Engaging Stakeholders in Policy Discussions: A Legal Framework

Nabirye Amina Okwir

Faculty of Business and Management Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

In the context of rapid technological advancement and shifting governance landscapes, effective stakeholder engagement has emerged as a cornerstone of inclusive policy development. This paper examines the legal and institutional frameworks necessary for integrating diverse stakeholders into public policy discussions, especially concerning emerging technologies and public governance. Drawing from case studies and comparative analyses, the paper identifies best practices, typologies, and tools for engagement, highlighting the need for legitimacy, transparency, and accountability. Challenges in participation, ranging from socio-political imbalances to economic constraints, are analyzed through legal and practical lenses. The study emphasizes the significance of institutional design, public participation mechanisms, and evaluative methods in ensuring that stakeholder engagement is not merely symbolic but substantively influential. A new legal framework is proposed that categorizes participation modes, clarifies stakeholder roles, and suggests robust tools and techniques for meaningful policy dialogues.
Keywords: Stakeholder Engagement, Legal Framework, Public Participation, Deliberative Democracy, Policy Legitimacy, Governance, Emerging Technologies.

INTRODUCTION

Steering innovation is a challenge for industry and governance. Pioneers of advanced technologies express concern over ineffective governance, especially in public policy discussions. Emerging technologies present both opportunities and risks, requiring a rethinking of policy instruments in collaboration with stakeholders. Regulation of technology possibilities and risks has not been prioritized by governments. The absence of a market and system has left some technologies outside governance. In contrast, IS technologies have spurred governance discussions, raising questions about the roles of governments and academics as mediators in innovation. Research on framing innovation in public discourse has largely focused on cultural and social perspectives, leaving gaps for systematic studies on stakeholder framing in public policy. Assessing stakeholder needs in policy discussions involves engaging with normative questions about policy legitimacy. Political elites often propose agendas aligned with their interests rather than the collective good. This is evident in South Korea's anti-smoking policy, where policy framing influenced stakeholder interpretation and legitimacy. Policy legitimacy is typically viewed as a result of open debate among diverse views on political issues. However, it often gets evaluated based on goals stated by political elites. Political figures should avoid decision-oriented agendas before proper deliberation. Failure to engage in collective assessment over a significant time can render the agenda illegitimate [1, 2].

Understanding Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement, a term that is often used interchangeably with consultation or collaboration, involves the active participation and involvement of specific groups in essential policy discussions and various decision-making processes. This important concept is formally referred to as "public participation" or "deliberative democracy," and it highlights the critical importance of collaborative decision-making that actively integrates the diverse perspectives and voices of many different actors, organizations, and community members. The process of participation can be meticulously evaluated through a variety of inputs, which might include surveys, interviews, and focus groups, as well as through

important outcomes like reports and actionable recommendations. These mechanisms allow all interested parties to exert significant influence on the overall decision-making landscape, ensuring that diverse viewpoints are taken into account. This engagement not only serves to signify a substantial vested interest in the outcomes produced but also reflects a proactive stance as stakeholders actively manage, express, and champion the interests that matter to them most deeply. Moreover, effective stakeholder engagement plays a pivotal role in enhancing water governance, which is increasingly recognized for its role in promoting fundamental principles of empowerment and transparency. These principles are essential for improving individual agency, as they advocate for equitable involvement that allows all stakeholders to have a say in the processes that affect them. This kind of engagement also significantly contributes to fostering accountability, legitimacy, and trust within the communities involved, which are vital for successful governance. Ultimately, such a collaborative approach not only facilitates a more profound understanding of local issues and challenges faced by the community but also leads to pertinent and impactful policy outcomes that reflect the genuine needs and concerns of those communities. This process further encourages broader acceptance of policies among stakeholders, even in situations where disagreements with authorities may exist. By creating a platform where the voices and concerns of stakeholders are actively heard and genuinely considered, it results in more inclusive and widely accepted governance practices that resonate with the people they impact the most [3, 4].

Definition and Importance

The union of stakeholders interested in a matter is called the public. A stakeholder is related to a person or group having an interest in/or concern with or impact on a corporation, meaning that the corporation's actions will affect that stakeholder. Stakeholders may affect or be affected by the actions, objectives, and policies of the corporation. Stakeholders may include shareholders, employees, suppliers, customers, businesses, communities, or even politicians. Reflects a mutually binding value, which hypothesizes, or, in a way, a series of interests about the material value that concept comprehends. These interests then become related to the other side of the relationship, the group of actors that manage and/or influence the values implemented. Therefore, a stakeholder is a player within a field of competition between actors that pursue due confederated interests. Stakeholder theory promotes the idea of an association of institutions and individuals that are, in some sense, stakeholders in or with the firm, society, or community. Given this cluster of interests, actors have a practical and strategic role in delimiting the risks and opportunities related to the development of a given subject. As it was seen above, the right level of analysis of a risky relationship is the firm and/or its executives (grouping what happens to a firm with what it earnestly thinks about itself). As a strategic capacity, interpretive schemes developed around a given relationship interpret it only at a dramatic level, as a process carried out by a group of individual actors who present it as a personal and direct engagement, where any volunteers action is offered with its precise motivations, well construed and thought out at the individual level, as a pool of converging portraits that share common interests. Such a scheme neglects the fact that a process is going on somewhere else where groups of actors struggle to select what terms of the engagement are going to be emphasized and/or presented to the public. A firm's stakeholder public identifies, selects, and characterizes the previously explicit set of interests that could become (and remain) public. A filtering and refining process is going on whereby a previously unitary relationship is dismantled, and new pieces are selected. In a filter epistemology, some of these newly selected pieces may revert and become threats. Filters may be understood as a conglomerate of actors with some power to enact a process of selecting activities exposed to the public to construct the pertinent representation of a corporation. Filters tend not to be emotionally self-dramatizing and to rely on routines. In a stark contrast, filtering is conceived in a way just as a set of rules that help, or not, the engagement [5, 6].

Types of Stakeholders

Institutional Decision-Makers are key stakeholders in the NDC Policy, including ministries, regulatory agencies, and relevant institutions. They are expected to lead discussions based on evidence from Government and Non-Government Stakeholders. Various institutions play critical roles in implementing the NDC Policy, potentially enhancing transparency and efficiency despite existing coordination challenges. Capacity-Building Stakeholders have a secondary but significant role, facilitating participatory discussions for Government Stakeholders. Evaluation institutes and think-tanks could provide essential evidence, though their involvement has yet to be seen. The impact of these engagements may not surface until coordination challenges arise later in the discussion process. Other institutions also have minor capacity-building roles. Non-Government Stakeholders are not expected to lead discussions, and while some possess strong capacities, a lack of cooperation from Government Stakeholders limits their

contributions. Additionally, certain institutions, like labour unions, are viewed as weak stakeholders, lacking engagement and understanding of the NDC issue, thus unable to advocate effectively [7, 8].

Legal Framework for Stakeholder Engagement

The legal framework derives from the principles outlined primarily in the following publications: The framework illustrates public engagement mechanisms and how they are linked in a participatory system in the form of six matrices. Utilizing 22 public engagement mechanisms, 35 entry points, and over 40 stakeholders, the legal framework effectively shapes stakeholder engagement activities and structures across multiple departments. It recognizes that such implementation may come with difficulties, mainly through the need for internal guidance or binding mechanisms. Throughout organizations, public participation varies around several characteristics: (1) the first is about the main institutional phase and/or stage; (2) the second pertains to the information flow over time; (3) the third ontological aspect refers to the change that occurs as a result of the participation; (4) the fourth is about the role of the public in the participation process; and finally (5) the fifth is the internal and external function of the activity. As such, a typology arises with the categories of (1) informing, (2) consultation, (3) deliberation, and (4) continued monitoring. Such public participation categories or activity types often capture the direct engagement and/or dialogue with the public from strategic documents. Though academics tend to see 'participation' as a euphemism for 'public consultation' or 'consultation' as suppression of participation, in practice, 'consulting' is often seen more benignly. Aside from the direct mechanisms, participation is guided at a higher or more indirect level of process through selection of stakeholders, interpretation of issues, timing, representation of interests, etc [9, 10].

Best Practices in Stakeholder Engagement

Involving a wider range of stakeholders in EU policymaking is a complex process. Stakeholder engagement was originally conceived as a means of making existing practices more transparent. Stakeholder engagement will improve transparency, enhance accountability, and thus legitimize EU policymaking processes. The need for this radical redesign of how stakeholders are engaged, and of the role that new technology can play in this, is framed in a context of increasing numbers of stakeholders involved in EU policymaking and of fears that the democratic deficit is becoming more acute as EU decisions impact on citizens, but are perceived as being out of their control. During stakeholder engagement, participants should have the opportunity to present information, advice, or opinions that can be considered by decision-makers. Facilitators are advised to encourage the free flow of information. However, there is a risk that some stakeholders may dominate the process or may not feel comfortable with the mode of expression. It is often recommended that, for large groups, participants should interact indirectly through a facilitator who notes contributions and discusses them with the group. Another concern is that the knowledge produced should then be accessible to all stakeholders to allow them to see how this knowledge was created. Knowledge construction involves collective sense-making of what is said and agreed upon. This requires a pro-active attitude from facilitators, as knowledge often emerges from searching for inconsistencies in the verbal or visual collective view. Stakeholder engagement contributes to improving water governance defined as the policy and practices of managing water in different societal contexts, and aims to access various knowledge bases. However, stakeholders' knowledge production processes, as the underlying dynamics of stakeholder engagement, are often overlooked. Because of this, engagement processes can lead to unexpected or even undesirable outcomes [11, 12].

Challenges in Stakeholder Engagement

Addressing legal issues from stakeholders' engagement presents various challenges at the institutional, socio-political, economic, and individual levels. At the institutional level, the definition of 'stakeholders' is sometimes narrowly interpreted, favoring State actors and public institutions. In some countries, non-state-affiliated stakeholders struggle to participate in policy discussions. This creates power voids between private organizations, leading to conflicts over stakeholder engagement and exclusion. For instance, Minigrids operators are often excluded from discussions due to a lack of licenses, despite being recognized as stakeholders. While participatory platforms are available, affected parties question their effectiveness and fear engagement fatigue if outcomes don't reflect their interests. At the socio-political level, challenges arise in the joint knowledge-generation process, as policy-makers, researchers, and civil society may have differing priorities. This necessitates negotiation to accommodate diverse agendas. In Cambodia, licensing conditions are adjusted to explore financial sustainability, while in Vietnam, attempts to convene stakeholders are often met with political resistance when power imbalances persist. These engagements may struggle if perceived as encroaching on local authorities' domains. Economically, the

challenge lies in matching funds and establishing a sustainable financial model. Unlike State projects, participatory engagements require budgeting for mediator fees and venue costs. Without a nuanced approach, early interventions may rely on uncertain funds, leading to distrust. Building human capacity to run and regulate Minigrids could create jobs and revenue, yet it demands investments akin to traditional electrification. To improve affordability, regulatory options with untested political viability may need to be included, but fee reductions could worsen fiscal conditions and exacerbate energy poverty unless supported by State or donor financing [13, 14].

Case Studies

Recent #YouthActionPack campaigns were evaluated against a new legal framework to engage advocates in policy discussions. Assessments targeted the framework's effectiveness in enhancing stakeholder involvement and the adequacy of existing policies. Each campaign featured contrasting cases. In response to COVID-19, a bill was enacted on April 7 to provide emergency powers for quarantining, shopping closures, and work-from-home regulations. About 100 provisions restricted basic rights, conflicting with WHO resolutions and local laws. In April, 2 million people urged parliamentarians to address policy gaps reflecting WHO urgencies. Most parliamentarians engaged with constituents to address legislative deficiencies before the emergency ended. Although some legislative actions aligned with WHO categories, restrictive influences remained, with limited contact, only two direct instances noted. A dissonance effect emerged, leading to changes in the policy processes. Various health measures were unsuccessfully enacted with inadequate resolutions. Other legislative proposals appeared in the news, but policymakers did not respond meaningfully. The pandemic stirred youth awareness, prompting redesigned advocacy campaigns both online and offline, hoping legislators would ease restrictions. This study examined three contrasting but similar campaigns focused on enhancing transparency in governance, supporting freelancers and cultural industries, and enforcing penalties for gathering violations. Diverse means and formats were employed, with most youth policy stakeholders participating in co-creating ideas as social asymmetry decreased [15, 16].

Tools and Techniques for Engagement

A variety of tools and techniques have been adopted to engage stakeholders in public policy discussions to foster wider participation and improve the quality of policies. These include: What is Internet-based engagement and/or engagement using ICT? The eEngagement techniques employed by civil society organisations are broadly classified into: − Internet-based engagement tools; − Direct engagement techniques, with a focus on Internet-based eEngagement with citizens to encourage greater participation. The emphasis on techniques designed to shift power in favour of stakeholders is a welcome new focus. It is important to break the cross-sector divide still present in much eParticipation literature. Nevertheless, the political and institutional dimensions of wider participation, which are arguably more important than tool/technique development, should receive more emphasis. As engagement is largely driven and shaped by institutional and networking environments, the engagement techniques adopted by these organisations will not only be determined by the perceived properties of these techniques but also by the broader context. Thus, the effectiveness of a technique cannot be fully understood without considering the political and institutional characteristics of the engagement process and the power play involved in it. The civil society organisations interviewed care for more than the participant numbers. They do not merely embrace ICT's properties to engage wider audiences, but want engagement with citizens to shift power away from government technocrats. Don't forget who you are engaging with and what the context is. Do not blindly adopt the newest eEngagement procedure. The original goals that emerged from informal talks and institutions are important. Do not forget about wider goals concerning less asymmetric debates, accountability, and transparency. And do not forget that some tools may become part of the monopoly of those in power. Don't lose sight of these as engagement grows more institutionalised. In most cases, a beginning can be made with the tried and tested face-to-face common ground technique, and communication channels should be opened. Internet-based engagement is more effective and encompassing, and events can be streamed and archived [17, 18].

Evaluating Stakeholder Engagement Efforts

Evaluating the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement involves assessing how well policies reflect the concerns raised. This is crucial for analyzing practical applications of engagement, including broader goals like inclusivity and stakeholder empowerment, often called 'meta-assessment' issues. Effectiveness can be evaluated on various levels, from basic "did they talk?" assessments to deeper considerations of the quality of conversations. Challenges arise because stakeholder engagement is usually one step in a lengthy policy development process. Time constraints often hinder thorough evaluations, as policy

developments occur quickly, which pressures analysts evaluating effectiveness amid ongoing changes. Linking engagement results to decision-making can help, especially when focusing on specific issues, since measuring broad impacts like those on national climate policies can be complex. Stakeholder engagement is increasingly relevant in environmental management, climate change, transport infrastructure, and business sustainability, supported by legal frameworks for appraisal and assessment. These frameworks guide the selection of engagement methods and evaluate the adequacy and quality of the processes and outputs. Context-specific, cost-effective frameworks are particularly significant as the demand for effective stakeholder engagement frameworks grows [19, 20].

Future Trends in Stakeholder Engagement

The thesis on public participation in water governance focuses on the EU-WFD and insights from EU policymakers, water managers, and stakeholders. It introduces a framework categorizing stakeholders as non-influential, passive, reactive, or active, and discusses its implications for designing information campaigns, planning sessions, and stakeholder initiatives, particularly in light of European water classification efforts. The thesis posits that EUROFINS should adopt a proactive approach in political stakeholder involvement, enhancing skills in dialogue management and negotiation game design. A literature review on dispute resolution and negotiation technology will support research aimed at creating a serious game for water issue categorization. Additionally, interviews with historical key actors will explore the influence of social and political networks on stakeholder participation in the seventies. The importance of stakeholder engagement in water governance is emphasized, noting its potential to lead to sustainable solutions. While not always explicitly recognized, stakeholder engagement is crucial for improving governance, defined as the policies shaping water management in various contexts. This engagement is vital for sustainable development, empowering stakeholders, and fostering transparency in planning and decision-making. The OECD principles advocate for informed contributions to water policy, yet actual engagement dynamics reveal that favorable outcomes are not guaranteed. Case studies illustrate both the successes of engagement and the challenges inhibiting effective processes. The conclusion provides insights on enhancing stakeholder engagement to improve water governance practices [21-26].

CONCLUSION

This study underscores the vital importance of structured stakeholder engagement in shaping legitimate, inclusive, and sustainable public policies. Legal frameworks that promote equitable participation must go beyond tokenistic consultation to institutionalize deliberative processes. Stakeholders ranging from institutional decision-makers to marginalized civil society groups must be empowered with platforms that not only allow but encourage their input to influence outcomes. The effectiveness of engagement is heavily reliant on the robustness of institutional support, access to transparent tools, and continuous evaluation of the participatory process. As governance becomes increasingly complex amidst technological and societal shifts, the role of law as both an enabler and a safeguard becomes indispensable. A legally anchored participatory approach not only strengthens democratic governance but also fosters trust, accountability, and policy resilience. Moving forward, governments, civil society, and academic institutions must collaborate to refine legal norms and engagement practices, ensuring that diverse voices are genuinely heard and integrated into policy-making.

REFERENCES

1. Barabashev A, Makarov I, Zarochintcev S. How to shape government policies on high-technology development using the indicative evaluation of risks?. Administration & Public Management Review. 2022 Jan 1(38). ease
2. Kaminski ME. Regulating the Risks of AI. BUL Rev. 2023;103:1347.
3. Ongesa TN, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI. Optimizing emergency response systems in urban health crises: A project management approach to public health preparedness and response. Medicine. 2025 Jan 17;104(3):e41279.
4. Salamanca-Cano AK, Durán-Díaz P. Stakeholder engagement around water governance: 30 Years of decision-making in the Bogotá River Basin. Urban Science. 2023 Aug 10;7(3):81.
5. Adom RK, Simatele MD. The role of stakeholder engagement in sustainable water resource management in South Africa. In Natural Resources Forum 2022 Nov (Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 410-427). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
6. Dinandus H. Stakeholder. Available at SSRN 4511365. 2023 Jul 15.

7. Freeman RE, Velamuri SR. A new approach to CSR: Company stakeholder responsibility. InR. Edward Freeman's Selected Works on Stakeholder Theory and Business Ethics 2023 Sep 21 (pp. 251-264). Cham: Springer International Publishing. ssrn.com

8. Nyamboga TO, Ugwu OP, Ugwu JN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Ugwu CN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI. Biotechnological innovations in soil health management: a systematic review of integrating microbiome engineering, bioinformatics, and sustainable practices. Cogent Food & Agriculture. 2025 Dec 31;11(1):2519811.

9. Mofako Rebecca E. CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTING CAMEROON'S NDC INSIGHTS FROM THE PARIS AGREEMENT FRAMEWORK. Available at SSRN 5181225. 2025. ssrn.com

10. Ramakrishnan D. Theories of stakeholder management. Available at SSRN 3535087. 2019 Feb 24.

11. Zhang H, Xu T, Feng C. Does public participation promote environmental efficiency? Evidence from a quasi-natural experiment of environmental information disclosure in China. Energy Economics. 2022 Apr 1;108:105871.

12. .Damayanti R, Syarifuddin S. The inclusiveness of community participation in village development planning in Indonesia. Development in Practice. 2020 Jul 3;30(5):624-34.

13. Shafiei M, Rahmani M, Gharari S, Davary K, Abolhassani L, Teimouri MS, Gharesifard M. Sustainability assessment of water management at river basin level: Concept, methodology and application. Journal of Environmental Management. 2022 Aug 15;316:115201. [HTML]

14. Pluchinotta I, Pagano A, Vilcan T, Ahilan S, Kapetas L, Maskrey S, Krivtsov V, Thorne C, O'Donnell E. A participatory system dynamics model to investigate sustainable urban water management in Ebbsfleet Garden City. Sustainable Cities and Society. 2021 Apr 1;67:102709. ucl.ac.uk

15. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Medical preparedness for bioterrorism and chemical warfare: A public health integration review. Medicine. 2025 May 2;104(18):e42289.

16. Sanz-Caballero S. The concepts and laws applicable to hybrid threats, with a special focus on Europe. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 2023 Jun 29;10(1):1-8.

17. Christensen MB. Decoding China: A Handbook for Traveling, Studying, and Working in Today's China. Tuttle Publishing; 2013 Feb 26.

18. Park C, Lee J. Stakeholder framing, communicative interaction, and policy legitimacy: anti-smoking policy in South Korea. Policy Sciences. 2020 Dec;53(4):637-65.

19. Balane MA, Palafox B, Palileo-Villanueva LM, McKee M, Balabanova D. Enhancing the use of stakeholder analysis for policy implementation research: towards a novel framing and operationalised measures. BMJ global health. 2020 Nov 6;5(11).

20. Heras-Saizarbitoria I, Urbieta L, Boiral O. Organizations' engagement with sustainable development goals: From cherry-picking to SDG-washing?. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management. 2022 Mar;29(2):316-28. wiley.com

21. Haklay M, Dörler D, Heigl F, Manzoni M, Hecker S, Vohland K, Vohland K, Land-Zandstra A, Ceccaroni L, Lemmens R, Perelló J. What is citizen science? The challenges of definition. The science of citizen science. 2021;13(1):34-51. oapen.org

22. Shaukat MB, Latif KF, Sajjad A, Eweje G. Revisiting the relationship between sustainable project management and project success: The moderating role of stakeholder engagement and team building. Sustainable Development. 2022 Feb;30(1):58-75. [HTML]

23. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Sustainable development goals (SDGs) and resilient healthcare systems: Addressing medicine and public health challenges in conflict zones. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41535.

24. Pizzi S, Moggi S, Caputo F, Rosato P. Social media as stakeholder engagement tool: CSR communication failure in the oil and gas sector. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management. 2021 Mar;28(2):849-59. academia.edu

25. Alamanos A, Rolston A, Papaioannou G. Development of a decision support system for sustainable environmental management and stakeholder engagement. Hydrology. 2021 Mar 4;8(1):40.

26. Kliskey A, Williams P, Griffith DL, Dale VH, Schelly C, Marshall AM, Gagnon VS, Eaton WM, Floress K. Thinking big and thinking small: A conceptual framework for best practices in community and stakeholder engagement in food, energy, and water systems. Sustainability. 2021 Feb 17;13(4):2160. mdpi.com