



Workshop Validation Session Responses

29 April 2005

The Royal Statistical Society, 12 Errol Street, London, EC1Y 8XL

Summarised below are the responses to the four main questions raised at the workshop. Further details of the responses are then given.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

1. Can the impact beyond the urban development scale be grouped within a single category “beyond urban development”?

There were differing opinions on the issue of grouping. Some felt that it was appropriate to group impacts occurring at scales greater than “urban development”. However others felt the scales above urban development should not be grouped and that there may be more appropriate levels especially the inclusion of a level between national and international (e.g. supra-national, EU) highlighting the difference between policy scales and impact scales. It was pointed out that a clear definition of each spatial scale and other terms would be useful.

2. Are there any stakeholders omitted and to what extent can they be grouped?

Some further stakeholders were suggested (wildlife trusts, health sector, R&D, young people, future generations, interest groups). It was also suggested that identifying stakeholders by their roles rather than their discipline provides more flexibility.

There were worries that grouping stakeholders may reduce the usefulness of the map and that “local government” and “local community” could be unpacked. However suggestions for grouping were made by all breakout groups. Suggested grouping reflected the following structure:

- Those involved in policy/regulation
- Those involved in delivery (supply and demand side)
- Those impacted

3. What sustainability issues should be added or omitted?

Some editing of the issues list at the material, building and urban developments level was suggested.

There was agreement that the issues identified as “organisational” can be placed within the standard categories of “environmental”, “economic” and “social”. However a suggestion was made that the issues are the priority and categories should evolve from these.

It was commented that the map should provide an opportunity for highlighting benefits and not only impacts although it was recognised that the costs and benefits may not be felt by the same groups.

4. What is the best option for visual mapping?

There was consensus that option one was the favoured approach as it allowed connections to be viewed.

Given the complexity of the map it was felt that multiple visual devices should be employed including: different line thickness, different colours, different shapes and icons. The accessibility issues linked to visualisation were highlighted such as for users with colour blindness.

It was suggested that the map could be used for benchmarking and for identifying relevant tools.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sue-MoT would like to thank all those who attended the workshop for their valuable insights and contributions.

DETAILS OF RESPONSES

QUESTION 1

Can the impact beyond the urban development scale be grouped within a single category “beyond urban development”?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
<p>Suggestion that at a regulatory point of view adopted- something between national and international</p> <p>What do we mean by urban or city?</p> <p>Do we mean local boundary?</p> <p>We need a clear definition</p>	<p>Suggestion to have the following levels:</p> <p>Local Regional National EU or Supernational Global</p> <p>“Local” includes boroughs and districts and the grouping of urban development and city level.</p> <p>Levels should be matched to impacts.</p>	<p>There are a range of impacts greater than urban. These could be grouped.</p> <p>Grouping will lead to better understanding of them.</p> <p>Not necessarily a demand to analyse impacts between such categories.</p>	<p>Scales depend on the type of space: i.e. political, physical with impacts moving upwards through scales and policy moving downwards through the scale.</p> <p>There is also a cross influence between policy and the levels at which impacts are recorded. This is reflected in the measurement frameworks</p> <p>Keep scale distinctions at least between global and national</p> <p>Probably keep regional as well May need flexibility at region/nation level</p> <p>Are scales right for all 3 sustainability dimensions? Probably</p>

QUESTION 2

Are there any stakeholders omitted and what extent can they be grouped?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
<p>Health care sector</p> <p>Break local government into local authority function (e.g. local health, planning, etc)</p> <p>Wildlife trust</p> <p>More definition (glossary)</p> <p>Would aggregating the stakeholders reduce the usefulness of the map</p> <p>Get full list and then could aggregated later</p>	<p>Stakeholders should go through a front-end to identify issue/problem then enter the map.</p> <p>Should get same (equal) information from the map for all stakeholders</p> <p>Add: researchers / academics NGOs Health care</p> <p>Alter: Disaggregate the local authority level</p> <p>Grouping options: 1) "personal" "community" etc</p> <p>2) "Project team" "receptors / impacted" "government" "citizen"</p> <p>3) "supply" "demand"</p>	<p>Add: Young people Future generations</p> <p>Grouping Options: 1) Those Regulating Those Involved Those Impacted</p> <p>2) Global Community Personal</p> <p>3) Supply Demand</p>	<p>Suggest use of role based terms rather than discipline</p> <p>List of roles will never be complete</p> <p>Single person may have multiple roles</p> <p>Add terms like scientist, funder</p> <p>What does producer mean?</p> <p>Identify community better</p> <p>Add different interest groups</p> <p>Need better identification of public</p> <p>Grouping Options: 1) Allow for arbitrary grouping. Tree hierarchy is too rigid</p> <p>2) Primary stakeholder Secondary stakeholder Tertiary stakeholder</p> <p>3) 'Importance' role</p>

QUESTION 3

What sustainability issues should be added or omitted?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
<p>Need to consider benefits as well as cost.</p> <p>The cost and benefits might impact on totally different areas and in different ways</p> <p>Could the organisational impacts (issues) be put under the 3 main headings? The 3 categories (dimensions) might be Ok.</p>	<p>Show above urban issues – but not grouped (see Q1)</p> <p>Users should be able to update issues</p> <p>Organisational heading confuses the scale and the component issues should be grouped under the social heading.</p> <p>Map to show benefits as well as impacts</p>	<p>Material level: Waste Extraction Transport Prefab</p> <p>Building: Recyclability Transport Remove embodied energy</p> <p>Urban development level: Wind</p>	<p>Complex issue</p> <p>Let the issue determine the category</p> <p>Do not force into rigid categories</p>

QUESTION 4

What is the best option for visual mapping?

Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
<p>If it is to be used as an educational tool for industry and outsiders it is useful to see the linkages and processes.</p> <p>A general preference for concept one.</p>	<p>The purpose of the map is to categorise issues and for visualising the complexity of connections and scope.</p> <p>Lots of people can't read roadmaps – a visual picture is a better approach.</p> <p>Use colour coding concepts for a simplified approach. Convey information by way of different sizes (link to impact size). Use symbols.</p> <p>Benchmarking for comparison</p> <p>How do we arrive at a “score” allowing comparisons for decisions.</p> <p>Fact findings and beacons for follow-up. Use the map to evaluate effect of change (e.g. cultural)</p> <p>Will Guidance be offered. Recommend tools to be used at each level.</p> <p>Link the map to GIS and other mapping approaches.</p>	<p>Option one This option is more organic though stakeholders are insufficiently represented.</p> <p>Also how is feedback represented?</p> <p>What problem are we trying to solve?</p> <p>Option two Looks like a Rubic cube – off putting.</p> <p>What happens to selections on the back row? Corners have less connectivity.</p>	<p>Use option 1</p> <p>Call it graph approach (not tree)</p> <p>Consider hybridising options one and two.</p> <p>Use shape as well as colour</p> <p>Add thickness to lines/arrows to show relative value</p> <p>Provide layers for thematic switching</p> <p>Develop icons</p> <p>Software: CURRENT: Using Director + Data Base LATER: Use more generic</p>

	<p>What about ecosystems?</p> <p>How will further information be added to the map? Can you edit the issues and impact information.</p> <p>Option one a better option. It flows better and relates to mind maps.</p> <p>Use a molecule/life/elemental thinking metaphor. Could an element be used as a common currency?</p> <p>The map should allow users to look at the big picture as well as the details.</p> <p>The map should not be tailored as a function of stakeholder. Remove stakeholder button.</p> <p>The map should be used in meetings to guide decisions.</p>		
--	--	--	--