####From the readings for this week, what are the different types of knowledge that can be brought to the table in co-management situations?

Local knowledge- Knowledge of local level systems and government.

Indigenous knowledge- Knowledge of different community types in a co-management situation.

Scientific knowledge- Knowledge of co-management situations from a scientific perspective.

Nonscientific knowledge- Knowledge of a co-management situation from a regulatory level.

Social science information - Knowledge of a co-management situation from a social perspective.

####And why are bringing these different types of knowledge together difficult?

It is difficult to bring these different types of knowledge together because each of the knowledge types requires a different perspective. Most people can only really argue with a few perspectives, and it is difficult to have all stakeholders view the conflict in the same perspective.

####What are the different types of knowledge in your case study that would be brought together if co-management / negotiations were to occur?

The different types of knowledge in my case study would be:

Scientific knowledge- The residents of Gainesville for the straw ban believe they have enough scientific evidence to prove that a straw ban would be effective. Is there were co-management negotiations then it might be clear from all stakeholders about the scientific research that has been concluded about single use plastic straws and what happens when there is a ban.

Social science information - The residents of Gainesville against the straw ban, do not have scientific knowledge to back up their disapproval but they are using a social science perspective. If co-management negotiations were to occur it would give a chance for this group to really impress on the other stakeholders about their concerns.

Overall, I do think crossing of the integration of knowledge systems would be beneficial to all stakeholders in my case study.

####What was different in this project (Fishsmart reading) to guarantee stakeholder support that is different from common practice?

What was different about the Fishsmart reading was that the stakeholder groups was at the center of the process. Members of the group were responsible for developing objectives for the fishery. The group also played a role in evaluating how to respond to the results from the simulation model. Normally, stakeholders groups are not that involved, especially in the evaluation process. This co-management was successful because the stakeholder had more say in the policy options and objectives.