

Proposal for Joint Fact Finding (JFF) Games: Off-Shore Wind Farm

Dong-Young Kim
March 1, 2004

Game I: Formation of Culture of Long-Term Collaboration using JFF

- **Purpose of the game**
 - Introduce the concept of JFF to participants, assuming there has been no case of collaboration
 - Overcome wrong assumptions about JFF among participants
 - Produce Mission statement (Goal (concrete, obtainable objectives), Scoping, choosing experts, Time and Cost of research)

- **Similar with Knowledge producer and consumer game at AGS meeting.**

- **Potential Lessons**
 - Usefulness of having JFF at earlier stage
 - Generating and maintaining low-stress setting by facilitation
 - Contribution of Non-expert knowledge or input in scoping
 - Thinking ahead about possible roadblocks (e.g. generation of adversarial science, scientific uncertainties)
 - Multi-users own the result of assessment by participating in designing assessment. (Scoping for assessment is determined by multi stakeholders rather than unitary decision maker or developer, or an expert)
 - Jointly produced maximum assessment with maximum amount of financial resources, if any.

- **Built-In Situation**
 - Pre-application stage but rumor about off-shore wind farm going around.
 - Not that polarized and organized conflict yet
 - Initial stakeholder assessment and issue assessment conducted
 - Citizen-based initiative
 - Distribution of stakeholders (including decision-makers and general public) at earlier stage
 - PRO: environmental and economic rationale
 - CON: Scientific uncertainty and Visual impact on historical, esthetic values.
 - Undecided: want to have more information to make a informed decision and balanced trade-off.

PRO	Undecided	CON
10 %	80%	10%

- Wrong assumptions among participants
 - There should be one model or assessment

- Non-experts cannot contribute to assessment
 - More scoping means more time and money, so not efficient.
 - Experts have their own agendas or they are purely neutral
 - Non-officials decision-making process is weak
 - Models cannot be relied upon.
 - Jointly designated experts are in conflict when they work together anyway.

- **Participants**
 - Developer (PRO)
 - Environmental group (PRO)
 - Residential representative (Undecided)
 - Federal permitting organization
 - State government?
 - Department of Energy
 - Facilitator
 - Association of recreational fishing (CON)
 - Residential representative (CON)
 - Experts without association with any party
 - Expert from PRO
 - Expert from CON

- **Issues to Discuss**
 - Goal of JFF
 - Scoping of research (stakeholders preference for their decision-making)
 - Time frame of the research with cost implication
 - Choosing joint expert team

- **Pro for this game**
 - Manageable within two hours
 - Introducing Joint-Fact Finding concept
 - Less complex with manageable data

- **Con**
 - difficult to show participants the positive effect of JFF
 - Limited role of experts and scientists
 - Limited learning about off-shore wind farm
 - No simulation on integrated assessment

Game II: Balancing Science and Politics using the results of JFF

- **Purpose of the game**
 - Generate agreement on the finding
 - Use of findings in Consensus Building
 - Get the systematic or comprehensive view on the issue
- **Similar with Young's Mexico City game**
- **Potential lessons**
 - How to incorporate scientific result into decision-making
 - Dealing with scientific uncertainties and independent studies from outside
 - What will happen stakeholders get the report from experts
 - The more that people affected by a decision are included in the design and implementation of the modeling process, the greater the chance they will value and use the information and tools in decision making.
 - Lessons for stakeholders as well as scientists or experts
 - PRO and CON can change their preferences after they get jointly produced scientific or expert assessment?
- **Built-in Situation**
 - There come more polarized and organized distribution among stakeholders on the issue

Distribution of stakeholders (including decision-makers and general public) at interim stage

PRO	Undecided	CON
25 %	50%	25%

- Some stakeholders don't like the result because the result is disadvantage to their interest and feel like using independent study
- A few stakeholders are not satisfied because there is no information that they wanted...
- Undecided stakeholders are most important factors who can change their opinion based on the information and make trade-off.
- **Debriefing**
 - Right after game, use questionnaires about
 - Existence of necessary data in the assessment (informed decision-making or not)
 - The use of those data in their consensus building
 - Process gives confidence on what experts find?
- **Pro for this game**
 - Increased scientists role to simulate their relationship in decision making process
 - More substantive on specific issue
- **Con for this game**
 - Too complicated and long-time development of game