



Syllabus for local coordinators training sessions on Active Methodologies

WP3 - Deliverable 3.3.1

8/11/2016





Version	1.0
WP	3
Dissemination level	Public
Deliverable lead	NOVA.ID.FCT
Authors	Lia Vasconcelos, Flávia Silva, Filipa Ferreira
Reviewers	Livia Mazzà (Fondazione Ecosistemi)
Abstract	<p>The present deliverable - D3.3.1. “Syllabus for local coordinators training sessions on Active Collaborative Methodologies” - is realized within the Task T.3.3 “Societal Active Engagement- Creation and implementation of physical urban agoras”.</p> <p>This task encompasses the training of teams, preparing them with competences in collaborative methodologies for promoting the creation of the physical urban agoras for stakeholders from various sectors to support joint development of strategies based on mutual learning in each city.</p> <p>Here, the syllabus for the structuring of the action is provided.</p>
Keywords	Collaboration, Engagement, Dialogue, Participation



The project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant Agreement No. 690047.

Disclaimer: The sole responsibility for any errors or omissions made lies with the editor. The content does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Commission. The European Commission is also not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.



Contents

1. Context	2
1.1. UrbanWINS project	2
1.2. Project work package context	2
1.3. Objective of the deliverable.....	4
2. Deliverable methodology.....	5
2.1. Theoretical approach.....	5
2.2. Syllabus: Promoting Dialogue among Multistakeholders in public governance.....	8
3. References	10



1. Context

1.1. UrbanWINS project

UrbanWINS (“Urban metabolism accounts for building Waste management Innovative Networks and Strategies”) (project no. 690047) aims to develop and test methods for designing and implementing innovative and sustainable strategic plans for waste prevention and management in various urban contexts based on innovative, interdisciplinary and participatory approaches. These will enhance urban environmental resilience and will guarantee progress towards more sustainable production and consumption patterns together with improvements in the recovery of waste and the use of recovered materials. Specifically, the development of strategic plans will be built on the basis of improved knowledge of the factors that influence the metabolism of cities and of a deep understanding of how those factors can be transformed in positive drivers of technological, non-technological and governance changes. The methods for designing and implementing innovative strategic plans for waste prevention and management will be extensively tested in 8 EU pilot cities: Cremona, Torino and two cities part of the Metropolitan City of Rome (Italy), Leiria (Portugal), Bucharest (Romania), and Manresa & Sabadell (Spain).

27 partners from 6 different countries are involved in UrbanWINS (local authorities, research bodies & universities, companies, NGOs), under the coordination of Comune di Cremona (Italy). UrbanWINS is a 36-month project and has a total budget of approx. 5 million EUR.

1.2. Project work package context

The current deliverable represents a component of WP3 - “Urban Agoras for societal transformation - waste prevention and management” that focuses on the stakeholder mapping, mobilization and engagement in a participatory process that aims to foster the emancipatory capacity building of stakeholders for waste prevention and management in the framework of urban metabolism. Thus the process developed in WP3 will be key in supporting the next activities of UrbanWINS, especially the participatory development of a Strategic Planning framework for urban waste prevention and management (WP4) and the participatory testing of the Urban Strategic Action Plans in eight pilot cities (WP5).

The main tool used for the innovative engagement of the stakeholders in the development and implementation of the waste strategies is represented by the **agoras**. The agoras are online and physical spaces where EU urban stakeholders are encouraged to meet and debate the strategic plans for waste prevention and management.



Consequently, the **specific objectives** of WP3 include:

- the creation of a participatory approach ensuring that people are effectively involved in the process of co-constructing strategic plans for waste prevention and management;
- the creation of a participatory technical capacity building of the teams through “hands on” training;
- the identification and engagement of stakeholders in the urban agoras where best waste prevention and management initiatives and tools will be debated;
- the evaluation and understanding of the level of waste prevention and management literacy of the different social actors;
- the creation of the online urban agoras for the collaborative participation of all interested EU citizens;
- the creation of the physical urban agoras for stakeholders from various sectors to support the collaborative development of strategies based on mutual learning in each city.

The involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process will allow to integrate different types of knowledge and to articulate different points of view contributing to a more representative and holistic approach. Creating such an inclusive participatory process, in which the equity among participants is assured, results in the capacity building of stakeholders and contributes to the sustainability of the process.

In order to reach its objectives, WP3 includes three **components**:

- 1) the mapping of the EU, national and regional stakeholders that will become members of the urban agoras,
- 2) the creation of the online urban agoras based on various sectoral, thematic and impact criteria, hosted by the project platform, with the main purpose of implementing a model of collaborative governance by continuously interacting with the physical urban agoras in a continuous flux of mutual feeding with the contributions of the involved stakeholders,
- 3) the creation and development of the physical urban agoras in each pilot city in order to promote the societal active engagement of the stakeholders at the local level.

WP3 will produce the following **deliverables**:

- Thematic, actor and country-oriented waste stakeholder matrixes, having the stakeholder’s categorized maps as annexes;
- Online agoras spaces that integrate the project platform including smart phone/tablet application with additional existing tools favoured by desired participants (December 2016);
- Syllabus for local coordinators training sessions on Active Collaborative Methodologies (current deliverable).





1.3. Objective of the deliverable

The present deliverable - D3.3.1. “Syllabus for local coordinators training sessions on Active Collaborative Methodologies” - is realized within the Task “T.3.3 “Societal Active Engagement- Creation and implementation of physical urban agoras”.

This deliverable reports on the methodology and program of the activities that intend to prepare the teams of the pilot cities, as well as team members of the Urban Wins project to lead operationally the physical agoras.

Therefore, it reports on the activities to be carried on to train these selected groups in collaborative methodologies promoting the genuine dialogue (Habermas, 1970, 1991) aiming at the co-construction of a joint strategy to waste management.

Beside the development of the strategies these collaborative processes, if successful, will generate social, intellectual and political capital (Gruber, 1994) key for social transformation and for sustainability.



2. Deliverable methodology

2.1. Theoretical approach

Participation emerged to “amplify the diminished voices” through the empowering of the community, sharing the idea that imposition without broad consensus leads to failure (Christie and White 2007) and the use of a bottom-up informal approach leads to success (Ansell and Gash, 2008) assuming the stakeholders a key role in the process (Berkes, 2009).

The main purpose of active participation is assuring interventive and responsible collaboration by all interested stakeholders. Strategies for collaboration have gained grounds by assuring means to address issues related to social-ecological systems, which - again - respond to the growing demand for participation. Supported by two main ideas - the “Social Exchange” and the “Network Approach” - the concept of collaboration is proven to contribute to long term social relationships, essential for long term sustainability (Nkhata et al. 2008). The central idea is to enhance relational change contributing to two types of capital: “relational capital” and “connectedness”. The amount of relational capital refers to the stock of socio-psychological attributes of social relationships, integrating two attributes: “trust” and “commitment”. The degree of connectedness refers to the social relationships and the strength of those links that mediate change in social relationships, which may be settled through bonds, activities and resources. For example, in areas of natural preservation growing social relationships is said to have a crucial role since it “gives way to conservation as relational connectedness expand and relational capital is consolidated” contributing for change from conflict-based relationships to cooperative interactions (Nkhata et al. 2008). This emergent phase is seen as the collaborative state (Nkhata et al. 2008). This can easily be extrapolated to other areas of potential conflict such as waste management.

Aarhus Convention

Environmental co-management has become a must to a growing number of specialists, and an increasing amount of legal framework directly or indirectly aims to promote it. Within this part the engagement of the civil society is encouraged as a way to assure long term sustainability. The basic idea is that to achieve sustainability it is necessary an effective, active and responsible citizenship of all.

However, part of the specialists are frustrated with the results of inadequately conducted participatory processes, and therefore considered participation a generator of societal conflicts, rather than seeing it as a contribution for the solution.

A great amount of controversy in public decision making, frequently results from the difficulty in effectively and timely integrating in the decision process the concerns and interests of those who would be directly affected by these decisions. This contributes frequently to feed the conflict and radicalize positions, making the implementation sometimes almost impossible. Other difficulties are also reported, such as, (1) the public decision process does not comply to the direct involvement of the potentially affected





populations - stakeholders involvement - since the early phases; and (2) there is resistance from the technicians who see this interference - public participation - as a challenge to their technical expertise, while politicians consider it a sharing of their invested power. A handful of myths also prevail in the political and/or technical arenas and make it difficult to integrate in the process the social decision component, restraining the possibilities to ameliorate the controversy.

At stake is the confrontation of two models of operation - the rational instrumental model and the interactive participatory model - displaying distinct roles and rules.

The issue is that citizen participation is strongly connected to the philosophy of democracy and cannot be seen detached from it. If planning is considered a political activity then some form of citizen participation appears to be necessary in a democratic state. What is a meaningful way of participation is still considered unresolved. Different scholars have different views. There is an implied assumption, among advocates of effective participation, that it increases the likelihood that public interest will be realized. Planners must have the power to propose decisions, but simultaneously have to integrate the desire and demands of citizens. Some kind of balance should be achieved. This is a problem of leadership, organization, alternatives, and systems of responsibility and confidence (Day, 1997).

The claims to adopt the participatory posture - expanded involvement of the citizen - are justified by the need to involve the users in the decision making process to assure that the proposed policies respond more adequately to the needs, account for the different types of knowledge and assure an efficient and effective implementation.

There is an implied assumption, among advocates of effective participation, that it increases the likelihood that public interest will be realized. Planners must have the power to propose decisions, but simultaneously have to integrate the desire and demands of citizens. Some kind of balance should be achieved. This is a problem of leadership, organization, alternatives, and systems of responsibility and confidence (Day, 1997).

With the 1990's deliberative turn, the theory of democracy moved from being a mere aggregation of preferences to become "*a democratic control through communication that encourages reflection upon preference without coercion*" (Dryzek, 2000). The idea is not to create more government, but to operate in a network form of organization, playing a crucial role in bringing contestation of discourses out into the open. A way to contribute to this is through the creation and structuring of forums to debate ideas and allow for interaction. This responds to the challenge raised by Bryson *et al* (1992), which we comment below.

This is of utmost importance as we live in a "no one in charge" "shared power world", where "institutions and organizations have to share objectives, activities, resources and power, or authority to make collective gains and minimize losses" (Bryson et al, 1992). Moreover, in the areas of policy and management the problems are frequently of high complexity, what Rittel and Weber (1973) even called "wicked". These problems have a multiplicity of solutions depending on the definition adopted for them, thus, the problem definition itself requires some process of consensus building. In fact, the literature suggests that the scientific model is inadequate in these cases, because it offers rules to solve problems and not to define problems, what is at stake in the decision making process



(Innes, 1990; Dryzek, 2000). Besides, one of the aspects frequently ignored in the decision process in complex contexts is that it is not exclusively technical, but includes several political options and value judgment that when not timely taken into account generates later a lot of controversy (Lake, 1987).

Meaningful Knowledge in Deliberative Settings

According to part of the literature of socio-political sciences, the reality is socially constructed (Berger and Luckmann, 1967) and the socially constructed knowledge is more influential in the decision process (Innes, 2000). This represents the constructivist perspective, assuming that “*knowledge utilization is best viewed as a process of constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing beliefs about the truth and utility of research findings*” (Dunn, 1989). Therefore, new formats of participation should be sought. These new formats, while providing the opportunity to generate social, intellectual and political capital (Innes et al, 1994; Gruber, 1994) allow for the adjustment of the participants perspective, often generating innovative solutions. To these three types of capital, some authors add the institutional capital, “systematic institutional design” (Healey, 1997), *i.e.*, the introduction of new rules and roles.

Therefore, a new challenge arises in terms of shaping the adequacy of institutionally defined processes for participation and development of shared responsibility among the different stakeholders. This calls for opening up the operational contexts, using new forms of informed and expanded stakeholders’ involvement, allowing for the integration of their values and interests, right from the beginning of the decision-making processes.

Inadequate Stakeholders Involvement

Part of the specialists assumes that participation is only a vehicle of information, and therefore, meetings can have a passive format, without deliberation and with a low interactive component. These meetings target to inform, rather to jointly build decisions.

This idea is reflected in traditional stakeholder involvement in environmental decision-making processes, which are mostly restrained to public hearings and consultation formats. These revealed to be inadequate to incorporate stakeholders’ interests and aspirations, do not assure sufficient integration of different types of knowledge to substantiate informed and consensual decision. These traditional methods are limited in contributing to the development of a sense of shared responsibility among the stakeholders on the implementation of decision.

Traditional participation in complex issues in environmental planning and management have generated substantial amount of controversy. Non-structured large numbers open meetings (with limited interaction) are usually carried out at the end of the process. When they are applied to complex issues, they lack interaction, an essential factor to settle disputes. Therefore, interactive participatory approaches might be the best way to expand stakeholder involvement in this new context allowing for interactive, structured and facilitated meeting, where stakeholder participation is inclusive, creative, and based on true dialogue (Vasconcelos, 2000).





In sum, as in any other scientific area, collaborative governance have a conceptual framework and requirements to support it and this is part of the basis to assure its success. Therefore, to create collaborative settings inclusive and promoting genuine dialogue (Habermas, 1970, 1991) requires professional facilitation namely through the training of a target group, in this case aiming specifically effective local collaborative governance.

2.2. Syllabus: Promoting Dialogue among Multistakeholders in public governance

Title: Promoting Dialogue among Multistakeholders in public governance

Part I - Introduction to Techniques and Methodologies

Part II - Experimentation and simulation of real situations

Objectives:

Prepare participants to active public participation giving the trainees of competences for the setting up spaces creating spaces of collaboration to encompass more expanded participation processes:

1. Learn and operationalize the collective work, namely in multidisciplinary teams and intra/inter institutions;
2. Acquire tools to decision making support and to coordinate entities in the joint development of strategies of action;
3. Promote knowledge in the area of negotiation and problem solving through collaborative processes;
4. Capacitation for the groups/networks dynamization and acquisition of competences to assure the multidisciplinary work of the team/group and intra/inter institutional.

Target Audience: Selected participants (2) from the different pilot cities and (if possible) at least one member of each country (a partner).

Main Trainers: Lia Vasconcelos, Ursula Caser, Flávia Silva, Filipa Ferreira.

Date: May 2017

Duration: 3 day course (15-20 hours)

Venue: Faculty of Science and Technology, New University of Lisbon (FCT NOVA) - Caparica, PORTUGAL.



Syllabus:

Part I - Introduction to Techniques and Methodologies

- **Myths** in the technical-scientific arenas, the difficulties in implementing active participation and the need to overcome them;
- **Key concepts** in collaborative processes: type of problems requiring different levels of participation; issues in communication; group processes and its dynamics;
- **Groups:** definition, identity and maturity. The role of empowerment. Value added and synergies in group work;
- **Participation, negotiation and mediation.** Pluralism and interest groups;
- **The interaction model:** win-win collaborative formats. Interests, values and positions. From the traditional model of meetings towards methodologies for consensus building;

Part II - Experimentation and simulation of real situations

- **Interactive methodologies** for the development of joint solutions (e.g. brainstorming, cloud structuring, visioning). Techniques and methodologies for professional facilitation/mediation. Settings, logistics and operationalities;
- **Simulation** a prototype of a Physical Agora.

The course will favour “hands on” and experimentation as a more efficient way for participants to acquire competences and internalize concepts essential for phasing and structuring efficient collaborative processes.



3. References

- Ansell, C., Gash, A., 2008. Collaborative governance in Theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory Advance* 18, 543e571.
- Berger, Peter L.; Luckmann, Thomas (1967). *The social construction of reality. A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Doubleday Press, USA.
- Berkes, F., 2009. Evolution of co-management: role of knowledge generation, bridging organizations and social learning. *Journal of Environmental Management* 90, 1692e1702.
- Bryson, John M; Crosby, Barbara C. (1992). *Leadership for the Common Good. Tackling problems in a shared-power world*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass
- Christie P, White A (2007) Best practices in governance and enforcement of marine protected areas: an overview. *FAO Expert Workshop on Marine Protected Areas and Fisheries Management: Review of Issues and Considerations*. FAO, Rome.
- Day, Dianne (1997). Citizen Participation in the Planning Process: An essentially contested concept? In *Journal of Planning Literature*, vol.11, n°3 (February 1997) Sage publications, Inc.
- Dryzek, John S. (2000). *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond. Liberals, Critics, Contestations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.
- Dunn, William (1989). *Reconciling Divergent Models of Research Utilization*. *Knowledge in Society: The International Journal of Knowledge Transfer*, vol 2:3, Fall 1989, pp.3-5.
- Gruber, Judith (1994). *Coordinating Growth Management through Consensus Building: Incentives and Generation of Social, Intellectual and Political Capital*. Working paper 617. April 1994. Institute of Urban and regional Development, University of California at Berkeley, USA.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1970. 'Towards a theory of communicative competence', *Inquiry*, 13 (1-4), 360-375.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1991. 'A reply', in Axel Honneth and Hans Joas, eds., *Communicative Action: Essays on Jürgen Habermas's The Theory of Communicative Action*, translated by Jeremy Gaines and Doris L. Jones, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, pp. 214-264 (first published in German in 1986).
- Healey, Patsy (1997). *Collaborative Planning. Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*. MacMillan Press.





- Innes, Judith; Booher, David (2000). Collaborative Policy Making: Governance through Dialogue. In *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, edited by M. Hajer and H. Wagenaar. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Innes, Judith; Gruber, Judith; Neuman, Michael; Thompson, Robert (1994). *Coordinating Growth and Environmental Management through Consensus Building*. Policy Research Program Report, California Policy Seminar, University of California, USA.
- Lake, Robert W. (Ed.) (1987). *Resolving Locational Conflict*. Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers - The State University of New Jersey, USA.
- Nkhata AB, Breen CM, Freimund WA (2008). Resilient social relationships and collaboration in the management of social-ecological systems. *Ecol Soc* 13:2
- Rittel, Horst W.J.; Webber, Melvin M. (1973). *Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning*. *Policy Sciences*. 4: 155-169.
- Vasconcelos, L. T. (2000). New Ways in Shapping Local Agendas - the Experience in Implementing Sustainability at the Municipal Level, ACSP Nov 2-5, 2000, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.



