

FOUR Rs

Rights, Responsibilities, Returns and Relationships

Conservation, Livelihoods and Governance Programme Tools for participatory approaches

February 2013

The Four Rs can help in clarifying the roles played by different stakeholders through identifying their **rights**, **responsibilities**, and **returns** (revenues or benefits), the balance between each of these, and the **relationships** between stakeholders.

What is it useful for?

- Analysing multi-stakeholder situations and identifying issues or potential problems, such as the imbalances of rights, responsibilities and returns, or the health of relationships between stakeholders.
- Increasing individual stakeholders/groups understanding of their rights, responsibilities and returns, and their relationships with other stakeholders.
- Provides a basis for dialogue between different stakeholders, particularly where roles need re-thinking, negotiating and developing.
- Assessing and comparing policies and regulations in terms of formal and *de facto* rights, responsibilities and returns.
- Monitoring change in rights, responsibilities, returns and relationships over a period of time, or evaluating a project in terms of its effect on the 4Rs.
- The tool may be applied at different levels, for example in a project or local initiative, at district level, or at national level.
- In the context of climate change, this tool can be used to analyse how the 4 Rs affect different people's vulnerability or resilience to the negative impacts of climate change or ability to take advantage of positive impacts.
- In the context of ecosystem services valuation this tool can be useful for understanding the different values and returns for different stakeholders and negotiating trade-offs.

Suggested steps

Allow **3 hours** for this exercise.

The 4 Rs analysis is comprised of two stages. The first is an assessment of the balance of rights, responsibilities and returns within and between stakeholders, and the second is an assessment of the status of relationships between stakeholders.

Assessment of the balance of rights, responsibilities and returns within and between stakeholders

- 1) Agree the focus of the exercise with participants (i.e. a planned project, a specific intervention, a site or protected area) and ask participants to brainstorm and list all relevant stakeholders. (See Stakeholder Analysis tool for guidance on the definition and identification of stakeholders).

- 2) Explain and agree what is understood by the terms rights, responsibilities and returns. The generic examples in Box 1 may help with this.
- 3) Either as one group, or in smaller sub-groups (depending on the number of participants or numbers of stakeholders identified), ask participants to complete a table listing all the stakeholders, and for each stakeholder identify and discuss their rights, responsibilities and returns in relation to the site or focus (e.g. policy) of concern.
 - Who has what rights to use the site/protected area/resources? (Rights)
 - Who takes what actions in terms of site/protected area/resource management? (Responsibilities)
 - Who benefits from the site/protected area/resources and in what ways? (Returns/Revenues)

Box 1: Examples of Rights, Responsibilities and Returns (Worah, 2008)

Rights

- Access to and use of resources (statutory and customary)
- Ownership of resources (statutory and customary)
- Decision-making over resource use and management (e.g. setting by-laws, enforcement/fines, zoning/exclusion, licensing/income, etc.)

Responsibilities

- Resource management (planning, monitoring, measurement, etc.)
- Implementing decisions in rules, regulations, procedures, etc.
- Abiding by rules and regulations

Returns

- Direct benefits arising from resources accessed
- Direct benefits derived from employment related to the resource/area
- Indirect benefits such as those accruing to a community from resource management agreements

For ecosystem services valuation returns can be analysed according to the different categories of ecosystem services (provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural).

- 4) Ask participants to analyse the current situation, discussing and agreeing each stakeholder's formal and de facto rights, responsibilities and returns in relation to the site. Each of these can then be allocated a relative score (0 = none, 5 = high/maximum). The description should reflect the formal position and the score should reflect the reality, for example where a stakeholder has a legal responsibility but is not actually being responsible, or a stakeholder has a right that is not actually being upheld, the description would explain the responsibility or right and a low score would indicate that it is not carried out in practice. (See Figure 1).
- 5) It is not necessary to use scoring, although it can help in assessing actual practice and any imbalances. Where scoring is used it is important that all participants are using the same criteria for scoring, particularly if the exercise is carried out in smaller groups.
- 6) Discuss and analyse the 3Rs table. Following presentation of each table to the wider group (if applicable), participants should check the results for consistency (by checking across each row and checking down each column) and final agreement. Any inconsistencies or differences of opinion should be noted. These can be explored further, either as part of this exercise or through ongoing discussions and negotiation. Note that a consensus is not necessarily a desired outcome – differences in perceptions can be very useful basis for further discussions.

Questions to guide discussion and analysis (stage 1)

Ask participants to discuss the table, focusing on the balance of rights, responsibilities and returns, for each stakeholder and between stakeholders. Questions to prompt discussion include:

- Are the descriptions accurate? Do they describe what **should be** happening or what **is** happening?
- Does stakeholder X actually take more responsibility than stakeholder Y?
- Which stakeholders have the same level of responsibility? Is this really the case?
- Do some stakeholders benefit very little yet take responsibilities?
- Do some stakeholders benefit but without taking any responsibilities?
- Are certain stakeholders benefiting to the same extent? What kind of balance is desirable between the 3 Rs and between stakeholders?
- Should it be a perfect/equal balance or can it be tipped in favour of certain interests?

Figure 1: Current Rights, Responsibilities and Returns table for 9 stakeholders* (Mayers, 2005)

Stakeholder	Rights	Score	Responsibility	Score	Benefit	Score
Charcoal Burners	Part access	2	Registered with Operations Committee	2	Direct income	4
Timber Exploiters	Part access	0.5	None	0	Direct income – timber	4
Firewood collectors	None	0	None	0	Direct income Resource	4.5
CDC (a parastatal plantation company)	Rightful leasehold owners	5	Ensure proper land management	1	None	0
Chiefs	Authorise access to all resources	3	Custodians Monitor	2	Fees Gifts	1
Farmers	Access to land Participation/decision making	2	Implement land use plan (tree planting) Registration	1	Crop sales Crop consumption	5
MINEF (Ministry of Environment & Forestry)	Supervision Management	4	Control exploitation Collect government taxes Community forest procedure	2	Auction sales revenues Exploitation fees	3.5
BBNRC (local management council for the forest)	Management authority Negotiate on behalf of the community Sanction	3	Implement land use policy; Monitoring and control; Establish community forest	3	Allowances Training Gifts Informant fees	2
Traditional Doctors	User right Participation	1	-	0	Consultation fees Treatment Herbs sales	5

* In this example participants identified 18 stakeholders and divided into two groups, each taking 9 stakeholders for analysis.

- 7) The discussion may lead to some adjustments to the descriptions or the scores so that the comparison between stakeholders is more meaningful. At the end of the discussion there should be broad agreement on the relative 'weight' of different rights, responsibilities and returns.
- 8) It may be helpful to prepare a summary table of the situation, ranking the stakeholders according to their rights, responsibilities and returns (as in Figure 2, based on the situation revealed in the table in Figure 1).

9) The same exercise can be repeated (optional), but this time participants can envisage the desired situation in 5 years (for example). This future scenario table can act as a tool for negotiation, providing a basis for dialogue between stakeholders, as well as enable identification of issues that require action and provide a reference point or targets. In preparing this table participants should bear in mind the previous discussion and in particular the following.

- What kind of balance is desirable between the 3 Rs and between stakeholders?
- Should it be a perfect/equal balance or can it be tipped in favour of certain interests?

Figure 2: Summary table of Rights, Responsibilities and Returns (Mayers, 2005)

Stakeholders with highest Rights	Stakeholders with highest Responsibilities	Stakeholders with highest Benefits
1. CDC 2. MINEF 3. MCP 4. BBNRMC/chiefs	1. MCP 2. BBNRMC 3. MINEF/villages/chiefs/elites/ charcoal burners/LUC	1. Farmers/fishers 2. Firewood/traditional doctors 3. Timber/charcoal

Assessment of the status of relationships between stakeholders

10) Participants can analyse the relationships between stakeholders using a pairwise matrix (Figure 3). It is important that the basis on which relationships are being analysed and assessed is agreed. Stakeholder relationships may be analysed according to a number of factors which can all contribute to their general 'health', including:

- the convergence of values or opinions
- mutual support
- frequency and intensity of contact
- transparency
- commitment
- (inter)dependence
- equity
- respect

Figure 3: Relationships matrix (G = good, F = Fair, P = Poor) (Mayers, 2005)

	Chiefs	Farmers	MINEF	BBNRMC	Villages	Admin	LUC	Trad Doc	Charcoal	Timber	Fuelwood	Hunters	MCP	MINAGRI	CDC	Elites
Chiefs		F	G	G	G	G	F	-	F	P	P	-	G	F	F	F
Farmers			F	F	F	F	-	-	F	P	P	-	G	F	F	F
MINEF				G	F	G	F	-	F	P	P	P	G	G	F	-
BBNRMC					G	G	G	-	G	P	P	P	G	F	F	F
Villages						G	G	-	-	P	P	P	G	F	F	G
Admin							G	G	-	P	P	P	G	G	G	G
LUC								-	-	-	-	-	G	F	F	-
Trad Doc									-	F	F	F	F	-	-	-
Charcoal										G	G	-	F	-	-	-
Timber											G	-	P	-	F	P
Fuelwood												-	P	-	P	P
Hunters													-	-	-	F
MCP														G	F	F
MINAGRI															G	F
CDC																G
Elites																

- 11) Relationships can be categorised as Good, Fair or Poor, or placed into other categories as agreed by participants.
- 12) Discuss and analyse the results.

Questions to guide discussion and analysis (stage 2)

The following questions can be used to guide the discussion but should be adopted and adapted according to the focus of the exercise.

- Is there a need to improve specific relationships?
- What actions could be taken, and by whom, to enable this? Can certain stakeholders play a role in improving relationships between other stakeholders?
- How might a change in the balance between rights, responsibilities and returns affect relationships between stakeholders?

Points to remember:

- ❖ It is helpful, but not essential, if this tool is used in conjunction with, or after, the Stakeholder Analysis tool. If used in conjunction, both tools will need further adaptation depending on the time available and objectives of the exercise.
- ❖ Political or social relationships might influence group discussions. It is not necessary to reach a consensus but it is important to explore different perspectives.
- ❖ Since the analysis concerns power relations it can touch on sensitive issues.
- ❖ Successful analysis and negotiation depends on good facilitation by a respected and neutral third party.
- ❖ Analysing relationships can raise expectations regarding potential changes and the attainment of desired future scenarios. It is recommended that the 4 Rs is only used as a basis for negotiation where there is a reasonable hope that change can take place.
- ❖ Local participants should be encouraged to build as much of the diagram as possible without interruption and to suggest anything else that should be recorded.
- ❖ Before using this tool read the accompanying document, *A guide to using tools for participatory approaches*.

For further information

Mayers, J (2005) *The four Rs*

Power tools series. International Institute for Environment and Development, London, UK.

<http://www.policy-powertools.org/Tools/Understanding/TFR.html>

Worah, S (2008) *Participatory Management of Forests & Protected Areas: A Trainers' Manual*
RECOFTC

<http://www.recoftc.org/site/resources/Participatory-Management-of-Forests-and-Protected-Areas-A-Trainer-s-Manual.php>



FFI's Conservation, Livelihoods and Governance programme is financially supported by Anglo American.



The development and public dissemination of this tool has been co-funded by the British American Tobacco Biodiversity Partnership.



Fauna & Flora International, 4th Floor, Jupiter House, Station Road,
Cambridge, CB1 2JD
Telephone +44 (0) 1223 571000
Fax +44 (0) 1223 571000
Email info@fauna-flora.org