

D.T1.1.1 COMMON METHODOLOGY FOR FUA- LEVEL STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AND CO-CREATION PROCESSES

Version 1
09 2019





Summary

| | |
|--|----|
| Foreword and Context | 2 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| 1.THE PROCESS (WHAT? WHEN?) | 4 |
| Stakeholder group (SG) activities and tasks..... | 4 |
| Detail of the activities involving SGs, in chronological order | 5 |
| Stakeholder Advisory Panel activities and tasks | 7 |
| Practical hints | 8 |
| 2. STAKEHOLDER MAP (WITH WHOM?)..... | 9 |
| Stakeholder group (SG) composition..... | 9 |
| Stakeholder advisory panel (SAP) composition..... | 11 |
| Practical hints | 11 |
| 3.TECHNIQUES (HOW?)..... | 12 |
| How to engage stakeholders, co-creation in CWC approach | 12 |
| Monitoring and evaluating stakeholder engagement..... | 14 |
| References..... | 15 |



Foreword and Context

The present document has been produced in the context of Interreg Central Europe project CWC, as Deliverable D.T1.1.1 of Work Package T1 “Common methodology for FUA-level stakeholder involvement and co-creation processes”, led by project partner Poliedra.

Because of the importance attributed to stakeholder groups (SGs) throughout CWC project, in particular regarding the co-creation processes, and since their involvement is foreseen through SG meetings (SGMs), the aim of the deliverable is to focus on SGMs. The role of the stakeholder advisory panels (SAPs) is also pointed out.

Other moments of stakeholder involvement, for instance the questionnaire survey to assess the public perception FUA-level water efficiency and reuse (D.T3.1.4), are faced in other deliverables.

In each FUA, the implementation of the pilots includes different degrees and typologies of participation, which are also not the object of the present deliverable, although some of the suggestions given here can be useful in those contexts as well.

The deliverable is a practical guide tailored on CWC needs. Many manuals and materials are available for a broader view about stakeholder engagement and co-creating processes (see for instance Durham et al. 2014 and Morello et al. 2018).



Introduction

CWC project was structured having in mind that stakeholder engagement is a fundamental part of any co-creation process.

We synthesise here key points (adapted from Morello et al. (2018)) of stakeholder engagement (see also Durham et al. (2014)):

- ‘Stakeholders’ are all those who have a stake in any aspect of your activities - you should think broadly about who will be affected or have an interest
- Well-planned and inclusive engagement leads to better outcomes
- Identify your stakeholders, map and prioritize them to inform the development of your engagement plan
- Engagement should be participatory, inclusive and tailored to the stakeholder group
- Make sure to regularly monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of your stakeholder engagement.

In the following, we suggest how to develop the main aspects of stakeholder engagement in each FUA.

In particular, the document is organised in three main sections.

In Section 1 -The Process- the main activities and tasks of the SGMs and SAPs are pointed out, together with the deadlines.

Section 2 -Stakeholder Map- specifies which subjects should be involved and how to map them.

In Section 3 -Techniques- methods that can support the engagement process are suggested in connection with the purpose of each individual engagement.



1. THE PROCESS (WHAT? WHEN?)

Stakeholder group (SG) activities and tasks

In each FUA, SG members take active part in the following activities:

- 5 stakeholder group meetings (SGMs)
- 1 FUA level competence building workshop (min 20 participants per WS)

The tasks to be completed by the SGs are:

- Acquire knowledge and build self-competence;
- Co-develop with the PPs local vision, strategies, action plan and concepts with an official endorsement;
- Co-design & verify local outcomes, including those related to pilot actions;
- Aid the PPs to deal with the multi-level governance aspects of circular water management in the FUA.

Furthermore, STHs, depending on their roles and possibilities:

- Apply the tools developed by the project (digital learning resources, innovative water efficiency and reuse solutions, smart governance and ICT tools) and make decisions on future applications as a direct result of the project;
- Direct future users of new tools developed by CWC;
- Help PPs in the raising awareness campaign and in the organisation of the local events;
- Support PPs in the engagement of citizens and in the diffusion of materials in order to accelerate knowledge transfer and to elaborate novel solutions;
- Help PPs in the diffusion of the questionnaire on water usage habits and attitude of citizens on water reuse;
- Cooperate with the PPs to show pilot action results to the public, in particular at the local closing public events and through thematic conferences.
- Committed and creative stakeholders or community members cooperate with the PPs in the creation of amateur videos to improve engagement and to promote pilot actions results

We synthetize here the SG roles in each WP.

WPT1

SGs, coordinated by the project partners (LP, POLIEDRA, EZVD, IDS, RERA, SAP), take part in the participatory strategy building process, they co-design and verify local outcomes through their regular meetings (5/each FUA).

SGs participate to the 1 day long local competence building workshop organized in each of the 5 FUAs in national language, to be organized after the core master training in Milan. During the workshops, the SGs will gain skills regarding water efficiency, reuse and cross-sectoral cooperation, to be used after the project closure.



WPT2

SG members provide inputs to elaborate the local pilot concepts, they define new and upgrade existing methods and tools related to circular urban usage based on their specific thematic background and experiences. These will be channelled into the CWC TCs and synthesized in the Translational Online Handbook (OT2.1). Stakeholder experts and relevant APs are involved in the preparation and implementation of the pilot actions (O.T2.2-3-4) and related investments.

WPT3

SGs contribute in each FUA to the participatory planning process building local strategies on urban circular water management (O.T3.1)

SG members, representing the target groups, based on their specific thematic background & experiences, provide supportive place-based information for local SQ assessments & public perception surveys (AT3.1), the local potential analyses (AT3.2) and take part in co-developing local visions & concepts (AT3.3).

WPTC

Committed and creative stakeholders or community members cooperate with the PPs in the creation of amateur videos to improve engagement and to promote pilot actions results (D.C.6.4).

Detail of the activities involving SGs, in chronological order

The descriptions of the 5 SGMs and of the competence building WSs are reported here in chronological order. The deliverables directly influenced by those activities are listed after each activity.

SGM1 (within 10/2019): Start of the stakeholders cooperation process

SGM1 marks the start of the SG cooperation process, introducing:

- CWC project: objectives and main actions, with focus at the local FUA level
- SG and SAP composition and roles/tasks
- Roadmap and co-working methods

Furthermore, the SG is invited to give supportive inputs for the local SQ assessment and the public perception survey.

D.T1.1.2 (10/2019) - Reports on the FUA-level SGM1

FUA-level competence building WS held for the SG (within 01/2020)

1-day long local competence building WS organised in each of the 5 participating FUAs in national language for SG members.

The WSs follow the interactive core MT session (O.T1.1) held for PPs, APs & key STHs in Milan in November 2019, and the delivery of D.T1.3.4 documenting the core MT.

The SG participates to the workshop, with SAP having a key role in local knowledge transfer. The SG give feedbacks evaluating the workshop, in order to upgrade the applied training materials into their own national language for digital learning resources (DLRs).

D.T1.4.3 (01/2020) - Feedback and evaluation reports on the FUA-level competence building WSs held for the SGs



SGM2 (within 5/2020): local visions and potential analysis, pilot concepts, tools at the project level

SGM2 is organised (linked to the local competence building WS) to co-develop local visions, discuss and provide inputs for the local potential analysis (WPT3) & pilot concepts, and to the tools to be jointly developed on project level (WPT2).

SGs co-create initial local documents paving the way to create the CWC strategies by setting the objectives, place-based targets and directions for circular urban water use.

D.T1.1.3 (05/2020) - Reports on the FUA-level SGM2

D.T3.3.2 (06/2020) - FUA-level collaborative visions on circular urban water use, based on the documents drafted during SGM2

SGM3 (within 9/2020): updates, inputs for local strategic concept

The SGs discuss the actual status of pilot implementation & get informed on the mentoring & peer visits (WPT2) and on the potential analysis results, and provide inputs for drafting the local strategic concept (WPT3).

The SGs co-create inputs to draft documents identifying the main steps needed to improve municipal background conditions in terms of organisational, cooperation, financial and attitude changing capacities (D.T3.3.3).

D.T1.1.4 (09/2020) - Reports on the FUA-level SGM3

D.T3.3.3 (01/2021) - FUA-level concepts on creating enabling frameworks for integrated circular urban water management, based on the documents drafted during SGM3

SGM4 (within 5/2021): pilots evaluation and learning, inputs for FUA level action plan and national policy recommendations

SGs co-evaluate local pilot achievements, learn on other pilots' results, and outline possible FUA-level cross-adaptations and follow-up interventions (WPT2).

In addition, they contribute to design the FUA-level action plan and strategy outlining desired interventions to utilize RW & WW, and give suggestions for national policy recommendations (WPT3).

D.T1.1.5 (05/2021) - Reports on the FUA-level SGM4

D.T2.7.1 (05/2021) - Final self-evaluation reports on pilot implementation with upscaling plans

D.T3.4.3 (06/2021) - National level policy recommendation discussion papers in EN and national languages

D.T3.2.5 (08/2021) - FUA-level draft targeted Action Plans (AP)

SGM5 (within 9/2021): updates, strategies, Online Handbook

SGs get informed on national policy roundtable achievements, they take part in finalising the FUA-level strategies (WPT3, OT3.1) identifying local policy measures fostering urban CW use & finalized targeted action plans (based on DT3.2.5) to realize specific interventions.

They get acquainted with the Online Handbook and they contribute to customizing the national language version (WPT2).



D.T1.1.6 (09/2021) - Reports on the FUA-level SGM5

D.T3.3.4 (10/2021) - FUA-level CWC strategies (OT3.1) on integrated circular urban water management incl. targeted action plans

D.T2.1.6 (01/2022) - Tailored CWC online handbooks in national languages

Stakeholder Advisory Panel activities and tasks

SAP members take part to all the activities of their SG.

Furthermore, SAP members are involved in identifying specific national capacity needs & adapting the DLR (OT1.2) to national languages. They also play a key role in local knowledge transfer processes and actively support PPs by cooperating with external trainers in delivering a FUA-level competence building workshop for the SG (OT1.2). They will provide apt thematic input and also act as facilitators/moderators of the regular SG meetings.

In addition, two SAP members for each FUA are expected to participate to the Core Master Training (MT) organized in Milan by Poliedra in November 2019 (O.T1.1), linked to TTM1.

SAPs members, as well as all the other participants, give feedback on the MT in order to constitute the basis to upgrade and develop training materials (TMs) into a comprehensive Digital Learning Resource (DLR) applicable by any CE public authority also beyond PPship.

The MT will be followed by 1 day long local competence building WSs organized in the 5 participating FUAs (1 in each) in national language for SG members, by PPs responsible for coordinating local STH involvement processes (FCSM, Poliedra, EZVD, ISD, RERA), with SAPs having a key role in local knowledge transfer.

The deliverables directly influenced by SAPs activities are listed here.

Deliverable D.T1.3.4

Feedback and evaluation report on the core Master Training held for PPs, APs and SAP members

The report includes participants' evaluation to be used for upgrading the TMs into the comprehensive DLR.

Deliverable D.T1.4.1

FUA-level demand assessments on the key place-based training paths

Report on the result of scanning regional/national competence building needs in light of the target groups' actual knowledge, capabilities & priorities, and the FUA-level SQ assessments (D.T3.1.5). Each co-developed by local PPs and the SAPs.

Deliverable D.T2.1.5

Content design of the online Handbook's tailored national versions relying on needs assessment conducted to prepare the TMs, FUA-level strategy & national policy assessment of the given PP countries, elaborated by PPs with the involvement of SAPs.



Practical hints

A template for the SGM1 report is provided in *Annex 1*. In the template, you find in red illustrative answers that will have to be changed according to the specific FUA process. At least one month before the deadline of each SGM report, Poliedra will send to the project partners the pertinent report template. As the project progresses, we could like to adjust something, or at least we will be able to be more specific. Preparing the template closer to the report deadline will allow to keep all this into consideration.



2. STAKEHOLDER MAP (WITH WHOM?)

Stakeholder group (SG) composition

Building the CWC project, the main categories of stakeholders that should be considered in each FUA were analysed. In the AF, the following target groups were individuated and prioritized as those that should be part of the SG. A target value, in terms of number of people the CWC project aims to actively involve, was also fixed. In order to have an estimate of the number of subjects that should be part of each SG, we divided the target value by 5 (number of FUAs implementing pilot cases and having a SG). As a result, in italic you find a “FUA target”; of course you cannot have 1.6 stakeholders representing regional level authorities or 2.2 representing sectoral agencies, but these values give us a useful rough indication. Altogether, each SG should be composed by 20-35 people.

A check should be done at the FUA level, eventually involving some of the stakeholders already identified, to be sure that no relevant stakeholder is left out, and eventually add some subjects to the SG.

Local public authority

Neighbouring local authorities, most of all municipalities within the same FUA, but also others especially if facing challenges of urban flooding or water scarcity, to aid co-producing local outcomes.

Target value = 20

FUA target = 4

Regional public authority

Regional level authorities (e.g. councils, sectoral departments in charge of environment, water management and spatial planning) to tackle the multi-level governance aspects of circular water usages.

Target value = 8

FUA target = 1.6

Sectoral agency

Environmental, water, energy and regional agencies as well as geological surveys.

Target value = 11

FUA target = 2.2

Infrastructure and (public) service provider **key members**

Public companies (mostly owned by municipalities) in charge of (fresh)water and sewage management systems, as well as further public utilities are key members of the SGs in all FUAs, being important direct future users of new tools developed by CWC.

Target value = 15

FUA target = 3



Interest groups including NGOs *key target groups*

NGOs and institutes will be key target groups of CWC and active members in all SGs, such as institutes for environment, innovation, sustainable development, infrastructure and water development/management.

Target value = 20

FUA target = 4

Higher education and research

Universities will be invited to accelerate knowledge transfer and elaborate novel solutions within the SGs. Relevant faculties will be those of e.g. civil, chemical, biotechnical, geodetic engineering, urban and landscape planning and economics.

Target value = 12

FUA target = 2.4

General public

The general public is represented through actively involved community members (e.g. neighbourhood groups, students) in the co-working processes of the SGs (5 ppl/FUA) and communication activities e.g. shooting amateur promo movies linked to the pilots.

Target value = 25

FUA target = 5

SMEs

SMEs active in water industry, landscaping and social innovation will be involved in the SGs and will take important roles in the pilot actions developed under the project.

Target value = 15

FUA target = 3

For the FUAs of the countries specified below, the following typologies of subjects should also be involved in the SG.

HU, SI, PL:

Education/training centre and school

PPs of 3 FUAs, resp. Zugló and MBVOD/EZVD seek to invite representatives from kindergartens, primary schools and secondary schools to their SGs. ISD and Bydgoszcz involve various training and education centres related to environment and agriculture.

Target value = 18,00

6 HU, 6 SI, 6PL



HU, SI, IT:

Large enterprises

PPs from 3 FUAs, resp. Zugl6, Turin and MBVOD will seek to invite larger companies to their SGs, made out of e.g. construction and manufacturing companies, banks and companies dealing with social innovation.

Target value = 6

2 HU, 2 SI, 2 IT

Stakeholder advisory panel (SAP) composition

Few members of the SG, as much as possible representative of the SG, will constitute the **Stakeholder Advisory Panel (SAP)**. SAP members are committed to the project, at least at the local/national level. They are key experts actively cooperating during the whole project in generating the outputs, transferring the knowledge, and managing the SGs

There is not strict rule about the number of SAP members; given the high level of involvement required, **5 people** can be considered a reasonable target.

Practical hints

In order to better understand your SG, we suggest to synthesize the information regarding each stakeholder specifying the following data:

Stakeholder name: ...

Target group (e.g. local public authority, general public, infrastructure provider, SME): ...

Institution/Organization/Company: ...

Specific role of the stakeholder within the organization (e.g. director of the water management department, biology teacher): ...

Main competencies typology of the stakeholder: technical and/or administrative and/or political: ...

Territorial coverage, when applicable (e.g. FUA, municipality, metropolitan city): ...

Reason for engagement: ...

Using this information, it will be useful to generate a table as the following one, in order to check the completeness of the SG.

| Stakeholder name | Target group | Main competencies typology | Territorial coverage |
|------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |



3. TECHNIQUES (HOW?)

How to engage stakeholders, co-creation in CWC approach

A key factor in successful stakeholder management is tailoring the content, scope and focus to the interests and priorities of the stakeholders. It is important to understand what CWC is seeking to achieve and how stakeholders can be involved in that process.

We give here examples of techniques that can support the co-creation process, at its different stages.

Opening Out techniques can be used for opening up a dialogue and gathering views from stakeholders about issues linked to the NBS and is usually applied to the development and initial co-implementation of the project.

- Methods used can include brainstorming, listing ideas, using Venn diagrams, and carousels.
- Other creative participatory methods can include: community/asset mapping; accompanied walks; participatory video and photo voice activities; and play/artistic approaches for children.

Exploring techniques will allow you to explore and critique your approach and findings.

- Methods can include mind-maps, problem tree analysis and SWOT analysis. Some of the Opening Up techniques can also be useful for these purposes.

Closing Down and Deciding techniques can be used to start closing down options and deciding upon actions.

- Methods include voting, ranking, prioritisation exercises and multi-criteria decision modelling.
- Other participatory methods can include citizen juries/ panels and the Delphi method

Although most of the methods listed here could be used in different moments for the SGMs, some of them clearly don't fit in that context, for instance "play/artistic approaches for children". We wanted to include them to take into account also the participatory processes connected to the pilots implementation (for instance the integrated RW harvesting and GW reuse technology in a kindergarten in Budapest 14-Zugló), which could eventually benefit from such techniques.

At each stage, each FUA will need to identify the methods that best suit the project, the specific objective to be pursued in that moment, and the stakeholder group.

Furthermore, while it can be useful to adopt and include participatory techniques, this does not mean that such approaches should be used to the exclusion of traditional information and consultation techniques. Surveys and structured interviews, for instance, may remain a highly effective method for understanding the views of a large and representative sample of the local community or of a group involved in an activity. The results and implications of such research can then be built upon through more participatory methods.

Within the CWC project, a **questionnaire survey** will be used to assess the public perception FUA-level water efficiency and reuse (D.T3.1.4); a specific guideline about this will be issued in D.T3.1.2. We suggest to use questionnaire surveys also to get a first feedback and evaluation of the Core Master Training (MT)



and FUA-level competence building workshops (WSs). Poliedra will prepare the questionnaire for the MT, and that will then constitute the basis for the questionnaires for the WSs, customized in each FUA.

In picking methods of engagement, it is important to consider the context and time and budget constraints, as well as the diversity, needs and preferences of your group to ensure their meaningful participation. There are also a growing number of digital tools (see, for example, (Parks, D'Angelo, & Gunashekar, 2018)) which allow to seek stakeholder input and help to make decisions collaboratively online. These digital tools are probably not the best tools to be used for SGMs management, but could eventually be used for a broader stakeholder engagement. Often, however, these tools can lead to the exclusion of important stakeholder groups and hence should be used with caution. It is important to both identify who your groups are, and to devise engagement strategies which are tailored to their needs and preferences, helping to overcome barriers to participation.

Guide to participatory techniques:

You can learn more about many of the techniques by following the hyperlinks below

Guides to Opening Out techniques:

- [Brainstorming](#) - (Mind Tools, 2018a)
- [Venn diagrams](#) - (DHHS, n.a.)
- [Carousels](#) - (Stix, 2012)
- [Community/Asset mapping](#) - (Preston City Council, 2017)
- [Participatory video](#) - (Insight Share, 2006)
- [Photo voice](#) (Velea & Alexandru, 2017)
- [Artistic approaches for children](#) (Kleine, Pearson, Poveda, 2016)

Guides to Exploring techniques:

- [Mind-maps](#)- (Mind Tools, 2018b)
- [Problem-tree analysis](#) -(ODI, 2009)

Guides to Closing Down and Deciding techniques:

- [Multi-criteria decision modelling](#) - (DCLG, 2009)
- [Citizen Juries/Panels](#) - (NCCPE, n.a.)
- [The Delphi Method](#) - (Grime & Wright, 2016)



Monitoring and evaluating stakeholder engagement

Monitoring and evaluation are very important in ensuring that your mechanisms for stakeholder mapping and engagement are effective and have the intended impact. Different methods can be used for this (e.g. Theory of change). We propose here a simple approach. As Durham et al. (2014) state, the evaluation process needs to consider:

1. Are the goals of the engagement process being met?
2. How is the engagement process running? What has worked well and what needs improving?
3. What impact has the process had?

The answers to the first two questions can constitute a paragraph of each report on the SGMs (D.T1.1.2, D.T1.1.3, D.T1.1.4, D.T1.1.5, and D.T1.1.6), see for instance *Annex 1*, template for the SGM1 report. The answer to question 3. can be part of the opening of each SGM, except obviously for the first one.

If the answers show that the process is not running well, and/or the results are not those expected, an analysis of the reasons why this is happening should be done, to find out possible solutions to improve the process. Such analysis and the individuated solutions should also be reported.



References

Center for Theory of Change, (n.a.) What is Theory of Change? Retrieved from <https://www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/>

DCLG. (2009). Multi-criteria analysis: a manual. London: Department for Communities and Local Government. Retrieved from http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/12761/1/Multi-criteria_Analysis.pdf

DHHS. (n.a.). Stakeholder Analysis (Venn Diagrams). Retrieved from https://www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0019/85132/Stakeholder_Analysis_Venn_Diagrams.pdf

Durham, E., Baker, H., Smith, M., Moore, E., & Morgan, V. (2014). BiodivERsA Stakeholder Engagement Toolkit. Paris. Retrieved from <http://www.biodiversa.org/stakeholderengagement>

Grime, M., & Wright, G. (2016). Delphi Method. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305909817_Delphi_Method

Insight Share. (2006). Insights into Participatory Video: A Handbook for the Field. Retrieved from <https://insightshare.org/resources/insights-into-participatory-video-a-handbook-for-the-field/>

Kleine, D., Pearson, G., Poveda, S. (2016). METHOD GUIDE 8 Participatory methods: Engaging children's voices and experiences in research. Retrieved from <http://globalkidsonline.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Guide-8-Participatory-methods-Kleine-Pearson-Poveda.pdf>

Mind Tools. (2018a). Brainstorming Generating Many Radical, Creative Ideas. Retrieved from <https://www.mindtools.com/brainstm.html>

Mind Tools. (2018b). Mind Maps ® A Powerful Approach to Note-Taking. Retrieved from https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newISS_01.htm

Morello, E; Mahmoud, I; Gulyurtlu, S; Boelman, V; Davis, H (2018). CLEVER Cities Guidance on co-creating nature-based solutions: PART I - Defining the co-creation framework and stakeholder engagement. Deliverable 1.1.5, CLEVER Cities, H2020 grant no. 776604.

NCCPE. (n.a.). Panels and user groups. Retrieved from <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/do-engagement/choose-method/consultation/panels-and-user-groups>

ODI. (2009). Planning tools: Problem Tree Analysis. Retrieved from <https://www.odi.org/publications/5258-problem-tree-analysis>



Parks, S., D'Angelo, C., & Gunashekar, S. (2018). Citizen science: generating ideas and exploring consensus. (R. EUROPE, Ed.). Cambridge, UK: The Healthcare Improvement Studies Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.thisinstitute.cam.ac.uk/using-citizen-science-to-generate-ideas-andbuild-consensus-explored-in-new-report/>

Preston City Council. (2017). The Community Mapping Toolkit. Retrieved from <https://www.preston.gov.uk/yourservices/neighbourhoods-and-community/community-mapping-toolkit/>

Stix, A. (2012). Stix Pix for the interactive classroom. Retrieved from http://www.andistix.com/carousel_brainstorming

Velea, S., & Alexandru, M. (2017). *PhotoVoice_Connector*. Retrieved from https://www.erasmusplus.ro/library/files/Ghiduri_CConnector_2017/PhotoVoice_Connector_2017.pdf