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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}

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

c. \textit{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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making steps</th>
<th>Citizen’s perspective</th>
<th>Participatory tools</th>
<th>Ex. in Uganda (2012-2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREPARE</td>
<td>We will respect our own rules</td>
<td>PrePar  Preparing design of the decision process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>We know what is happening around us</td>
<td>Rock  Observing the river</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAGNOSIS</td>
<td>We know what we want</td>
<td>Smag  Establishing a territorial diagnosis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCENARIO EXPLORATION</td>
<td>Now we understand the big picture</td>
<td>Wat-A-Game  Modeling &amp; role-playing-games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITION OF OBJECTIVES AND</td>
<td>We, too, have good proposals to make</td>
<td>Just-A-Grid  Discussing justice principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFERENCES</td>
<td>In democracy, our voice count</td>
<td>Cooplan  Building action plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIONS</td>
<td>Let’s do it!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND PLANS</td>
<td>Are we getting there?</td>
<td>Encore-Me  Evaluating impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE, PRIORITISATION AND VOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Help modeling… whatever is worth representing, discussing and changing for / by participants

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

Since 2006:

Integrated management plans (2006)

(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**
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

Example: outstanding strategy
And... YES! It's implemented.

Strategy Household Short Term (ordered)
- Energy-saving stoves
- Adopt energy-saving technology at HH level (solar & biogas)
- Tree planting
- Tree nursery beds
- Irrigation
- Conservation methods of farming + organic farming / better methods of agriculture
- Control pollution of soil/water/air
- Mutual Information sharing and documentation
- Family planning
Uganda – 2013

27 communities strategies

+ 3 meso-level strategies

Proposed regional INRM strategy
### Household

- **Energy-saving stoves**
- **Tree planting**
- **Tree nursery beds**
- **Conservation methods of farming + organic farming / Better methods of agriculture**
- **Control pollution of soil/water/air**
- **Mutual Information sharing and documentation**
- **Farming family planning**
- **Food crop / vegetable growing**
- **Semi-cultivated areas**
- **Water harvesting**
- **Fishery**
- **Boat keeping**
- **Community members to construct terraces**
- **Coffe growing**
- **Kitchen gardens**
- **Sanitation on and proper disposal of non-biodegradable materials**
- **Nursery beds**
- **Agroforestry**
- **Eucalyptus growing**
- **Tea growing**
- **Proper soil and water conservation**
- **Rain water harvesting for domestic use**
- **Energy-saving stoves**
- **Proper waste management**
- **Eco-san toilets**
- **Family medicine plant gardens**

### Community

- **Information sharing and documentation**
- **Tree planting**
- **Tree nursery beds**
- **Reporting environmental encroachers to relevant authorities**
- **Establishment of Environmental committees**
- **Community by-laws on sustainable NRM (formulation & enforcement)**
- **Sanitation about NRM + extension of the game**
- **Demonstration centres and plots**
- **Vegetable growing**
- **Collective marketing and establishing markets**
- **Proper land use planning**
- **Generation of wetlands**
- **Making fishponds**
- **Fishing with authorized net**
- **Sanitation**
- **Herbal medicine clinic and training centre blocks**
- **Pumping**
- **Promotion of tourism in the Rwenzori region**
- **Camping sites**
- **Non-polluting washing bay**
- **Sanitation**
- **Educate other children on envt**
- **Mobile the community to initiate income generating activities**
- **Use media to sensitize community**
- **Exposure tours**
- **Feedback back from forums & platforms**
- **Making environmental reports**
- **Stringent laws on water usage**
- **Building of small reservoirs**
- **Non-polluting washing bay**
- **Sanitation**
- **Tea growing**
- **Promotion of furiculture**
- **Turf growing**
- **Turf growing according to land capacity**

### Regional / National

- **Enforcement of laws and policies**
- **Put means of preventing animals destroying crops**
- **Harmonize working relationship between gathered areas and the community**
- **A sense of ownership by policy makers about NRM**
- **Environmental Monitoring, reports + independent body at regional level to look into environmental and natural resource management issues**
- **Mass sensitization about NRM**
- **Policies on family planning - population growth control**
- **Construction of feeder roads**
- **Protection of wild life**
- **Promotion of tourism in Rwenzori region**
- **Non polluting hotels**
- **Lowest price for agricultural products - no access to good prices**
- **Value addition to maize and milk**
- **Environmental monitoring for the whole of Rwenzori region + feedback back from forums/ platforms**
- **Translate available policies on NRM into local languages**
- **Subsidies for tree seedings**
- **Government should work with corporate bodies which cause pollution for contribution**
- **Rural electrification**
- **Sanitization on environmental conservation**
- **Restoration of degraded river banks**
- **Loaning farmers at a minimum percentage rate**

---

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

nils.ferrand@inrae.fr
A generic framework to observe and describe multi-dimensional change for a target group (Ferrand, le Bars, 2004)

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

• External: external (to the group) change in sustainability
An overall approach of M&E (Hassenforder, 2015)

CONTEXT
- Descriptive
- Analytical

PARTICIPATORY PLANNING PROCESS
- Descriptive
- Analytical

OUTPUTS / OUTCOMES
- Descriptive
- Analytical

MONITORING & EVALUATION VIEWPOINTS

(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
MEPPPP = 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)
- Micro (subnational)
- Village (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

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
MONITORING & EVALUATION VIEWPOINT

CONTEXT
- Environmental changes
- Organizational / institutional context
- Socio-economic changes
- Institutional context

PARTICIPATORY PLANNING PROCESS
- Access to information and expertise
- Representation
- Participation
- Transparency
- Formal / informal decisions / agreements
- Timing of involvement of the various stakeholders
- Feedback / expression
- Coherence
- Legitimacy of the process
- Transferability
- Scale

OUTPUTS / OUTCOMES
- Normative / educational
- Monitoring and evaluation system of the actions / social environmental system (including timelines, monitoring teams and feedback)
- Learning mechanism
- Conflict resolution mechanisms
- Knowledge about the social environmental system and dynamics of the problem
- Evaluation
- Collaboration
- Organizational identification
- Externalities between new decisions / agreements

OPERATIONAL
- Behavior / practice / actions
- Capacity to act
- Influence of actors / actual behavior and time between the 2 relationships
- Relationships / stakeholder / organization / groups (intra and inter)
- Information / knowledge (before and after)
- Authority / power
- Frequency of the interactions
- Multi-scale
- Social aspects
- Socialization / empathy
M&E methods

EX-ANTE
Baseline studies
Document review
Stakeholder analysis
Interviews

EX-POST
Interviews

PERMANENT
Logbook

PUNCTUAL
Attendance lists
Pictures and videos
Interviews
Expectations
Participant observation
Questionnaires

LONG TERM
Regular contacts with the team and key stakeholders

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 plans, actions, interventions, sessions, interactions, events, operational change, and other ex/ternal or contextual factors

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

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

Events' form
- 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

Rapporteur debriefing sheet
- By rapporteurs (local observers)

Facilitator debriefing sheet
- By Facilitators

Thorough Questionnaires
- Participant observation
  - By researcher
  - By Facilitators

Simple Questionnaires
- Participant observation
  - By Facilitators

Transfer to researchers via logbook 2

PUNCTUAL LOCAL scale

By rapporteurs (local observers)
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

Strategic planning

Values ad distributive justice

SES models and simulation

Participatory process planning

Gouvernance diagnosis

© 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-requirement: 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.
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
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!