

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Printed Materials	<p>Written and graphic information about the project process, timelines, definitions, options available and ways to be involved</p> <p>e.g. See example project - City of Mandurah</p>	<p>\$\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>All</p> <p>Low</p> <p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can include fact sheets, flyers, newsletters, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) - Can be distributed in a targeted manner and either in print or online - Creates awareness if distributed broadly and direct traffic to primary information source (e.g. through QR code) - Can be tailored, visually interesting and provide good examples of different coastal options - Can be the primary source, referred back to often and updated if needed - Newsletters formatted for electronic distribution as well can have significant reach if the coastal manager has a significant number of subscribers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited ability to communicate complexity of coastal hazards and the challenges of decision making without making content excessive - Once distributed it can be difficult to observe responses to the materials - If information changes, re-printing materials could cost money, take time to get back out to the community and it will be hard to guarantee that people are using updated information - May not suit all audiences due to language or access
Media Releases	<p>Statement release to the public by the local government or key political representatives</p>	<p>\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>All</p> <p>Low</p> <p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relatively quick and inexpensive - Creates awareness if distributed broadly - Can herald sponsorship of process by decision makers, giving it gravitas - Success relies on simple, factual messages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not all people pay attention to media statements - Assumes media will distribute statements - Assumes distribution of statement by media will be accurate and without 'spin'
Other advertising	<p>Inform</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Printed materials could also include postcards, suggestion boxes, public displays (unattended) in libraries or Council facilities. - Local radio or television advertising, where Council has reliable relationships. 			

Legend: **\$\$\$ Cost** **@ In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**

Methods of engagement for coastal hazard planning

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Signs on site / in public areas	<p>Signs placed at key coastal destinations, directing people to project information (e.g. by QR code)</p> <p>e.g. <i>See Participant Attachment 11 examples</i></p>	<p>\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>All</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Primary and secondary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can create awareness of the project at the project location, so is relevant to users - Can be effective at driving traffic to websites/ opportunities to engage more formally - QR code redirects to the website can be monitored, so it is a good method to analyse retrospectively and see how effective it is - Relies on clear, simple messaging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large areas may make it difficult to achieve adequate distribution, or costs might be higher - Distribution requires human resource time - Typical on-site signage is made from plastics and can contribute to waste locally (especially if signs are not removed at the end of engagement and become unfixed/fly away) - Once distributed it can be difficult to observe responses to the materials
Project Website	<p>A dedicated site with information about a proposal, such as fact sheets, FAQs, project timelines, surveys / polls, online mapping, newsletters / e-News</p> <p>A website itself is an 'inform' tool, but may include tools that support 'Consult' and 'Involve' methods</p> <p>e.g. Mandurah Southern Beaches CHRMAP</p> <p>Cocos (Keeling) Island CHRMAP</p> <p>Geraldton CHRMAP</p>	<p>\$\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>All</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can include engagement activities with a range of specific tools included or linked for easy access (discussed in other methods) - Can include sign-up for further information, supporting improvements to database for stakeholders interested in coastal management - Can be active or passive, support required can be curated to low, medium or high effort - Specific engagement websites can help gather data on interested user demographics, high traffic channels (e.g. best channels for user engagement) and more expensive tools include a number of in-built analysis and sentiment tools - Can be used in an <i>ongoing capacity</i> during implementation to show action taken over longer periods / achievement of goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs clear/effective content/format that is regularly updated - if it stagnates the community can feel like 'nothing is happening' - Requires active management and reminders to users when material/information changes - Assumes that participants have internet access - Tools made specifically for engagement can be expensive if not required for other purposes

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Social Media	Communicating and engaging project process, timelines and ways to be involved via a variety of platforms e.g. Gingin Project Updates	<p>\$\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>All</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can potentially reach large numbers - Has greater youth reach for those not familiar with traditional media; can be more accessible for diverse communities - Can be designed to seek quantitative and qualitative responses - Can drive traffic to the engagement process itself - Social media postings can be monitored to gauge anecdotal community sentiment - A range of specific tools can be linked (website link, videos, surveys etc) - Form, content and participation can be tailored to the recipient's needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can be highly imprecise and subject to external changes in algorithm and costs - Becoming less trustworthy - Can be difficult to identify and record usable, representative data - Responses can be dominated by special interest groups - Difficult to filter responses - dissenting voices may be targeted and conflict can occur - Success relies on clear and effective content/format - Assumes that participants have internet access - Highly curated content requires dedicated personnel
Recorded Video/webinar	A video presentation, webinar of recorded video available online e.g. Cocos (Keeling) Island Webinar series #1 (other videos linked on engagement page) <i>These Training Module Videos</i>	<p>\$\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>Consult</p> <p>All</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works when face to face engagement is difficult (e.g. COVID) or where large or remote areas are involved which would be hard to service - People can attend sessions or watch later in their own time - Can be tailored to the specific project need, such as informing and educating stakeholders on the trade-offs (social, environmental, and economic) associated with adaptation actions and option - Can be highly visual - Assumes equal access to technology for special-interest groups, in regional areas etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better quality video recording achieves improved results but can be expensive to create - Videos will be permanently online; if information changes the video may need to be modified, and any comments on the video may need moderation - Relies on clear and effective content/format, a personable and clear speaking presenter, and clarity of messaging - short videos are more preferable, but short, concise content is harder to create and can be expensive

Legend: **\$\$ Cost** **In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Polls	A small number of prepared questions asked of participants to gauge community feedback, sentiment or registration for activities (short, to the point)	<div> <div>\$</div> <div>@</div> <div>Consult</div> <div>All</div> <div>Low</div> <div>All</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A wide variety of implementation techniques are available online, phone, face-to-face etc. - Provides quick, qualitative data points, especially when there are clear options to choose from - Can give an accurate indication of community perspectives and reactions - Can be implemented quickly and at relatively low cost - Can be designed to reach a large number of people or targeted to a specific group - Polls can be undertaken several times to gauge change and test outcomes - Could be used to understand specific trade-offs that the community is willing to make in Stage 4, or during implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anonymity typically means that it is hard to analyse or understand reasons for polling - Data can be distorted by multiple responses from the same individual, low response rates or flooding of poll by activists - Less opportunity for relationship building and network creation - No opportunity for detailed explanation of issues or discussion/clarification of responses - Unlikely that data is representative and statistically valid
One-on-one meeting or interview	One-on-one conversation to gain information about stakeholder expectation and issues, and to build consensus	<div> <div>\$\$\$</div> <div>@</div> <div>Involve</div> <div>Stage 1</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>Primary and secondary</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meetings can collect information from a wide range of people - Very useful at the early stages of engagement to build trust, relationships and explore issues in depth - Can provide deeper insight into community issues and an opportunity for Council to test ideas - Suitable for hard to reach audiences and can be effective in identifying divergent concerns - Works well with other methods of broader engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It can be time consuming and expensive - Information collected is qualitative and data captured may be slightly different to that gathered through other methods making comparison with other feedback difficult to compare - Lacks peer-to-peer dialogue and can leave people dissatisfied if they feel their feedback is representative of others, but it was an outlier; particularly challenging if the stakeholder is a known community leader - Less opportunity for relationship building and network creation

Legend: **\$\$ Cost** **@ In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**

Methods of engagement for coastal hazard planning

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Walking tours	Organised site tour incorporating information sharing and the opportunity for dialogue between Council, technical experts and stakeholders	<p>\$\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Involve</p> <p>All</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Primary and secondary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suitable for small or large groups - Because it is on site, it can help explore known issues and historical information - Visibility of the group can increase awareness of the project - Could be done during ordinary project site visit, so some costs may be mitigated and greater benefits gained - It is more productive at the early stages of the development of a project - Suitable for key stakeholders, elected members steering group members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could result in low turnout, attendance may not be representative and particular group/s may dominate the conversation - Not effective for some groups, e.g. aged persons, persons with disability, families with small children - Potentially attractive to agitators - Information collected is qualitative and data captured may difficult to capture - Subject to weather impacts
Direct Mail	Personalised or bulk letters mailed directly to interested or affected stakeholders	<p>\$\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>Stage 1, 6</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Primary and secondary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High probability that target recipients will be informed. - Letter drop can potentially reach all households in a postcode/agreed study area - Good for when timeframes are limited - Can also include information in Rates Notices if timing is right (only goes to landowners) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can be costly if personally addressed (formal local government logos and personalised addresses envelopes increase the likelihood of letters being read) - If sent at the wrong time (e.g. during holidays), letters can be ineffective at driving engagement within timeframes
Other Information Sharing	<p>Inform</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion papers providing balanced information on a particular issue without promoting any particular position. Could be used to support any of other more intensive engagement. Can be non-confrontational well in advance of a CHRMAP being completed. May be more beneficial than detailed technical reports if using plain language. 			

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Surveys	<p>Prepared questions asked of participants to gauge community feedback, sentiment or registration for activities (longer)</p> <p>Simple tools like newsletters and QR codes posted in the study area can drive traffic to a link</p> <p>e.g. See Participant Attachment 5 example and content from the Guidelines</p>	<p>\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Consult</p> <p>Involve</p> <p>All</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Primary and secondary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works well when there is a lot of information accessible, time for stakeholders to become aware of the opportunity is adequate, and stakeholders know the context of the survey - A wide variety of implementation techniques are available online, phone, face-to-face etc. - Can give an accurate indication of community perspectives and reactions - Respondents may be anonymous or their details may be recorded – anonymous input encourages honesty but registering provides data in itself and allows contact to be maintained - Can be implemented quickly and at relatively low cost - Can be designed to reach a large number of people or targeted to a specific group - Surveys can be undertaken several times to gauge change and test outcomes - Could be used to understand specific trade-offs that the community is willing to make in Stage 4, or during implementation - Can be focussed on primary and secondary without excluding tertiary stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data can be distorted by multiple responses from the same individual, low response rates or flooding of survey by activists - Less opportunity for relationship building - No opportunity for detailed explanation of issues or discussion/clarification of responses, so qualitative information can be difficult to analyse - Analysis can be expensive and time consuming dependant on the number of responses and the nature of questions - The survey should be designed and implemented so that data is representative and/or statistically valid - Stakeholders tend not to complete surveys with more than approximately 10 questions (plus demographic questions)

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
School Sessions	Workshops with school aged students to increase youth participation (utilising schools in the study area)	<p>\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Involve</p> <p>All</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Primary and secondary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works well in engagement processes where proper representation is sought - Connecting with Humanities and Social Science courses, geography and science based classes - Young people have unique perspectives that add value; they are also most likely to experience impacts in their lifetime - Young people also aid increased awareness of coastal projects in their parent cohorts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class time allocated is often limited, so questions and activities need to be fast and visually appealing - Coastal hazards are complex to explain and explore; it may not be possible to talk about all the issues, but setting tasks for students to do afterward online can simplify - Data captured may be slightly different to that gathered through other methods making comparison with other feedback difficult to compare
Public Meetings	<p>An open public meeting with self selected attendees, usually associated with large numbers</p> <p>Comments and questions usually invited from participants</p>	<p>\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Consult</p> <p>Stage 1</p> <p>High/ Expert Support</p> <p>Primary and secondary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works for projects of significant interest where engagement is required within a short timeframe or at short notice – for example, crisis management - Some communities are familiar with this method - Generally held in a neutral or trusted venue - Works most successfully for high level strategies and plans that are non-committal about long term recommendations - Works best where participants aren't being asked to respond to major or complex recommendations (best done in early stages where outcomes are not yet confirmed) - An open and transparent forum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risk of excluding seldom-heard groups and people who don't like public speaking/forums - confident participants will dominate discussion - Emotional responses and 'group mentality' can be hard to manage –this can make it difficult to deliver your message and skew participant perception of issues - There is a risk of conflict between passionate participants with different views and this tool can generate media interest – positive and negative - A clear explanation of the purpose of the meeting, the process and next steps is required; an experienced facilitator is necessary if the issues are controversial - Effort needs to be made to identify and record usable, representative data - The capacity of the venue must match the level of community interest – people don't want to feel like they have missed out

Legend: **\$\$ Cost** **@ In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Interactive Mapping Tools	<p>A method of seeking feedback using spatial information in online mapping tools which can be done on desktop or on smart devices</p> <p>Simple tools like QR codes posted in the study area can drive traffic to a link</p> <p>e.g. Shire of Cocos (Keeling) Islands online web map and website</p>	<p>\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Consult</p> <p>Involve</p> <p>All</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Primary and secondary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works well in coastal hazard planning to understand locational values, important characteristics and areas of focus - Can be used to seek input on 'values' associated with the coast (e.g. sunset , surf watching), 'uses' (e.g. surfing, swimming, walking), and issues or concerns (e.g. erosion, inundation) - Can help extract historical data and anecdotal information from stakeholders - Highly interactive for most users, intuitive, accessible for a range of cohorts - Can be used to communicate the location and extents of coastal hazard exposure risks. - In later stages of the CHRMAP, can be used to present options in various locations, with trade-offs, impacted assets etc - Can be used in <i>an ongoing capacity</i> during implementation to show action taken over longer periods / achievement of goals - Will be most attractive to primary (proximate) stakeholders and regular (secondary) users of the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs to be simple and clear, especially for mobile devices - If user comments are visible or are open for comment by others, an element of moderation is required - Assumes that participants have internet access - Mapping tools can be expensive if the primary tool is not required for other purposes (e.g. project website, surveys etc) - Less opportunity for relationship building and network creation - No opportunity for detailed explanation of clarification of inputs



METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Display Sessions and Pop Ups	A temporary place or event that uses active, interesting ways to achieve awareness and seek comment	<div> <div>\$\$</div> <div>In Person</div> <div>Consult</div> <div>Involve</div> <div>Stage 1-5</div> <div>Draft CHRMAP</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>Primary and secondary</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Often uses highly visual tools such as outdoor displays, sausage sizzles, and staged in local venues such as libraries, community centres or shopping centres - Used to reach a lot of people in their own setting, including those who wouldn't normally participate - Visually attractive materials will attract responses and gather local knowledge and qualitative data - Helps communicate the risk and vulnerability assessment processes, and can show key areas and assets or values at risk requiring risk treatment - One-on-one interaction – participants can readily ask questions and raise concerns - Works well in tandem with other methods such as surveys, where users can get a bit more information about the project before responding to passive methods - Works well if trying to increase participation in workshops. - Highly inclusive – including of people unused to participating (e.g. be conscious of height of materials from the ground, colour choice for colour contrast and colour blindness etc) - Will be most attractive to primary (proximate) stakeholders and regular (secondary) users of the area, if venue is within the coastal zone of the study area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effort needs to be made to identify and record usable, representative data - May be effected by bad weather; contingency may be required - Run times to enable different people to access the event, and events often on weekends - Large scale printing can be costly - Design of materials should be interesting and engaging, which can take time and effort to get right without overdoing material presented and overcrowding the pop-up space - Activities typically allow for stakeholders to respond in their own way, and this can mean it becomes harder to compare feedback between stakeholders - Facilitators must be mindful to not have their time monopolised by a small number of participants - Coastal hazards are complex to explain and explore; it may not be possible to adequately talk about the issues with each individual or a groups of individuals without some stakeholders being left out. More facilitators may be required to avoid this, which can become expensive - Can leave people dissatisfied if they feel their feedback is representative of others, because they did not experience peer-to-peer discussion or hearing other stakeholder points of view

Legend: **\$\$ Cost** **In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**




METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Focus Groups	Small group discussions with aligned groups, curated together to resolve relevant issues (e.g. environment advisory groups, Disability advocates etc)	<p>\$\$</p> <p>In Person</p> <p>Involve</p> <p>Collaborate</p> <p>Stage 1-5</p> <p>High/ Expert Support</p> <p>Primary and secondary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works well when there is divergent views between groups and bringing them together would create difficulties/agitation - Allows for working directly with key stakeholders to seek subject matter expertise feedback - Allows time for groups to hear peer feedback and other points of view in a safe environment - Can work for discussion at different stages of CHRMAP preparation - Can be convened more rapidly than large workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can be resource intensive if there are a number of groups - Limits engagement with other groups, where different viewpoints might be important for stakeholders to hear - Limits users to specific dates and times - Requires good existing relationships to encourage attendance and participation; may work best when existing groups are already convened
Traditional Owner and First Nations Meetings	<p>Meetings with First Nations people, communities, and representative organisations</p> <p>Could include Walk on Country for specific areas of interest</p>	<p>\$\$\$</p> <p>@</p> <p>Inform</p> <p>Consult</p> <p>All</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct engagement with First Nations people can unearth oral histories, anecdotal information about past management and coastal contexts and identify important values, goals, and aspirations for coastal management. - First Nations people can partner and provide valuable support to management and adaptation, especially in land management - If not present, engagement can help begin to establish relationships with First Nations people - A good relationship can support the CHRMAP in <i>an ongoing capacity</i> during implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First Nations people may not have the time or capacity to participate in any program or project activities - First Nations people have extensive commitments. Existing committees or advisory groups should be utilised for engagement, rather than creating new or standalone mechanisms - Engagement is unlikely to be linear and time should allocated to allow for open agendas, and flexibility for the engagement to take place

Legend: **\$\$ Cost** **In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**

Methods of engagement for coastal hazard planning

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
3D model, wave tank model display	Visual representations of potential coastal hazards and how they impact the coast	<p>\$\$\$-\$\$\$\$</p> <p> Consult</p> <p>Involve</p> <p>Stage 1-5</p> <p>Expert Support</p> <p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fun and innovative way to show coastal impacts if 3D Models are shown in video format, or if a wave tank is physically present at workshops, display sessions, pop-ups - Adaptable to a range of scenarios and option testing, and could be partnered with 3D printing of scenarios - Helps participants to grasp difficult concepts and understand alternate impacts/consider trade-offs - Can be very accurate if specific to local area, taking into account local conditions such as geography, important assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can be very expensive - Participants can view proposals in a manner that reflects the issues important to them - Need to ensure that the conveyed images reflect what may ultimately occur or trust will be eroded - Modelling become outdated quickly and needs to be updated - Physical wave models are fun, but not available for use everywhere, all the time; once gone, stakeholders may begin to 'forget' the information shared and the value of the tool may lose its potency
Steering Group / Working Group / Committee / Council	<p>A panel of experts guide the decision maker on issues across the life of a proposal</p> <p>Participants are usually technical experts rather than community representatives</p>	<p>\$\$</p> <p> @</p> <p>Collaborate</p> <p>All stages</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>All</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Works best when the group meets regularly during the course of the project and potentially commits to longer term partnership - Works where there is a high degree of public interest and impact and participants are knowledgeable and engaged - Facilitates a balanced and un-emotive approach to issue resolution and trade-offs - Group can provide technical and administrative 'sponsorship' for the project and give the process legitimacy - Works best when the group includes Elected Members who can be involved throughout the life cycle of the CHRMAP and provide stewardship of the implementation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There must be a clear process and terms of reference for the group - Misalignment between technical (quantitative) outcomes and community values (particularly qualitative) need to be resolved and can compromise members - Process and outcomes will need to be conveyed to the community; consider if some community participation is needed - Participation is likely to be a paid role in member organisations; if community participation is proposed this should be equitable - If members leave organisations, or the local area, or no longer want to be involved during the project, loss of that member/s can lead to loss of institutional knowledge, delays and rework

Legend: **\$\$ Cost** ** In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Workshops (this table presents three different variations)	Community Workshop Self selected stakeholders who come together and are facilitated in small groups to provide inputs and/or feedback on the CHRMAP	\$\$\$ - \$\$\$\$  Involve Stage 1-5 High/ Expert Support Primary and secondary	All workshop types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well managed and programmed workshop with formal agenda, generally for a minimum of 2.5-3 hours with refreshments and other accessibility support - Provides opportunity to increase stakeholder awareness, build capacity and relationships - May be helpful in understanding community reactions to a variety adaptation options and actions to inform the MCA assessment 	All workshop types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires good facilitator and presenters that understand the issue and the stakeholders/ audience - several facilitators may be needed which can be costly - If the community is not interested in coastal hazards (no current or visible impact etc), it can result in low turnout and lack integrity - Representativeness need to be curated; considerable effort goes into recruitment - Some people find workshop style processes intimidating or find them too fast (or slow) - Meetings can be hijacked or dominated by individuals or groups and can quickly escalate out of control because emotions can be high if coastal issues are extensive - High levels of planning are required, including the venue, accessibility, refreshments, transportation, audio visual and workshop materials (printing etc) CRGs and Citizen's Juries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Councils need to commit to respecting recommendations (Reference Groups) or endorsing the recommendations (Juries), otherwise trust will be lost in the process - Participants have to reach agreement (although not 100% consensus) - Selection processes for representativeness need to be professionally managed - Remuneration is recommended; budget should be allowed - Time commitment is extensive; whole day and multiple day commitments are typical - Issues are still highly complex, just shared
	Community Reference Groups (CRG) Stakeholders and subject matter experts come together to review and resolve issues and provide inputs / feedback on the CHRMAP e.g. City of Mandurah Southern Beaches CHRMAP CCRG	\$\$\$\$  Collaborate Stage 1-5 Implementation Expert Support Primary and secondary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Builds engagement with other groups, where different viewpoints might be important for stakeholders to hear - Informs and educates stakeholders on the trade-offs (social, environmental, and economic) associated with adaptation actions and options - Works well for potential recommendations that are highly emotional, highly political or where there is a need to understand the impact of Council's actions or the process of decision making for specific issues - Can contribute at any stage of the CHRMAP process (and is best undertaken at multiple stages throughout with continuous feedback loops) 	
	Citizen's Jury A panel of community representatives provides recommendations to the Council for inclusion or authorship of the CHRMAP	\$\$\$\$  Empower Stage 1-5 Expert Support Primary and secondary	CRGs and Citizen's Juries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can be designed to include community representatives through stratified sampling - A well managed process results in stakeholders 'paying it forward'; sharing knowledge and information with others and being advocates for action - For Citizen's Juries final recommendations will be based on its findings, removing any sense of Council doing hazard planning 'to' the community. 	

Legend: **\$\$ Cost** **In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**

Methods of engagement for coastal hazard planning

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	KEY INFO	PROS	CONS
Public Displays / Formal Submissions	A temporary place or event that uses active, interesting ways to achieve awareness and seek comment	<div> <div>\$</div> <div>@</div> <div>Inform</div> <div>Consult</div> <div>Draft CHRMAP</div> <div>Medium</div> <div>All</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support final inputs of the draft CHRMAP and implementation priorities when seeking endorsement from Council; formal engagement provides all stakeholders an opportunity to provide feedback on the draft - One-on-one interaction – participants can contribute at their own pace - Public displays can be undertaken with key technical experts present to answer questions - Key messages need to clearly show how engagement occurred during the development of the CHRMAP - Feedback is typically via a proforma form, making feedback relatively consistent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feedback can look different to inputs from engagement in earlier stages If stakeholders contribute that have not previously been engaged - Engagement at this stage is often too late for sweeping changes without considerable cost - The draft CHRMAP may include recommendations that aren't supported making public displays contentious - Despite proforma forms, some stakeholders will provide feedback in formats not consistent with the requires template, needing to be adequately logged / data input
Citizen science programs, planting days, regular project updates	Activities that are implemented after the CHRMAP is complete to ensure continued engagement occurs e.g. CoastSnap	<div> <div>\$</div> <div>@</div> <div>Inform</div> <div>Implementation</div> <div>Low</div> <div>All</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reminds stakeholders of the ongoing efforts required for coastal hazard management - Can include relatively passage communications tools, such as the CoastSnap coastal monitoring program, and can involve all members of the community including young people - Can including planting programs that continue to highlight the need to look after the environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Needs to be linked to the CHRMAP and ongoing coastal management action, so that the community continues to have a line-of-sight to the reasons for the information
General Seminars and Education	<div>Involve / Collaborate</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deliberative polling (could be uses in CRGs and Citizen's Juries) to vote on suggested outcomes. - Coastal Conference/Symposium to present key technical information over the course of a day, where stakeholders can ask questions and interrogate data with little or no decision making process, could be videoed and publicised 			

Legend: **\$\$ Cost** **@ In Person** **@ Online/Remote** **Engagement Level** **Timing (CHRMAP Stage)** **Resources Required** **Target Stakeholder Audience**