

# Stakeholder and Solution partner mapping for Solotvyno and Transcarpathia (D5.1)

---

Project acronym:	<b>ImProDiReT</b>
Project full title:	<b>Improving disaster risk reduction in Transcarpathian region, Ukraine</b>
Grant agreement no.:	<b>783232</b>
Responsible:	<b>Sjirk Meijer</b>
Contributors:	<b>Edmunds Akitis, Tayisiya Kimocko, Peter Glerum</b>
Document Reference:	<b>D5.1</b>
Dissemination Level:	<b>CO</b>
Version:	<b>Final</b>
Date:	<b>10/06/18</b>

**Disclaimer:** The content of this document represents the views of the author only and is his/her sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.







## History

Version	Date	Modification reason	Modified by
0.1	16/5/2018	Initial draft	Edmunds Akitis
0.2	17/5/2018	Modification and update	Edmunds Akitis
0.3	27/05/2018	Modification and update	Sjirk Meijer
0.4	27/05/2018	Quality check	Edmunds Akitis
1.0	10/06/2018	Final reviewed deliverable	Peter Glerum



# Table of contents

---

History .....	2
Table of contents .....	3
List of figures .....	4
List of tables .....	5
List of abbreviations .....	6
Executive summary.....	7
Introduction .....	8
1 Methodology.....	9
2 Stakeholder analysis, Solotvyno case.....	10
3 Stakeholder analysis, Transcarpathia .....	16
4 Conclusions .....	21



## List of figures

---

No figures in the report



## List of tables

---

Table 1 : Stakeholders Solotvino.....	10
Table 2 : Stakeholders Transcarpathia.....	14



## List of abbreviations

---

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
ARDZ	Regional Development Agency of Transcarpathia –
BUVR	Regional Water Directorate (Tysa river)
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DG ECHO	Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Crisis management (EU)
EU	European Union
EUCPT	European Union Civil Protection Mechanism
EUAM	The European Union Advisory Mission
GIS	Geographical Information system
IGS NASU	Institute of Geological Sciences, National academy of Science of Ukraine
MFSF	Main School of Fire Service (Poland)
MoAFp	Ministry of Agriculture and Food policy
MS	Member State (of the European Union)
PJSC GIRHIMPROM	Scientific and Research Institute of Halurgy and Institute for Mining and Chemical Industry
RAN	Resilience Advisors Network
RO	Romania
SES	State Emergency Service (Ukraine)
UA	Ukraine



## Executive summary

---

With this document – Stakeholder and Solution partner mapping for Sotolvyno and Transcarpathia – the project aims to identify the main stakeholders, partners and solution partners for addressing the project goals.

This document is submitted as deliverable. But will be a living document and will be updated regularly for the whole period of the ImProDiReT project.<sup>1</sup> Stakeholder and Solution partner mapping is fundamental for the project activities as based on these mappings the key stakeholders will be chosen for the interviews, for building the dissemination strategy and meetings with the local and other key stakeholders. A number of key stakeholders (like State Emergency Service of Ukraine, regional administration, rayon and oblast) are the crucial and central actors for both the Sotolvyno and the Transcarpathia stakeholder mapping. As it has proven in the past (EU Civil Protection Mechanism missions in 2016), then the central governmental authorities are crucial and paramount for getting the right information across the different stakeholders. However, with the ImProDiReT project the general public and reach out to them plays more importance than before. We could define the two different groups of stakeholders – the population and the decision-making bodies and authorities. Risk awareness is about educating the general population and the authorities. Therefore, by addressing one group of stakeholders the other group will be kept in mind and their interests and concerns addressed. The previously conducted EU Civil Protection Teams' missions have noted the disputes among the stakeholders, the fragmented understanding of the disaster risk reduction and disaster risk management and the polarized views on the best ways or solution for addressing the Sotolvyno salt mine case. However, this project looks beyond the “salt mine case” and systematically addresses the disaster risk reduction issues at the regional level, with huge potential in making tangible differences in Ukraine to start with.

Stakeholders listed here are organized by Sotolvyno and Transcarpathia respectively. The main target groups will be chosen for the further interviews and for establishing communication and exchange of information. Both lists will be updated regularly throughout the project period

---

<sup>1</sup> The deliverable is according to the contract this version, but for project purposes at least each 6 months an updated version will be made.





## Introduction

---

Objectives of the project among other, aim to provide higher resilience to disasters of the inhabitants of the Transcarpathian region. The regional government of Transcarpathia (by trainings, workshops, change in dealing with risks and hazards) will gain a heightened knowledge of disaster risk reduction and will be able to improve its disaster risk reduction government. Therefore, the regional government of Transcarpathia is one of the major and central stakeholders that the project will work closely with

The regional government, the district governments and the municipalities (by the risk/ hazard map, prioritizing and policy development) will gain a heightened understanding of the risk, an improved risk reduction and a heightened resilience. It is important to establish communication and a form of exchange of information with them from the early start of the project. A dissemination event is to be conducted in close coordination with this target group. Responsibilities of the civil protection lies within the State Emergency Services, regional and district bodies. The regional civil protection response organisation (by risk maps, basis for contingency planning and capacity building.) will be better prepared for and adequate response to possible occurring disaster. Thus, they are on the list of stakeholder mapping.

At the country level, both State Emergency Service and Ministry of Agrarian Food and Policy (MoAFP), as the central institutions for the emergency situation in Solotvyno, through this project will learn and accumulate knowledge and know-how for similar like potential catastrophes and will be among the key and paramount solution partners for the solution finding.

EUCPT missions noticed remarkable drawbacks in functionality and disagreements among the main Ukrainian stakeholders within the Ukrainian civil protection system. Coordination and information sharing horizontally was lacking and therefore disaster risk management system is fragmented. Knowledge and expertise is needed to ensure the proper risk management process. A clear link between risk assessment, monitoring, prevention and mitigation, preparedness and response, evaluation etc.) must be introduced, explained and discussed with the Ukrainian colleagues. In order achieving this, the close collaboration with the State Emergency Services and local and district authorities will be established.

Taking into consideration that the solution of the problem on the mitigation and ecological rehabilitation of the territory lies within the mandate of not only the MoAFP of Ukraine but also of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, State Emergency Service and others, in 2015 the representatives of the above mentioned institutions held a series of consultations with a view to jointly coordinate and approve further actions. The MoAFP of Ukraine by its Order dated from 29.12.2015 No 499 established a Working group on the issue of mining influence territory ecological rehabilitation carried out by the state enterprise "Solotvynskiyi



solerudnyk” consisting of the representatives of the above-mentioned Ministries, local authorities and institutions. During the project the project team will hold meetings and regular information exchange with the MoAFP and the working group. Also, with the regional administration and local (in Solotvyno) authorities.



## 1 Methodology

The stakeholder and solution partner analyses is based on assembling the expert knowledge of the project partners. They have access to previous reports on the subject in Transcarpathia and Solotvyno.

The stakeholders and solution partners are assembled in two databases, the Solotvyno case and The region of Transcarpathia.

For every key stakeholder their interest in the project is assessed. This is done on five parameters:

1. **level of Governance:** International, European Union, national, regional, local and municipality;
2. **role / responsibilities:** what responsibility and role does the stakeholder has in respect to the project focus area? e.g. decision-maker, supplier, consumer, financier or beneficiary;
3. **Interest:** What is the stakeholder's interest in the project? What is the long-term benefit for the stakeholder?
4. **position:** the position of the stakeholder towards the project objective: e.g. in favour, against, ambiguous towards the change(s) required to meet the development goal
5. **influence:** In what way can the stakeholder influence the project, what is their power and mandate? The degree of influence the stakeholder has in the project context: High; Medium; Low.

## 2 Stakeholder analysis, Solotvyno case

Which key stakeholders or stakeholder groups are identified in the project context? Stakeholders are those parties influenced by the project and those that can influence the project directly or indirectly.

Stakeholder	Level of Governance <sup>1)</sup> (GL/CL)	Role <sup>2)</sup>	Interest <sup>3)</sup>	Position <sup>4)</sup>	Influence <sup>5)</sup>
1. Regional Development Agency of Transcarpathia – ARDZ	Regional	Implementer Influencer	Fulfil the organisation's mission	In favour	Medium
2. Institute of Geological Sciences, National academy of Science of Ukraine – IGS NASU	National	Implementer Advisor to Ministries and governors	To fulfil the mandate – estimate geo hazards	In favour	Medium
3. DG ECHO – Project officer	EU	Financer	Successful DRR project Visibility and validity	In favour	Low
4. DG ECHO – Technical Assistant, Ukraine Field Office	EU	Influencer Networker	Visibility	In favour	High to EU delegatio



This project is funded by the European Union Civil Protection, under grant agreement No 783232



					n
5. Member State Embassies – MS	EU	Influencer Networker Advocacy	Visibility	In favour	High
6. Mining companies – one single company and it has almost no staff– state owned – legally there are two legal entities	Local	Adopter Disturb the process	Sustained economic benefits CSR	Neutral (may be against if it affects economic activity)	High
7. Tourist industry (house owners, tour operators etc. it is more than 250 private entrepreneurs)	Local	Consumers Troublemakers	Keep the region attractive for tourism Not be kicked out of the mines	Neutral (may be against if it affects economic activity)	Medium
8. State Emergency Services (SES)	National	Implementer Decision-maker Advocacy and convening power	Visibility Improving disaster risk management and response capacity Validation for political and	In favour	High



			financial capital		
9. Regional Water Directorate (BUVR Tysa river)	Regional	Decision-maker Influencer Implementer Responsible for land use around the river – Have GIS data	Improved water quality – linkages not clear	Ambiguous Could be competitors – if we do it right they might support project	Higher than Medium
10. Allergical Hospital – to help with the Asthma	Local	Implementer	Has clearly economic interest and influence	In favour and has interest	Medium
11. Village council	Local	Decision-maker, Influencer, Implementer, Consumer	To stabilise the situation in the village, risk reduction. Better social and economical	in favour (ambiguous) depend on how they will respond to our input	Medium / High



			situation in the village		
12. District administration	Local	Decision-maker, Influencer, Implementer, Consumer	Strengthening political influence, stabilisation situation in the region.	In favour	Medium / High
13. Department of ecology and natural resources of Transcarpathian regional Administration	Regional	Decision-maker, Influencer, Implementer	Processing the ecological issues, fulfilling own mission	in favour	Medium
14. Neighbouring UA village councils	Local	Influencer, Implementer, Consumer	To stabilise the situation in the village, risk reduction. Better social and economic situation in the	in favour (ambiguous) depend on how they will respond to our input	Low



			village		
15. Sighetu Marmatiei municipality, RO.	Regional/International				
16. State ecological inspection in Transcarpathian region	Regional	Decision-maker, controller, Implementer	Processing the ecological issues, fulfilling own mission	in favour	Medium
17. Ukrainian allergic hospital	National	Consumer	Is interested in stabilizing the situation in the village	in favour	Low
18. Institute of nuclear Research	National	Consumer	Renewal of unique scientific work	in favour	Low
19. Ministry of Defence + State reserve	National	Consumer, Decision-maker, Beneficiary	In the mines was situated the biggest strategic reserves of the gas oil and masout in the west Ukraine	netral to in favour	Medium





20. The European Union Advisory Mission (EUAM) Ukraine	National	Decision-maker, Networker, Coaching on civil security	to assist the Ukrainian authorities towards a sustainable reform of the civilian security sector through strategic advice and practical support for specific reform measures based on EU standards and international principles of good governance	in favour	Medium up to higher
21. ICO “Environment–People–Law”	National	Decision-maker, Networker, Awareness campaign	–defend environmental rights of people on the nationwide and	in favour	High



			regional levels –do active awareness raising among the population		
22.Ukraine State Ecological Inspectorate	National	Decision-maker	–ecological policy –monitoring ecological state –adaptation of legislation	in favour	Medium
23. PJSC “Girhimprom”	National	Implementation	Has agreements with authorities in doing research projects within the Solotvyno mine area.	Ambiguous, ambitious	High
24. State Enterprise “Production board of Solotvino salt mine 18limination”	National	Implementation	Direct interest	Local stakeholder	Medium



25. Schools - minority schools and regular schools	National	Implementation; Information dissemination Influencer	In-direct interest	Local stakeholder	Medium
26. Churches	National	Influencer	Direct interest	Local	Medium



### 3 Stakeholder analysis, Transcarpathia

Which key stakeholders or stakeholder groups are identified in the project context? Stakeholders are those parties influenced by the project and those that can influence the project directly or indirectly.

Stakeholder	Level of Governance <sup>1)</sup> (GL/CL)	Role <sup>2)</sup>	Interest <sup>3)</sup>	Position <sup>4)</sup>	Influence <sup>5)</sup>
1. Regional Development Agency of Transcarpathia – ARDZ	Regional	Implementer Influencer	Fulfil the organisation's mission	In favour	Medium
2. Institute of Geological Sciences, National academy of Science of Ukraine – IGS NASU	National	Implementer Advisor to Ministries and governors	To fulfil the mandate – estimate geo hazards	In favour	Medium
3. DG ECHO – Project officer	EU	Financer	Successful DRR project Visibility and validity	In favour	Low
4. DG ECHO – TA Ukraine Field Office	EU	Influencer Networker	Visibility	In favour	High to EU delegation



5. Member State Embassies – MS	EU	Influencer Networker Advocacy	Visibility	In favour	High
6. Tourist industry (house owners, tour operators etc. it is more than 250 private entrepreneurs)	Local	Consumers Troublemakers	Keep the region attractive for tourism  Not be kicked out of the mines	Neutral (may be against if it affects economic activity)	Medium
7. State Emergency Services	National	Implementer Decision-maker Advocacy and convening power	Visibility  Improving disaster risk management and response capacity  Validation for political and financial capital	In favour	High



8. Village councils	Local	Decision-maker, Influencer, Implementer, Consumer	To stabilise the situation in the village, risk reduction. better social and economic situation in the village	in favour (ambiguous) depend on how they will respond to our input	Medium / High
9. District administration	Local	Decision-maker, Influencer, Implementer, Consumer	Strengthening political influence, stabilisation situation in the region.	in favour	Medium / High
10. Department of ecology and natural resources of Transcarpathian regional Administration	Regional	Decision-maker, Influencer, Implementer	Processing the ecological issues, fulfilling own mission	in favour	Medium
11. Neighbouring UA village councils	Local	Influencer, Implementer, Consumer	To stabilise the situation in the village, risk reduction. better	in favour (ambiguous) depend on how	Low



			social and economical situation in the village	they will respond to our input	
12.State ecological inspection in Transcarpathian region	Regional	Decision-maker, controller, Implementer	Processing the ecological issues, fulfilling own mission	in favour	Medium
13.Institute of nuclear Research	National	Consumer	Renewal of unique scientific work	in favour	Low
14. Ministry of Defence + State reserve	National	Consumer, Decision-maker, Beneficiary	In the mines was situated the biggest strategic reserves of the gas oil in the west Ukraine	neutral to in favour	Medium
15.The European Union Advisory Mission (EUAM) Ukraine	National	Decision-maker, Networker, Coaching on civil security	to assist the Ukrainian authorities towards a	in favour	Medium up to higher



			sustainable reform of the civilian security sector through strategic advice and practical support for specific reform measures based on EU standards and international principles of good governance		
16. ICO "Environment-People-Law"	National	Decision-maker, Networker, Awareness campaign	-defend environmental rights of people on the nationwide and regional levels  -do active awareness raising among the population	in favour	High





17.Ukraine State Ecological Inspectorate	National	Decision-maker	-ecological policy -monitoring ecological state -adaptation of legislation	in favour	Medium
--	----------	----------------	--	-----------	--------

## 4 Conclusions

Most of the stakeholders have been identified and both lists will grow throughout the project. The central and major authorities have been identified and this deliverable will of good use for other and relevant Working Packages of the Project.

The foreseen interviews will provide solid grounds for the establishment of dissemination and communication strategies, reach out to the general public and will contribute to the related Working Packages of the project.

It will be important to consider the polarized interest of the different authorities, including economic interest and actual performance in addressing the complexity of the issue.

During the past EU Civil Protection Mechanism missions, it was noted that individual approach is the preferred method of the Ukrainian authorities, therefore, organizing stakeholder meetings, where multiple stakeholders are present, should be avoided.

The interviews should be organized respectively to the Sotvyno and Transcarpathia cases. Number of stakeholders are key partners for both cases, therefore the relevant activities and questionnaires must be organized in a smart and diligent way to save resources and use the time spent with the stakeholders, wisely.

