. The time would seem to be ripe for an evaluation of this system, based on several years of experience with how it works, and aimed at streamlining and optimizing it, in order to provide a better balance between the national and international interests, on the one hand, and the local interests, on the other hand. In particular, the growing clout of civil society in Romania, especially in the area of nature protection (including biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management), should be better reflected.

^{34/} This speaks to the issue of *penetration*. This refers to the extent to which the project and its activities have reached a broad and major number of people in the project area of Tata Dornelor. Degree of penetration is a key determining factor for project success, in terms of outcomes (on the short term) and, especially, impacts (on the longer term). These are relevant arguments in connection with the evaluation of the project.

^{35/} The AER has stated that it is using also own resources in its work with the CNP, and this is presumably the explanation to this concern. Given this, it would be useful if AER would detail which CNP-related activities they have engaged in that were funded via other sources.

^{36/} A paper that addresses these issues has been accepted for presentation at the European conference of the International Association for the Study of Commons (IASC), in Plovdiv, Bulgaria, 14-17 September 2011.

Bibliography

- ActionAid USA and ActionAid Uganda. 2004. "Rethinking participation. Questions for civil society about the limits of participation in PRSPs". Discussion paper. Washington DC, United States: ActionAid USA.
- Bianchi, Robert R. and Sherrie A. Kossoudji. 2001. Interest groups and organizations as stakeholders. *Social Development Paper* no. 35, June 2001. Washington DC, United States: World Bank.
- Călimani National Park. 2008. "Management plan." Draft. Mimeo. Vatra Dornei: Călimani National Park.
- Călimani National Park. 2010. "Management plan." Draft. Mimeo. Vatra Dornei: Călimani National Park.
- Chevalier, Jacques. 2001. "Stakeholder analysis and natural resource management". Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University.
- Crosby, Benjamin L. 1991. Stakeholder analysis. A vital tool for strategic managers. *Technical Notes*, no. 2, March 1991. Washington DC: USAID.
- IFC. n.d. *Stakeholder identification and analysis*. Washington DC: International Finance Corporation.
- MindTools. 2010a. "Power/Interest grid for stakeholder prioritization". Mimeo.
- MindTools. 2010b. "Stakeholder analysis". Mimeo.
- Ministry of Transports, Constructions and Tourism. 2007. *Guide to protected natural areas*. Bucharest: Ministry of Transports, Constructions and Tourism.
- National Forest Administration. 2005. *Romanian forests. National parks and natural parks*. Bucharest: Romanian National Forest Administration.
- OECD. 2006. *Applying strategic environmental assessment. Good practice guidance for development cooperation*. DAC Guidelines and Reference Series. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- PRCDP. 2005. *Participation manual*. Beijing, China: Poor Rural Communities Development Project and ITAD.
- Rietbergen-McCracken and Deepa Narayan. 1998. *Participation and social assessment: Tools and Techniques*. Washington DC: United States: World Bank.
- Robson, Mark. 2004. "Complementarity between formal state policy and informal norms. An institutional determinant of success in environmental policy interventions? The case of deforestation in developing countries". Paper presented at the EBDI-WIDER conference, Helsinki, Finland, 17-18 September 2004.
- Schmeer, Kammi. 1999. *Guidelines for conducting a stakeholder analysis*. Bethesda, Maryland, United States: Partnerships for Health Reform and Abt Associates Inc.
- Soesttestad, Lars T. 1998. The international workshop on Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM). Workshop report. Washington DC, United States, 10-14 May 1998. URL: www.cbnrm.net.
- Speleological Foundation Bucovina. 2008. "Ecotourism in Tara Dornelor – An instrument for sustainable development." Project proposal, submitted to Innovation Norway, December 2008. Mimeo. Suceava: Speleological Foundation Bucovina.

- UNDP Romania. 1997. "Microfinance assessment report". New York, United States: UN Capital Development Fund, Special Unit for Microfinance (SUM). www.microfinancegateway.org accessed on 27 April 2011.
- World Bank. 1995. *Participation sourcebook*. Washington DC, United States: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2003. *Social analysis sourcebook: Incorporating social dimensions into Bank-supported projects*. Washington DC, United States: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2004a. "Consultations with civil society: A sourcebook". Working document. Washington DC, United States: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2004b. Operationalizing political analysis: The expected utility stakeholder model and governance reforms. *PREM Notes*, no. 95, November 2004. Washington DC: United States: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2006. *Conducting quality impact evaluations under budget, time and data constraints*. Washington DC, United States: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2009. "Guidance note on Bank multi-stakeholder engagement". June 2009. Washington DC: World Bank.
- WWF. 2005. "Cross-cutting Tool. Stakeholder analysis". Mimeo.

Appendix 1:

Members of the Consultative Council and the Scientific Council

The two Councils consist of members in public sector, civil society and private sector, as located at local, county, regional and national levels. In the Consultative Council membership is collective, while it in the case of the Scientific Council is personal. Members are listed in the order they are given in the sources.^{37/} Some stakeholders are members of both Councils. The location (i.e., city) is included were relevant.

1.1 The Consultative Council

Allocation of members to societal sectors (following CNPA's criteria): (1) Public sector – 1-74, 76, 78, 85 (total: 77), (2) Civil society – 75, 77, 79-84 (total: 8), and (3) Private sector – nil.^{38/}

1. Academia Română, Bucharest
2. Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
3. Alexandru Ioan Cuza University, Iași
4. Ștefan cel Mare University, Suceava
5. Ministry of Environment and Forests (MMP), Bucharest
6. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR), Bucharest
7. National Forest Administration (RNP, Romsilva), Bucharest
8. Local Environment Agency (APM), Suceava
9. Local Environment Agency (APM), Târgu Mureș
10. Local Environment Agency (APM), Harghita
11. Forest Research Institute (ICAS), Câmpulung Moldovenesc
12. Forest Research Institute (ICAS), Bistrița Năsăud
13. Călimani National Park administration (NCPA), Vatra Dornei
14. County Public Forestry District (DS), Bistrița
15. County Public Forestry District (DS), Târgu Mureș
16. County Public Forestry District (DS), Suceava
17. Prefecture, Bistrița Năsăud
18. Prefecture, Suceava
19. Prefecture, Târgu Mureș
20. County Council (CC), Bistrița Năsăud
21. County Council (CC), Suceava
22. County Council (CC), Târgu Mureș
23. Environment Control Body (GNM), Bistrița Năsăud
24. Environment Control Body (GNM), Suceava
25. Environment Control Body (GNM), Târgu Mureș
26. Mountain Rescue Team (Salvamont), Bistrița
27. Mountain Rescue Team (Salvamont), Toplița-Călimani
28. Mountain Rescue Team (Salvamont), Mureș

^{37/} The information on members in the Consultative Council is taken from the CNP's Draft Management Plan from 2008, and in the case of the Scientific Council it is taken from the CNP website.

^{38/} In 2008 the Council had 77 members (Călimani National Park 2008). In 2010 the number of members is increased to 85. The increase in members is mostly because further communes and Forestry Districts (DS) are included. The following members in 2010 are not any longer members: Biological Research Institute (Iași, public sector), Origins Green (Suceava, civil society), SC Sardolemn SRL (Vatra Dornei, private sector), and CENRES (Suceava, civil society). Membership per societal sector in 2010 were: public sector: 66, civil society: 8, and private sector: 3.

29. Mountain Rescue Team (Salvamont), Suceava
30. Mountain Rescue Team (Salvamont), Vatra Dornei
31. Commune, Vatra Dornei
32. Commune, Şeuť
33. Commune, Monor
34. Commune, Mărişelu
35. Commune, Stânceni
36. Commune, Dorna Cândrenilor
37. Commune, Şaru Dornei
38. Commune, Panaci
39. Commune, Deda
40. Commune, Aluniş
41. Commune, Topliţa
42. Commune, Lunca Bradului
43. Commune, Răstoliţa
44. Commune, Josenii Bârgăului
45. Commune, Brâncoveneşti
46. Commune, Vătava
47. Commune, Poiana Stampei
48. Commune, Ideciu de Jos
49. Commune, Batoş
50. Commune, Dumitriţa
51. Commune, Prundu Bârgăului
52. Forestry District (OS), Vatra Dornei
53. Forestry District (OS), Dorna Cândrenilor
54. Forestry District (OS), Dedeanca
55. Forestry District (OS), Cerbul Carpatin
56. Forestry District (OS), Dealu Negru (A.P.P.)
57. Forestry District (OS), Răstoliţa
58. Forestry District (OS), Lunca Bradului
59. Forestry District (OS), Topliţa
60. Forestry District (OS), Tihuţa-Colibiţa R.A.
61. Forestry District (OS), Dorna (APPBD)
62. Forestry District (OS), Valea Sieului R.A.
63. Forestry District (OS), Comuna Josenii Bârgăului
64. Forestry District (OS), Vătava (Associate member)
65. Forest Control Body (ITRSV), Suceava
66. Forest Control Body (ITRSV), Braşov
67. Fauna Administration (AJVPS), Suceava
68. County Inspectorate for Education, Bistriţa Năsăud
69. County Inspectorate for Education, Suceava
70. County Inspectorate for Education, Târgu Mureş
71. Gendarmerie, Topliţa
72. Gendarmerie, Vatra Dornei
73. Police, Vatra Dornei
74. SC Transair SA, Târgu Mureş
75. Club Ecological Tourism, Vatra Dornei
76. Science Museum, Vatra Dornei
77. Agriculture Association, Vatra Dornei
78. Ministry of Regional Development and Tourism (MDRT), Bucharest
79. Tourism Association "Perpetum mobile", ?
80. Dorna EcoActiv, ?

81. Foundation Tara Dornelor, ?
82. Association for Protection of Wild Rhododendron, ?
83. Association for Bird and Nature Protection, Milvus Group, ?
84. Association for Wildlife Conservation in Călimani, ?
85. SC Min Bucovina SA – Vatra Dornei

1.2 The Scientific Council

1. Abran Peter – Regional Environment Agency (ARPM), Târgu Mureş
2. Ion Barbu – Forest Research Institute (ICAS), Câmpulung Moldovenesc
3. Katalin Barbu – Faculty of Biology, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca
4. Andrei Blumer – Association of Ecotourism Romania, Braşov
5. Ash Radu – Faculty of Forestry, Ştefan cel Mare University, Suceava
6. Chirita Viorel – Department of Geography, Ştefan cel Mare University, Suceava
7. Ditoiu Valeria – Regional Environment Agency (ARPM), Suceava
8. Carmen Gache – Faculty of Biology, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University, Iaşi
9. Olenici Nicholas – Forest Research Institute (ICAS), Câmpulung Moldovenesc
10. Alexandru Szakacs – Department of Environmental Science, Sapientia University, Cluj-Napoca
11. Catalin Tanase – Faculty of Biology, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University, Iaşi
12. Dumitru Ungureanu – Regional Environment Agency (ARPM), Sibiu
13. Mihai Zotti – National Forest Administration - Romsilva (RNP), Bucharest
14. Basarab Barlaideanu – Administration, Călimani National Park (CNPA), Vatra Dornei
15. Elena Cenusă – Administration, Călimani National Park (CNPA), Vatra Dornei

Appendix 2:

The stakeholder analysis survey forms

The following survey forms used for the stakeholder analysis are available:^{39/}

1. Timeline of key events (see Page 39)
2. Issues (see Pages 40-41)
3. Stakeholder analysis, Step 1: Identification (see Pages 42-43)
4. Stakeholder analysis, Step 2: Determine interests (see Pages 44-45)
5. Stakeholder analysis, Step 3: Determine power and influence (see Page 46)

^{39/} Two survey forms that address social network analysis were also administered in December 2010. These data were not analyzed for the present report and these forms are accordingly not included here.