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Exploring the design of participatory and transformative research, and research on participatory transformation

Workshop

Nils Ferrand\textsuperscript{ab}, Wanda Aqua-Gaudi\textsuperscript{c}

\textsuperscript{a} INRAe, UMR GEAU; \textsuperscript{b} INRIA, STEEP; \textsuperscript{c} UMR/JRU G-EAU

\textsuperscript{c} Wanda aka. Emeline Hassenforder, Patrice Garin, Géraldine Abrami, Bruno Bonté, Raphaele Ducrot, Sylvie Morardet, Benjamin Noury, Julie Latune, Eva Perrier, Sarah Loudin, Patrice Robin, Laura Seguin, Julien Burte, Rémi Lombard-Latune, Caroline Lejars, Olivier Barreteau, Mélaine Aucante,
Agenda

• Introduction Lorenn / Ned (5 mins)
• Framing questions & sharing them (15 mins)
• Key issues / pathways & ENCORE evaluative framework (10 mins)
• Self-assessment on ENCORE targets (10 mins)
• PrePar protocol on developing a transformative research for your case studies (1h10)
• Mutual feedback of small groups and mutual evaluation discussion with ENCORE (15 mins)
• Final discussion and open time afterwards for going further
Initial questions + sharing answers (15 mins)

a. How does / can citizens’ participation contribute to your research? What would you expect from it?

b. How does / can your research contribute to citizens’ engagement in decision, action, transformation in favor of better futures?

c. Quote 2 or 3 (max) strong challenges or issues to be addressed for participation & research.

d. Do you have a specific application case study you’d like to see discussed?
Background & design context

- French public research unit (Montpellier), multi-disciplinary, specialized in water management & governance, working internationally (20 years + AU ties!)
  - Focus on engineering participatory methods
- Supporting public action with governments, NGOs, CBOs, agencies
- A 25y action-research on complex systems management (origin in A.I. 90s’ multi-agent models) with / by / for their stakeholders, incl. citizens, through participatory modeling
- A focus on autonomous adaptation and reflexive steering
- Combining physical and digital methods
- An ethical perspective on tools & intervention
Rationales

→ Supporting all stakeholders, from communities’ members (smallholders) to the “top” policy makers in discussing and engaging together into change strategies

→ Improving sustainability of the change pathway (decision and action) by reducing external interventions and incentives, and fostering self-conduct, social norming and local institutionalization → Autonomy

→ Developing a science, engineering capacity and a toolkit for “recoupling” levels, stakes, sectors, actors, methods

→ Monitoring and evaluating processes and socio-political impacts

http://cp.Watagame.info
Decision-making steps

PREPARE PARTICIPATION

DIAGNOSIS

SCENARIO EXPLORATION

DEFINITION OF OBJECTIVES AND PREFERENCES

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIONS AND PLANS

CHOICE, PRIORISATION AND VOTE

IMPLEMENTATION

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Citizen’s perspective

We will respect our own rules

We know what is happening around us

Now we understand the big picture

We know what we want

We, too, have good proposals to make

in democracy, our voice count

Let’s do it!

Participatory tools

PrePar
Preparing design of the decision process

Rock
Observing the river

Smag
Establishing a territorial diagnosis

Wat-A-Game
Modeling & role-playing-games

Just-A-Grid
Discussing justice principles

Coopplan
Building action plans

Encore-Me
Evaluating impacts

Ex. in Uganda (2012-2014)
Help modeling… whatever is worth representing, discussing and changing for / by participants.

Since 2006:

Integrated management plans (2006)

Historically: Socio-ecological systems (> 180 case studies !)

(past) Governance (2017)

(target) Participatory Governance (2016)
Critical design of participatory research vs. research on participatory transition methods

Both are designed and steered by researchers, but…

- **Who / what initiates the research?**
- **What is the expected outcome or impact by the researchers?**
  - New knowledge about an existing system engaging the participants
  - New knowledge about a process induced by the researcher her-him-self
    - Target an impact and evaluate its reaching
- **What is the perceived goal of the process by the participants?**
  - Satisfy the (scientific) needs of the researchers, and of “The Science”
  - Explore alternative social and technical settings as possible solutions
  - Obtain a personal or collective or social benefit (incl. socialization)
- **How is it monitored and evaluated?**

⇒ *Evaluative / reflexive steering of the process*
e.g. **Natural Resource Management in Africa (FP7 Afromaison 2011-2014)**

**Fogera (Ethiopia)**

Agriculture intensification and soil degradation in uncertain land tenure context

- Procedural agreement
- Focal issue
- Actions identification
- Planning
- Role-playing game
- Implementation plan

**Rwenzori (Uganda)**

Proposal and validation of INRM plan in context of overexploitation of land and resources

- Co-design the process itself
- Share equity preferences
- Propose actions
- Build and assess integrated strategies
- Build own model
- Simulate new actions and norms

Source: E. Hassenforder, 2015
Multi-stakeholders process, coupling levels, tools (Uganda)

Source: E. Hassenforder 2015
COOPLAN: confronting heterogenous actions and strategies at all levels
Uganda– 2013

27 communities strategies

+ 3 meso-level strategies

Proposed regional INRM strategy
## Final draft INRM strategy (soft version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Regional / national</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Energy-saving stoves</td>
<td>P Information sharing and documentation</td>
<td>P Enforcement of laws and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>m-u</strong> Energy-saving technology at NM level (solar &amp; biogas)</td>
<td>P Education</td>
<td>P Pet means of preventing animals destroying crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AC</strong> Tree planting</td>
<td>AC Tree planting</td>
<td>P Harmonize working relationship between gated areas and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u Tree nursery beds</td>
<td>AC Tree nursery beds</td>
<td>P A sense of ownership by policy makers about NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m Conservation methods of farming + organic farming / Better methods of agriculture</td>
<td>P Reporting environmental encroachers to relevant authorities</td>
<td>P Environmental Monitoring, reports = independent body at regional level to look into environmental and natural resource issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d P Control pollution of soil/water/air</td>
<td>P Community by-laws on sustainable NRM (formulation &amp; enforcement)</td>
<td>P Mass sensitization about NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d P Mutual information sharing and documentation</td>
<td>P Sensitization about NRM + extension of the game</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d PL Forest planning</td>
<td>P Demonstration centre and plots</td>
<td>P Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-d D Forest planning</td>
<td>D Vegetable growing</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-d P Food crop / vegetable growing</td>
<td>D Fruit growing</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-d W Water harvesting</td>
<td>D Water harvesting</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-r P Pig farming</td>
<td>D Pig farming</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-r B Bee keeping</td>
<td>D Bee keeping</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u A Community members to construct terraces</td>
<td>D Community members to construct terraces</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u A Coffea growing</td>
<td>D Coffea growing</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u A Kitchen gardens</td>
<td>D Vegetable growing</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-d L Sensitization on and proper disposal of non biodegradable materials</td>
<td>D Fruit growing</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-d A Nursery beds</td>
<td>D Nursery beds</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m AC Agroforestry</td>
<td>D Agroforestry</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m A Eucalyptus growing</td>
<td>D Eucalyptus growing</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m A Tea growing</td>
<td>D Tea growing</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m C Proper soil and water conservation</td>
<td>D Water harvesting</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m u W Rain water harvesting for domestic use</td>
<td>D Rain water harvesting for domestic use</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-d E Erosion</td>
<td>D Erosion</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m E Energy-saving stoves</td>
<td>D Energy-saving stoves</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m L Proper waste management</td>
<td>D Proper waste management</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m L Ecosan toilets</td>
<td>D Ecosan toilets</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m E Energy-saving stoves</td>
<td>D Energy-saving stoves</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m L Proper waste management</td>
<td>D Proper waste management</td>
<td>P Policies on family planning - population growth control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Are on the final picture of the regional strategy (meaning the "action implementation sheets" have been made*)

---

nils.ferrand@inrae.fr
E.N.C.O.R.E. : coupled dimensions of change for a target group (Ferrand, le Bars, 2004)

- External: external (to the group) change in sustainability
  - Environmental / Political / Economical
- Normative: changing participants’ values and preferences
- Cognitive: changing participants’ representations and beliefs
- Operational: changing participants’ practices and actions, within and outside the group and process
- Relational: changing participants’ social relationships
- Equity: changing the social justice’ regime (distribution of resources, equity) among participants and outside

A generic framework to observe and describe multi-dimensional change, but not to prescribe (non-normative).
An overall approach of M&E (Hassenforder, 2015)

(Based on Ferrand & Daniell, 2006; Beierle & Cayford, 2002; Midgley et al., 2013; Ostrom, 2005; Sabatier, 1988)
M&E Frameworks
(Hassenforder, 2015)

DESCRIPTIVE FRAMEWORK
COPP = Comparison of Participatory Processes

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK
MEPPP = M&E of Participatory Planning Processes

ANNEX 1: Framework application template

A. Context-related characteristics

A1. What are the system elements the participatory process targets to improve?
(Multiple options can be chosen □)
- Natural / Environmental: e.g. water, forests, wetlands
- Economic: e.g. labor, import-export
- Social: e.g. livelihoods, migration
- Political: e.g. votes, policies
- Urban: e.g. infrastructures, housing
- Health: e.g. facilities, equipment
- Technological: e.g. internet
- Educational: e.g. curriculum, classes

A2. Which levels of governance are critical influencers of the target system elements?
(Multiple options can be chosen □)
- Macro (national or larger)
- Meso (subnational)
- Micro (village or group of villages)

A3. Have there been previous intervention attempts aiming to influence the selected target system elements?
- Many
- Few
- None

A4. What relationships existed between participants before the participatory process started?
- No pre-existing relationship
- High degree of mistrust / conflict
- Moderate trust and conflict
- Good pre-existing relationships and trust

MONITORING & EVALUATION VIEWPOINT

CONTEXT
- Environmental changes
- Organizational / institutional context
- Technological changes
- Institutional context

PARTICIPATORY PLANNING PROCESS
- Access to information and expertise
- Participation / representation
- Independence
- Legitimacy / credibility
- Influence / impact
- Transparency
- Strategic decisions / decisions / for prioritizing
- Timing of involvement of the various stakeholders
- Feedback in expression
- Consensus
- Negotiation / willingness of the process
- Transferability
- Scale

OUTPUTS / OUTCOMES
NORMATIVE / DECISIONAL
- Normative and decisional outputs / inputs
- Monitoring and evaluation system: the actions / social / environmental system (including newsletters, monitoring teams and feedback)
- Mobilizing mechanisms
- Conflict resolution mechanisms

OPERATIONAL
- Behavior / practice / actions
- Capacity to act
- Mobilization of actions, actual behavior and time between the two

RELATIONAL
- Mobilization of stakeholders / organizations, groups
- Institutional
- Strategic / learning (above oneself and others)
- Authority / power
- Frequency of ties
- Multi-scale

SUGGESTED SCALES
- Socialization / novelty
M&E methods

**EX-ANTE**
- Baseline studies
- Document review
- Stakeholder analysis
- Interviews

**EX-POST**
- Interviews

**PUNCTUAL**
- Attendance lists
- Pictures and videos
- Interviews
- Expectations
- Participant observation
- Questionnaires

**LONG TERM**
- Regular contacts with the team and key stakeholders

**PERMANENT**
- Logbook

Workshops:
- Workshop 1: April 2012
- Workshop 2: August 2012
- Workshop 3: January 2013
- Workshop 4: July 2013
A global M&E approach

PERMANENT (everyday)

Logbook 1: Overall process
- Tracking all standardised interventions, sessions, interactions, events, operational change, and other internal or contextual factors

- 3 forms/files:
  - Events
  - Participants
  - Participants/Events

Logbook 2: Local scale process
- For entering all the local documents related to the local sessions

- 4 forms/files:
  - Monitoring tables
  - Rapporteur debriefing sheet
  - Facilitator debriefing sheet
  - Simple questionnaire

PUNCTUAL MESO & LOCAL scales

- Pictures and videos
- Attendance list
- Monitoring tables
  - Expectations
  - Interviews

PUNCTUAL MESO scale
- By researcher
  - Participant observation
- By Facilitators
  - Thorough Questionnaires

PUNCTUAL LOCAL scale
- By rapporteurs (local observers)
  - Participant observation
- By Facilitators
  - Facilitator debriefing sheet
- Simple Questionnaires

Transfer to researchers via logbook 2
- Pictures and videos of the documents
Self-Assessment with ENCORE framework

For your preferred case study / research situation with participation:

- What are the anticipated / possible changes throughout the process?
  - in External / Normative / Cognitive / Operational / Relational / Equity terms
    - Please include also “negative” changes / risks

- Among them, which ones are expected vs. feared, by:
  - the researcher(s) (you & others)?
  - the participants?

- Can you qualify these changes as research topic, goal or side effect?
CoOPLAaGE decision steps & tools

7 DECISION STEPS

PREPARATION

DIAGNOSIS

EXPLORATION OF SCENARIOS

OBJECTIVES, VALUES, PREFERENCES

ACTIONS & PLANS

CHOICE, PRIORITIZATION, VOTE

IMPLEMENTATION

MONITORING & EVALUATION

Participatory process planning

Gouvernance diagnosis

SES models and simulation

Strategic planning

Values ad distributive justice

© emeline.hassenforder@cirad.fr, 2019
Pre-Participation
Let them decide their own participation’ program and rules

- Participation / decision procedures are usually decided « from the top » and imposed (tentatively) to participants

→ A deliberation on decision process, roles and rules
Deciding roles and methods for participatory transition processes

1. (participatory) stakeholders analysis: who?
2. Deciding procedural needs (steps, stages, ...)
3. Discussing roles and engagement
4. Choosing (participatory) methods for each step: how?
5. Discussing regulation, litigation, risks
6. Commitment
Pre-requisite: addressing decision steps

- PrePar phase 1 → participants discuss Decision Steps and assess the required « intensity » of participation

70 Part. methods referenced over a set of ~1000
PrePar phase 2: co-designing participation plan

Deciding and organizing participatory activities to get a final engagement plan, with all roles and actions
e.g. Tunisian governance adaptation

Supporting multi-level participatory process design in Tunisia
Engineering governance: process & structure
Your task with PrePar → design the actors’ engagement procedure in the research

1. Choose (quickly) a shared case study by small groups
2. Remind & share the research question(s)
3. Read & share the ENCORE changes you worked out previously
4. List the actors’ categories - max 8 (incl. e.g. researchers, facilitators, types of participants, policy makers, impacted but not included, etc)
5. List the sequence of needs or goals, step after step in the participatory process, starting from the design phase
6. Build a cross-table actors (vertical)-staged goals (as follows)
7. For each staged goal, propose one or more (participatory) action to achieve it
8. In column, for each action specify each actor’s role or commitment:
   Organizer, pilot / Active, primary contributor / Passive, follower, listener / (___) non present
9. Add at the bottom any product, outcome, artefact, result expected from action
# PrePar Matrix

## Staged goals / stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTORS</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion / discussion

Please discuss your analysis with another group and comment your analysis.

1. How would you now define participation in research and research on participation and transformation?
2. What are the new questions emerging for you?

And welcome for any other discussion.

Thank you!