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Aim of the SNA for the project

- To define the key actors in cross-border MSP
- Networks and their characteristics
- Trends in inter-state and intra-state socio-economic networks
What we did

- Define the Stakeholders
- Conduct an online survey
- Draw the networks
- Conduct face-to-face interviews
- Analyse
Define the Stakeholders

- Public organizations and NPOs
- We defined altogether 369 stakeholders

- Private organizations located in research area
- Altogether 6557 stakeholders
Conduct an online survey

• ADD A SNOWBALL EFFECT!!!

• => 7118 invitations were sent out
• => 207 properly fulfilled responses
• => response rate 2,9%
Draw the networks

• Distinguished between formal and informal networks

• Formal networks:
  • EU project-specific networks (53)
  • International networks (28)
  • Country-specific networks (8 FI / 13 EE)

• Limitations:
  • Abbreviations
  • Names in local languages
Draw the networks

• Informal networks = informal contacts btw people, organizations and sectors

• We used SocNetV free software
Estonian sectors

- Marine building
- Energy
- Public sector
- Marine transportation
- Marine fishing and aquaculture
- NGOs and support organizations
- Research and specific projects
- Tourism and maritime experience

Finnish sectors

- Marine building
- Energy
- Public sector
- Marine transportation
- Marine fishing and aquaculture
- NGOs and support organizations
- Research and specific projects
- Tourism and maritime experience

Sectors outside Estonia and Finland
Conduct face-to-face interviews

- Interviews for describing the characteristics of networks in project area
- Interviews describing trends of networks in project area
Limitations

• It is hard to identify the potential stakeholders (=> use the snowball effect)

• Low response rate (=> use the mouth-to-mouth advertising)

• Distortions by the the self-interest

• Distortions by the networks created by the project

• SNA presents current situation / individuals’ awareness of his/her connections at the present moment
Results

• Strongly personal networks = person moves with his/her networks

• Joining the networks (formal or informal) was through personal contacts

• Conflicting networks:
  • Nature protection and tourism
  • Nature protection and fishery
  • Nature protection and wind parks
  • Shipping and fishery
Results

• Deficiencies in networking
  • Lack of information
  • Lack of communication

• High public sector dominance in MSP

• Great differences in perceptions about networking on either side of the border as well as between public and private sector

• No common understanding what goes on within a particular sector as well as in the particular field in general
• Is the analysis needed?

• What new information it brought to the fore?

• Importance of the personal connections