



018530 - SWITCH

## Sustainable Water Management in the City of the Future

Integrated Project  
Global Change and Ecosystems

Learning alliance training

D6.2.1 Report of consortium learning alliances training workshop  
and  
D6.2.4 Training of learning alliance teams

Period covered: from M1 to M60

Date of preparation: 1 January 2011

Start date of project: 1 February 2006

Duration: 60 months

Project coordinator name: Carol Howe

Project coordinator organisation name: UNESCO-IHE

Revision [final]

## SWITCH Deliverable Briefing Note Template

<p><b>SWITCH Document D6.2.1-4 LA Training and Scoping</b></p> <p>The following four deliverables have been combined for final reporting purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D6.2.1 Report of consortium learning alliances training workshop and D6.2.4 Training of learning alliance teams: included as one combined file</li> <li>• D6.2.2 Scoping reports for each demonstration city</li> <li>• D6.2.3 Action plans for implementation</li> </ul>
<b>Deliverable reference:</b> D6.2.1-4
<b>Author(s) and Institution(s)</b> various
<b>Publication date:</b> various
<p><b>Audience</b> All for internal project use. Various materials from the training sessions were subsequently used in the formulation of other deliverables for external publication (especially d6.2.12)</p>
<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>To establish functioning and trained learning alliances teams at city level, and the right conditions and link between activities and teams within the consortium.</p>
<p><b>Background</b></p> <p>SWITCH was based around the development (of learning alliances) to drive more demand-led research processes and integration of activities at city level.</p>
<p><b>Potential Impact</b> Successful learning alliances have the potential for much wider and more integrated research impacts.</p>
<p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>n/a</p>

---

**SWITCH start-up meeting:**

**Report of learning alliances training**

---

April 2006

IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre, Delft, The Netherlands

Prepared by

Marieke Adank  
Peter Bury  
John Butterworth  
Deirdre Casella  
Mike Morris  
Joep Verhagen

# Table of Contents

Annex 1: Presentations.....	iii
Background .....	1
Session 1. Introduction to learning alliances (Wednesday am) .....	3
1.1. Agenda .....	3
1.2. Discussion of introductory Learning Alliance presentation .....	3
1.3. Discussion of Empowers presentation.....	4
1.4. Group work .....	5
Session 2. Scoping the city learning alliances: an Open Space on themes and cities (Wednesday pm) .....	7
2.1. Agenda .....	7
2.2. Results of the Open Space session .....	7
Session 3. Learning alliance visioning (Thursday).....	8
3.1. Agenda .....	8
3.2. Discussion .....	8
3.3. Group work .....	9
Session 4. Preparation of LA action plans (Friday am).....	10
4.1. Agenda .....	10
4.2. Results .....	10
4.3. Discussion .....	10
Session 5. Reflections .....	13
5.1. Evaluation cards .....	13
5.2. General reflections .....	16

Annex 1: Presentations

Annex 2: Open space reports for each city

Annex 3: Outlines of city learning alliance action plans

## Background

Integrated urban water management (IUWM) - the objective of the SWITCH project - relates to a holistic and integrated approach to managing water supplies, wastewater, stormwater and water environments at the city scale. The goal is more effective provision of services (including environmental services) in settlements with lower risks and improved sustainability. IUWM poses extraordinary complex or 'wicked' problems. The problems, let alone the solutions, are not easily defined and agreed by all parties involved, and solutions to one problem in part of the system often create new problems elsewhere and for others.

Realising IUWM is challenging because it implicitly requires improvement in organisation and decision making. This has to occur at the city level, spanning several traditionally separate sub-sectors or functions of government, the private sector and civil society, but also taking account of the wider catchments within which cities abstract and pollute water resources. Improved IUWM requires engagement with a complex array of administrative, political, institutional, social, economic and cultural challenges in cities.

Learning alliances are proposed by the SWITCH project (see workpackage 6.2) to provide the necessary approach and structure to address these challenges. Effective Learning alliances will fundamentally change the way that key stakeholders work together and particularly how science in urban water management is undertaken, in order to improve scaling up of innovations and to effect wide spread impact: this is the paradigm shift that we seek to achieve.

### Learning Alliances in SWITCH

A Learning Alliance is a key group of individuals or organisations with a shared interest in innovation and the scaling-up of innovation, in a topic of mutual interest. Learning alliances typically consist of a series of structured platforms, at different institutional levels (national, river basin, city, community etc), designed to break down barriers to both horizontal and vertical information sharing, and thus to speed up the process of identification, adaptation, and uptake of new innovation.

These platforms bring together a wide range of partners with capabilities in: implementation; regulation; policy and legislation; research and learning; and, documentation and dissemination. The role of Learning Alliances in the SWITCH project is to guide and support the implementation of research and demonstration activities in the demonstration cities, taking account of local problems and needs, and leading to effective integration of activities at the city level and scaled-up implementation of findings within these cities, as well as in other European and Southern cities.

LAs are not just 'any' interested group, but ideally a cross-section or microcosm of the key stakeholders in the urban water management system. If there are representational gaps then the emerging solutions are less likely to adequately address 'wicked' problems (e.g. an unrepresentative group of influential stakeholders is more likely to be a cartel than a LA, and their 'solutions' are unlikely to address equity issues or the rights of less powerful groups.)

Learning Alliances training and planning sessions formed a core part of the agenda for the SWITCH start-up meeting held in Delft, the Netherlands between the 18<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> April, 2006 covering two days of the meeting. This report summarises the discussions during those sessions including copies of all presentations given as part of the training and the results of discussions and planning.

## Session 1. Introduction to learning alliances (Wednesday am)

The objective of this session was: *a shared understanding of the learning alliance (LA) concept within the SWITCH team*

A background paper on 'LAs for IUWM' was circulated prior to the workshop.

### 1.1. Agenda

- Introduction to the agenda for LA sessions (John Butterworth)
- An introduction to learning alliances for scaling-up impacts of research in IUWM (John Butterworth)
- Experiences in developing learning alliances for improved local water governance in the Middle East: The Empowers partnership (Patrick Moriarty) (included in Annex)
- Group work (mixed groups)

### 1.2. Discussion of introductory Learning Alliance presentation

The presentation by John Butterworth is included in the Annexes.

*Q: The remark was made that for the SWITCH project, platforms at the catchment level would be useful.*

A: This will depend on the city and its situation. If water resources are a problem in the city and there is not yet a platform at the catchment level, this might be very useful. This needs to be decided per city.

*Q: What are the resources and time needed for research and process?*

A: It is difficult to break down the numbers between research, training and implementation. The ratio of resources between the different activities are not that important, but setting a minimum is. Facilitating LA's is not a part time job that can be done by a junior person. At least one senior level person is needed (in the case of EMPOWERS, there were teams of 4 where the balance was 10% (formal) research, 90% process or action research)).

*Q: There was some confusion about the pronunciation of "wicked" ("wicked" or "Wickt").*

A: It was agreed that the term was meant as "wicked" in the meaning of evil and naughty. The remark was made that the nature of these wicked problems is that there are difficult to define and monitor, which in itself is a problem.

*Q: One of the researchers working on the topic of storm water drainage wanted to know whether she should contact the whole learning alliance when she would need info from them.*

A: Hopefully the researcher will not only contact the LAs to extract information. Theme specialists could work with sub-groups within the LA within their field of interest. The SWITCH project will use an integrated approach. The LAs are supposed to facilitate interaction between different stakeholders. Researchers should serve the LA, not the other way around. People in the LA will come up with problems for which they will need the help of the researchers. LAs will not survive without the input of researchers. Researchers will have to be able to answer questions and deliver solutions to problems identified by the learning alliances.

*Q: Many cities are focusing on a specific topic. How to tie the other themes to this?*

A: IUWM will mainly have to take place in the city / on city level, because this is where the themes come together. At the global level the integration is more artificial.

*Q: To what extent will the interest of the Southern Partners be reflected?*

A: This is the first time that all partners meet. Hopefully this week will give the southern partners the opportunity to have their voices heard as well.

*Q: Most examples of learning alliances can be found in developing countries. Are they also useful and possible in developed countries?*

A: The background paper dealing with the Learning Alliances is to large extent based on experiences of IRC, mainly from rural areas in developing countries. We realize that examples reflecting more the urban setting will have to be included. Work needs to be done on that. The concept of learning alliances is generic and applicable in other situations however. The concept of Learning Alliances stems from innovation system thinking, which comes from the industrialized world (more northern focus).

*Q: How to stimulate communication between learning alliances?*

A: This will have to be explored and developed. At the moment we do not have clear mechanisms for communication within the cities and between the cities. The interest of the learning alliances will be wider than the research that will take place in the cities. Therefore these exchange mechanisms will be important.

*Q: What is the mandate of the LA? Sharing info on city level, or also as a platform to facilitate scaling up? Scaling up is however not the responsibility of the city. Therefore, don't we also need a national level LA?*

A: A Learning Alliance consists of different platforms at different levels: local level (neighborhood), intermediate level (city), national level and possibly global level (the group we are with now).

*Q: Relation between demonstration activities and LA. Demo outside LA or as core of LA?*

A: The LA and the researchers are not 2 separate groups. Researchers are members of the LA. There should be interaction between the researchers and other LA members. The research should respond to the need of the LA and should therefore be quite flexible. The LA can also come up with additional problems (outside the areas in which the partners have determined they want to do research), which have not been budgeted for. We'll have to see how we will deal with this. Demos will be islands of success without the learning alliances and the learning alliances need the demos to avoid becoming just talking shops without action.

### 1.3. Discussion of Empowers presentation

The presentation by Patrick Moriarty is included in the Annexes.

*Q: What was the social process used?*

A: The assumption in the beginning was that there would be a lot of arguments. However, in reality it was not the case. The process consisted mainly of bringing together stakeholders, who would normally not necessarily come together and leading them through a process of visioning (problem tree, SMART vision development workshop etc) (See slide on approach from Empowers presentation). Based on the vision, the group of stakeholders was involved in a process of strategizing, making the vision more realistic.



*Q: Should the facilitators be country experts?*

A: The facilitators within Empowers were in-country facilitators. They should have sufficient weight (senior position) and have their own network.

*Q: Was IHE involved in capacity building?*

A: IHE was not a project member (maybe you meant IRC?). Partners in the countries provided most capacity building. The problems that were identified were mostly not technical, but managerial. There was little need for technical innovation.

*Q: What were other success factors, in addition to the ones mentioned in the presentation?*

A: Too many to mention. Conflicts within teams are a big problem. Leadership, quality of the team, national level policy, buy in etc played important roles.

*Q: Not all stakeholders seem to be part of the LA. Does that affect the sustainability?*

A: It depends on the level on which you are looking. Key stakeholders did form part of the LA, but not of the core team. In the case of SWITCH the number of stakeholders which will have to be represented in the LAs might be higher, because the scope of work is wider.

*Q: Locally initiated solutions might not be replicable at the national level.*

A: EMPOWERS started at the local level, but has now started to look more on governorate and national level. It has taken 3 years to create dialogue between the national and the local level.

*Q: The EMPOWERS project involved big groups in action and implementation. What large scale methodologies were used?*

A: There was not one specific methodology. The process picked up momentum by itself. The idea was that dialoging could solve a lot of the problems. Now, many actors are enthused by the process and are willing to take it forward.

## 1.4. Group work

Group work in mixed groups was based upon the following questions:

- What are the limitations you have experienced in scaling up solutions?
- What in your experience do you think that LAs offer in order to have more impact?
- What types/ particular issues in IWRM would benefit most from an LA approach?

The results were summarised as follows:

### *Group 1:*

The group mainly discussed question 1 and tried to define scaling. They defined it as:

- increasing special coverage
- scaling up of the acceptability of concepts and paradigms
- Replication of solutions: scaling up amongst the cities
- Scaling up from city to catchment
- Bottom-up approach

### *Group 2:*

In this group, 2 demo cities were represented and 2 of the cross cutting themes. The group viewed the learning alliance as a forum for stakeholders who would normally not have the

opportunity to communicate with each other. How to finance such a forum was perceived as the problem.

*Group 3:*

In this group there were a lot of experiences of scaling up, using the bottom-up approach. The group was of the opinion that LAs could have a lot to offer for them, but were not too sure whether they would have anything to offer to the LAs.

*Group 4:*

Scientists sometimes perceive themselves as people bearing gifts, but often they would come up with solutions to the wrong problems. There should be a shift in how to do science. It should not be the scientists coming up with solutions that should be the basis of the research, but the learning alliance should be the starting point. The question that arose in the group was how to enter a community without bearing the “traditional gifts”.

*Group 5:*

This group discussed the breadth of the learning alliance. Where should the effect be felt? This should determine the scale of the LA. In Beijing, reuse of waste water is a hot issue, while in Accra, industrial pollution of water bodies is. The group identified different sizes and shapes of learning alliances. Issues to be taken into account are:

- appropriate timing
- communication
- management

*Group 6:*

The Group concluded that research will have to be rooted in the actual situation, rather than the exceptional situation. For example, resources used for demos should be based on the normal availability of resources, not on exceptional availability, as is often the case in pilot studies.

*Group 7:*

The group mainly discussed the 2<sup>nd</sup> question and concluded that the main benefit of the Learning Alliance could be the creation of a platform of communication for stakeholders. It would be important however, to create a win-win situation and incentives for stakeholders to participate.

*Group 8:*

The group stated that engineers in general want to make complex problems less complex. The Learning Alliance concept is however quite complex. The group warned that the process should stay manageable.

## Session 2. Scoping the city learning alliances: an Open Space on themes and cities (Wednesday pm)

The objective of this session was: *to provide space for interaction for a better understanding of how the existing planned themes and sub-themes match with the urban water management problems and opportunities in the demonstration cities, and identified potential for better linkages and a more integrated approach*

### 2.1. Agenda

The methodology for the session was [Open Space](#) ([follow the link for references on the method](#)). This technology is based on trust in self-organizing groups and promotes creativity and commitment. While the method is rather simple, it does require experienced and confident facilitators. It could be a useful tool in the context of building up Learning Alliances. In this case the Open Space was somewhat structured around the represented 11 cities.

### 2.2. Results of the Open Space session

Outputs in the form of posters for each city are included in Annex 2 and present a summary of discussions taken place, including initial views on main IUWM issues in the city, possible research respons, envisioned impact and ideas on structuring process in the form of learning alliances.

A few quick comments made after the session were:

- It was useful to hear and share experiences from other cities
- Cities should be stimulated to include research related to work package 6 into their research (like research on management and financial issues)

## Session 3. Learning alliance visioning (Thursday)

The objective of this session was: *A specific vision on how the learning alliances will look in each city, and the steps needed to get there.*

### 3.1. Agenda

- Where Are We After Two Days? (Introductory presentation by Joep Verhagen) (included in Annex)
- Tailoring Learning Alliances for SWITCH: ambition and activities (Deirdre Casella) (included in Annex)
- Birmingham Learning Alliances IUWM (Phil Sharp and Rae Mackay) (included in Annex)
- Group work

### 3.2. Discussion

*Q: Synchronizing the Learning Alliances timeline with the research packages timelines: how will we optimize this?*

*Q: Who takes the lead (or coordinates) in all these various and parallel processes: city, research, LA ...?*

On Birmingham experience:

*Q: clarification of Birmingham LA*

A: The Birmingham LA exists, they are working on building a central LA. There are still communication gaps. The purpose of a central LA is to provide a platform so that the participating parties can talk to each other. The B-LA is long legged and sustainable because self-financing.

*Q: How to involve other levels around the core LA?*

A: UK is very centralized and concentrated. Birmingham tries to involve communities and attempts are made to involve the regional assembly. The regeneration schemes (2 or 3 main zones) provide a IUWM opportunity. Example: East Side has a sort of LA, the paradigm shift is ongoing.

*Q: is there a danger of not having real paradigm shifts but only optimization of current systems?*

A: True, yes there is this danger. Paradigm shift needs critical masses among city citizens. SWITCH and advocacy are needed.

*Q: Self financing: what is your strategy?*

Many parties have ongoing sustainability programmes in various sectors, which are funded and whose resources can be tapped. Collaborative funding is already happening in Birmingham. Commitments have been made, often also in kind (e.g. a staff person, an office, etc.).

*Q: Can we encourage Birmingham to document this LA experience as a story and make it available to all SWITCH partners?*

### 3.3. Group work

Working in city groups and one global group, we were then invited to use the project document (work package 6.2) as a guideline and our experience to answer the following four questions on a poster.

1. Looking at the problems identified yesterday. What changes (i.e. attitudes, policy, institutions and implementation) do we need to achieve a paradigm shift in water management in the city? (by whom?)
2. What (outputs) do we need to achieve this SWITCH of paradigm – workshops, consultations, exchange of information etc.
3. What are the tasks/ activities needed?
4. What are the preliminary activities needed in 2006

At the end of the session we visited each city to see the posters. These posters were developed further the next day (including budget estimation) and are included in Annex 3.

## Session 4. Preparation of LA action plans (Friday am)

The objective of this session was: *An outline action plan focusing on next steps and first budget estimation for developing city learning alliances*

### 4.1. Agenda

- Introduction: Preparation of LA action plans (John Butterworth) (presentation included in Annex 1)
- Groupwork
- Presentations and discussion

### 4.2. Results

Outputs from the city groups are included in Annex 3.

### 4.3. Discussion

Each group was asked to identify their city's situation out of 10 in relation to establishing a learning alliance (10 being perfect conditions), and to say why they gave it this rating.

- China: we found it difficult to identify the resources we need to mobilize stakeholders
- Hamburg: we have a very good base...have clarified members of learning alliance and direction, but it is complicated...it is a very complicated system...need to include at least 30 key members
- Tel Aviv (6 or 7/10): we have a learning alliance going on...but not called by that name...What we miss is technological advances, and to get money for the process
- Lodz: We have existing cooperation between the city council and university that will make this easier. The first step is integration of research and management
- Accra (5/10): We have existing platforms...but these are not about learning.
- Birmingham (7.5/10): Confident that structures are there...good opportunities to link to regeneration projects
- Alexandria (6 or 7/10): Some platforms are in place and we have identified existing activities. There are a lot of ongoing efforts, but these are not linked. There is strong political support...but we miss allocated resources. We need to plan for this and get the coordination going
- Colombia (4/10): We have some seeds, but key issue is about real participation. Have been working with high-level decision makers

We were then asked about the qualities that the city coordinators should have:

- They should work themselves out of a job...individuals will not solve the problems alone (Mike Morris)
- They need to have a very proactive attitude to be able to mobilize resources (Huub Giizen)
- They need to be able to attract the attention of city/ national politics...which is difficult...what are our entry points to local politics? (Zizimos Vergos)
- They should be independent and not perceived as a threat by other institutions (Peter van der Steen)
- We certainly need 3<sup>rd</sup> parties who are not members of the consortium. Need to bring them in (Huub Giizen)

- A patron...who has influence, is credible, can bring others on board (Carol Howe)
- Someone who is imaginative enough to see how to link research with learning alliances (Emmanuele Lobina)
- They need to be able to link to existing environmental partnerships (Rossa Donovan?)
- From Patrick's presentation, the key to success was the managerial skills to develop and coordinate. More than research input. A higher level of decision and skills making. (Monica Sanz)
- This person should work in the city...e.g. in the city administration. A major task is to get funding to implement activities and be independent (Avner Adin)
- Administration and government should be better involved in the project. Do we have consortium members representing the cities? Could we bring them in through the top up call (Heike Langenbach)
- Need recognition that doing business as usual in the cities is not going to work (Joep Verhagen)
- Need to see what could be the role for NGOs. Environmental NGOs may have ideas in line with SWITCH (Maarten Siebel)
- Someone not involved in past decision making...they may have to be critical (Heiko Sieker)
- A person who should acknowledge all the good things happening and be positive (Peter van der Steen)
- Need to have clear plans with widespread support...plans must be recognized as feasible and legitimate (Ian Smout)
- They will need to convince people that they will get better outcomes...value, new, different, why things will be better (Carol Howe)
- Look for existing projects/ demos and add value to them (Chris Jeffries)

#### Further discussion

- How do we go forwards with the resource issue? How do we do it? (Adriaan Mels)
- Maybe the impression was created that there are no resources for learning alliances. But in Zaragoza and Alexandria we have reservations of budget for new partners that could be used for learning alliances. There are also resources in Birmingham. In other cities, there are other resources that we could use. (Peter van der Steen)
- We can also make efficiencies by combining things. We have planned all kind of workshops. We can combine with learning alliance activities. (Peter van der Steen)
- How are we going to complete the city plans? (Rene)
- The next step is needed by the central management unit who will collect all the plans. IHE are responsible for demos but these are linked to learning alliances. We will together analyse the plans, draw conclusions and look at resources (Peter van der Steen)
- At the city level we need to be clearer and explicit about what resources are available, and all cities will need a minimum of some short term resources to complete the scoping exercise and action plans. This might be about 3 weeks input per city perhaps. (John Butterworth)
- We cannot say there is no budget. In each city there are lots of man-months time input available...often more than a 100. It must be possible to find those 3 weeks from other work packages. We can find money from other work packages and do this next step (Peter van der Steen)
- We should be examining the city plans as a broader group than just IHE & IRC because the learning alliances are so crucial. One idea might be to broaden the remit of the demonstration committee to become a 'learning alliance and demonstration committee'

with involvement of IHE (demos), IRC (learning alliances) but also representatives of cities and researchers.

- Will we have an overview of what work packages are doing in cities? Today we should know what is happening in each city. Can this be facilitated in the afternoon?

Key points relating to learning alliances made by Zizimos Vergos, EC Scientific Officer:<sup>1</sup>

- We assume you [the consortium] have state-of-the-art knowledge
- Everybody knows what the paradigm shift is we are looking for.....don't repeat what is already known [not to spend a lot of time reworking old knowledge, or coming up with guidelines that are not used]
- Through learning alliances we need to increase the involvement of everyone...there is an educational role
- The project should be visible [acknowledging EC funding]....we have a moral responsibility in this
- [we expect to be in close contact] we get worried if you take the money and run...we are looking for a partnership
- I am very concerned about the evolution of learning alliances...this is the backbone of the project. If they don't take off, we may as well pack up and go home and wrap up the project. SWITCH will be judged not by research, but by how research is used by the learning alliances.

---

<sup>1</sup> Comments made by Zizimos Vergos during group work: 'I am very worried about learning alliances. SWITCH was not selected [over other proposals] for the science, but for the learning alliances. I don't expect Nobel Prizes from the science. The Nobel Prize for SWITCH is in the process.'



## Session 5. Reflections

### 5.1. Evaluation cards

A number of the cards submitted by workshop participants related to the learning alliance training and learning alliance issues. These are identified below and grouped. A full evaluation based upon these cards will be prepared separately.

#### *Learning alliances*

- Good discussions on HOW to cause the paradigm shift, but not enough on WHERE to shift to. The development of a common vision is necessary.
- First LA Session: very dry and unengaging.
- Triggered thinking about how to integrate demo cities with work packages. What can cities and the LAs do for the work packages and the other way around.
- I believe that the success of this project is based on its INTEGRATION. I think that this kick-off helped successfully to reach this goal. I suggest to continue this effort, even it may be time-consuming, but cost effectiveness.
- Very interesting (and tiring!). Talking to the cities about their problems and researchers from other disciplines has been very useful and I feel enthusiastic to continue with SWITCH.
- Need to have more participants from the cities.
- Better integration WPs and cities needed.
- LA are well explained and put in operation. It could have been supported a bit more by the project management: What are we going to do and what to achieve.
- Find good CITIES facilitation where LA + WPs need to make the SWITCH
- Pro-actively develop more inter-linkages between wp's.
- Let's not get lost in details if we really want to achieve our main goal: a paradigm shift. For that purpose: rise above our specific research topics from time to time and activities and see if the WP is developing to enabling the desired paradigm shift.
- The link between city level tasks and the theme workpackages tasks is not yet established.
- The switch management still doesn't know how the whole process should proceed. Not completely clear the linkages and synergies between research, democities and LA.
- City coordinators should be given more attention and resources
- LA provides a good platform, willing to share and to communicate, and lead to build up a promising basis for the future. The expected step is to fruit it. I think offer an interface to outsiders is essential.
- It is very important to integrate more to participants for to generate trust between them and to facility to learning alliances between switch partners.
- Contents: too much time/attention for LA, lack of time for WP discussions.
- It does not seem that the resources presently budgeted for reflect realistically the likely requirements of LAs (as emerging from the EMPOWERS presentation). More flexibility would be required to ensure that resources (and deliverables) under one sub-theme/theme can be adapted to (blended) and/or transferred to Las if these are to take off the ground and deliver success.
- Workshop concerned: 1) Top down organisation (Severe lack of space for interaction on key issues) 2) UNESCO-IHE/IRC access 'feels' exclusive. 3) tension between standard 'business as usual' management approach and the LA approach. 4) Management team heavily skewed in favour of UNESCO-IHE and other northern partners; no southern

partners or cities. 5) Standard 'scientific committee' (to ensure good science?) but no equivalent for the institutional learning and change processes.

- The LA workshops were very good and useful but should have stopped on Thursday pm.
- While the LA learning was excellent, it was naïve to believe that the Las of the cities could be really evaluated and defined now. However, this attempt, in spite of a lack of city representation, was worth the time.
- It was disappointing that the Global Learning alliance team failed to talk about LA concepts.

#### *Comments made on balance of effort between LAs and other tasks*

- Too much stress on Las and not enough focus on the content of the work. As a consequence, there are still many ambiguities and unresolved issues which could have been addressed and resolved if the focus was placed on the content of the work packages.
- Overfocusing on Las as opposite to working out themes/packages in required details that will allow efficient follow-up.
- Balance Science/Research –LA approach
- The programme was very well organized. However more time was needed to discuss in detail the activities under the various themes.
- Overall well organized but too much emphasis on Las and associated work meetings. It was clear from the final reports from the themes that more time for 'theme' discussions was required.
- I would have like to see more about what the other groups were doing i.e. their scientific objectives and methodologies further than spend the majority of the time on LAs. While LAs are important, meetings such as this are vital for discussion and cross-fertilisation of ideas regarding the research. Most of us want to see our research used in society and manage to do it. Much of the LA implementation could have been dealt with via e-mail etc. I do not think I have missed the point being somebody who has managed to disseminate my research via Las in the past. Otherwise I enjoyed it.
- Things might have gone much faster if the project coordinators had pre-prepared a bit better, eg. Programme could have been prepared in draft from for criticism and alteration if necessary. A lot of time was wasted doing basic work. Perhaps excessive presentations on LAs – I read this document and heard the material all repeated back to me – waste of time. Otherwise staff very friendly and helpful. Could perhaps have run city workshops and theme workshops in parallel?

#### *General comments (not specific to Las)*

- Time allocated seemed too much at first but probably just about OK in the end
- Organisation excellent
- Good organisation
- 'Hosting' excellent and venue
- Good effort
- Not enough time for wp's
- Try to give great follow up for management and implementation, particularly that this is a huge project!!
- Organisation and workshop exercises were very interesting and innovative, however some of them did not lead to the intended objectives (e.g. researchers did not stick their blue & orange stamps, and not all theme coordinators considered city interests)
- Budget lines other than research, training and demo are not visible still, needed to be printed in project documents, as database is not user friendly.

- Edwin, Jeltsje and Inge: great job of organizing! Facilitating!
- More time should have been spent on technical content and theme/wp coordination.
- It was interesting, I got to know other partners in SWITCH many of whom I had not met before.
- It came together in the end, which was good, Discussion of the themes however was limited, I did not really get to know what was being done in the various themes and how these would/could be integrated.
- Organisation was quite good, but could have been better if facilities like lunch were provided in the afternoon sections. Workload was more than expected, because lack of clarification on issues concerning roles and req...? of the project.
- Interesting and intensive.
- Communication between partners should have been an issue (e.g. Attach NAMES to theme co-ordinators, so that it becomes clear how to send a message to a 'workpackage'.
- Thanks for the numerous opportunities for small group interactions, and the variety of working methods.
- Good and intensive workshop.
- Well organized. Well facilitated. Compliments for keeping it lively!
- The process put in motion is good and need to be fed with information and asking questions !!
- The meeting is very important for exchange between partners, we know the project more detail through the meeting. Thanks for good management.
- Key descriptors of this week: 1. Super large project 2. will require very strong and clear leadership 3) ample space for hobbing 4) important to maintain an overview of the project and it as 'one' project: In summary: an incredible challenge.
- Very well organized and great location. Nice people and very productive. Not enough time set aside for delegates to talk to each other though
- Simple, relaxed and enjoyable. The way forward is clearer.
- Workshop 2 pluses: 1. Meeting and working with people face to face. 2. opportunity to move the focus of activities from Delft (delightful though it is) to city locations.
- MT minutes need to be circulated promptly ('FEB' outstanding is NOT good enough) GA minutes could be typed and projected simultaneously. Very concerned at reluctance of IHE to be upfront about 'issues': apparent preference for back-room deals is disturbingly close to business as usual.
- Sometimes instructions were not very clear.
- Very good organized. Thank you very much. Suggestion for next meeting: please let us more time for self-organisation in small groups.
- Organisation: splendid!
- If there is regulations for the reports we have to do, please, let us know in the next 2 weeks, not 2 weeks before the deadline.
- Kick-off has provided clear understanding of SWITCH and particularly role of the partners.
- I would recommend once you need to make a kick-off meeting, to focus more on building relationships from the beginning and providing more general information from workshop 1, that is needed to successful outcomes (like short briefs initial presentations at the cities and interested cities).
- Negatives: 1) Should NOT held event over a major public holiday, Easter. 2) could cover in 3 days max 3) should have done 50% LA, 50% themes....?... Needed to see peoples specific research, e.g. 2 ppt slides for 2 minutes. Positives: 1) Otherwise OK! 2) Used range of IHE people well 3) Good end session.

- The attempt to finalise time charts through regulation and discussion before the end of Friday was/is not appropriate. It would have been far better to let people get as far as possible to agree the inputs and timing and the links. The WPs coordinators need to ... these away and is .... What has been learned
- It would have helped theme coordinators to have been briefed earlier on the ... and aims .. the theme contributions to.... Weak/week

## 5.2. General reflections

The outcomes of these training and first planning sessions will now lead into a scoping and more detailed planning exercise for learning alliances in the SWITCH cities (see the description of work package 6.2 for more information). The following reflections on the training aim to contribute to successfully completing these tasks:

- The level of understanding of learning alliance concepts and underlying principles and rationale has clearly improved. One team member reflected how ‘we need as scientists to get out from behind our computers and do this kind of work.’
- Members of the SWITCH consortium clearly have quite different views on how learning alliances might look in the cities, especially in the level of intensity of activities. These differences in vision have huge implications on the level of resources that are required.
- Some cities are well placed to start learning alliances with funding in place, and consortium members identified to facilitate the learning alliance. However, in most cities the resources available (financial and human) are unclear and need to be clarified during the inception phase. Many of the consortium members in cities do not have experience in facilitating these type of processes, and will need considerable further support. Some partners do have considerable experience and are already developing theme activities around learning alliance-based strategies.
- There is clearly a risk that learning alliances of limited scope and with limited funding will fail to achieve a paradigm shift in integrated urban water management. There is a danger they might drift towards becoming rather conventional dissemination fora, without focusing on learning and on finding new ways to do science and scale up innovations. A critical approach is needed backed up by a learning alliance and demonstration committee with members experienced in learning alliance processes, action research and implementation.
- We need to plan and communicate much better the detailed activities that will be undertaken by the learning alliances. This needs to be reflected in improved action plans for each learning alliance. We need to ensure that key elements, like process documentation, are not forgotten or neglected.
- Probably some learning alliances will need more external support (from the learning alliance support team) than others. More intensive support in some cities might be combined with developing a ‘toolkit’ to support development in other cities.
- We need to decide how to work with study sites where substantial research is planned but without a framework for scaling up e.g. in Colombia, or where learning alliances are planned but focusing on a narrower set of activities (e.g. urban agriculture in Lima).

## Annex 1: Presentations

An introduction to learning alliances for scaling-up impacts of research in IUWM (John Butterworth)

Experiences in developing learning alliances for improved local water governance in the Middle East: The Empowers partnership (Patrick Moriarty)

Where Are We After Two Days? (Joep Verhagen)

Tailoring Learning Alliances for SWITCH: ambition and activities (Deirde Casella)

Birmingham Learning Alliances IUWM (Phil Sharp and Rae Mackay)

Preparation of LA action plans (John Butterworth)

## Annex 2: Open Space reports for each city

## Annex 3: Outlines of city learning alliance action plans

### Accra

Proposed interim city coordinator: Olefunke Cofie

#### Changes needed:

- all people to have access to water and sanitation services
- attitudinal and behavioral change at all levels
- improved coordination and communication

#### Initial activities:

- Recruitment an of full-time coordinator and establishment of core team (3-4 institutes, including IWMI, KNUST and AMA)
- Review scoping study
- Prepare, publish and distribute SWITCH Accra briefing note
- Individual stakeholder consultations (info gathering and lobbying)
- Organization of first workshop
  - o Situational analysis
  - o Introduction to the SWITCH intervention
  - o Launching of LA
  - o Action planning
  - o Formation of research working groups

#### Estimated costs

Inception phase	# mandays (1 manday@60 euro)	Additional costs
Formation of core team <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- formation meeting</li><li>- communication</li><li>- documentation</li></ul>	5	200
- Preparation of SWITCH briefing note for Accra <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Preparations</li><li>o Printing</li><li>o distribution</li></ul>	4	200 500
Review of scoping <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Communication</li><li>o Transport</li></ul>	5	
Stakeholder consultations and lobbying <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Communication</li><li>o Transport</li><li>o documentation</li></ul>	10	200
Preparation for 1 <sup>st</sup> workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o logistics (venue,</li></ul>		10.000

publicity, background materials) ○ Facilitation ○ Documentation ○ DSAs ○ Lunch		
---	--	--

Summary of resources required till end 2006:

- Activities (see above):	21.000 euro
- Man days	1.400 euro
- Costs of full time coordinator: 3000 euro x 6 months:	18.000 euro
- Contingency costs (20% of total):	9.000 euro
- Total:	about 50.000 euro



## Alexandria

Proposed interim city coordinator: Khaled Abuzeid ([kabuzeid@cedare.org](mailto:kabuzeid@cedare.org)) and Aymon El-Hefnawi ([a\\_elhefnawi@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:a_elhefnawi@yahoo.co.uk))

City main problem	Changes required	Whom	How	Tasks and activities
Institutional bottlenecks	Institutional mechanism should reflect Learning Alliance	Governorate, holding company, NGOs, representatives of poor and underserved areas, donors	Meeting in Alexandria Paying number of visits	Stakeholder analysis Forming La (2 workshops)
Technical challenges and availability of water resources	The move towards integration of WR (IUWM)		Building IUWM Until 2022 → rapid assessment → LED (existing activities / plans)	Formulating a committee responsible for the plan (Work Group)
Finance	Cost recovery W&S services provision		1) innovative financing 2) Tariff structure 3) Metering	1) WTP survey 2) Best P's of tariff structure options

# Beijing

## Proposed interim city coordinator:

### Problems identified:

#### 1: resources

- agriculture
- scarcity
- storm water (June – September)
- Industrial use
- Groundwater table going down

#### 2: Water supply

- High leakage
- Demand management
- No much reuse
- Ground water recharging

#### 3: Waste water:

- separation (industrial, domestic, storm)
- Reuse (multiple use, food security, health)
- Ecological
- High operation costs

#### 4: storm water

- lack of strategy and long term salutation
- No reuse

### Q1: Main paradigm shift required

- ➔ Waste water and storm water seen as a resource rather than a problem
- ➔ IUWM truly implemented, coupling of responsibilities

### Q2:

- Changes in attitude
- Demo projects
- Awareness through seminars, workshops

### Q3:

- key stakeholder analysis
- Identifying problems / needs
- Identifying solutions
- Research on solutions
- Pilot project
- Training

### Q4:

#### 2006:

- Stakeholder meeting
- Demo site

#### 1: Paradigm shift:

Wastewater and storm water from problems -> resources

## 2: Activities:

1. Exploratory studies
  - Current situation and problems
  - Key stakeholders and their needs
2. LA at cit level or Multi stakeholder workgroup
  - i. Present findings
  - ii. Prioritize of needs
  - iii. Policy awareness  
(workshop ->research agenda, choosing dmo sites)
- 3: Research and technology innovations
- 4: Pilot projects and demo activities
- 5: Training and capacity building
- 6: policy recommendations

## Inception phase

### 1: Exploratory study

IGSNRR      No  
CU  
WU  
.....

Covered by WP 4.1 and 5.2

### 2: LA and the team

CC CAI 2 m / year

Team: CU / MOC / BA (2) / WU / Assistant (5m)

Training: IRC, WU

### 3: Workshop: 2-3 days

September: 0.5 m

Not covered yet. Proposed to cover it with budget from 5.2

### 4: Choosing demo sites

CC: CAI Jianming

Not covered yet. Proposed to cover it with budget from 5.2

Covered by WP4.1 and WP 5.2

# Birmingham

Proposed interim city coordinator: Philip Sharp (Philip.sharp@arvp.com)

## 1. Governance -> breaking down barriers

Rising G/W (Poll!)

Sustainable (urban) drainage -> specific problems

Urban regeneration -> Facilitation / demonstration

## 2. Creating a sustainable “**Trading Place**”

## 3. and 4. Extended scoping study (mth 5)

- Core group consolidation
- Feedback on the themes / sub themes
- Quantifying pressures for change
- Exploring the wicked problems

LA launch meeting (mth 5)

Newsletter (mnt 6)

S.L.A.B. -> Establish the future programme

# Colombia

Proposed interim city coordinator: Monica Sanz ([monica\\_snz@yahoo.com](mailto:monica_snz@yahoo.com))

## Tasks for Learning alliances in 2006

- Jump start event
- 3 PHD research proposals
- work plans for study cases
- searching for project (co) financing
- Finking up with the other demo cities
- Preparing Aqua 2007

## Costs

1.	Workshop T. 5 x 2 days	US\$ 25.000
	Workshop R 50 x 1 day	US\$ 25.000

2.	- Information materials	US\$ 25.000
	- Website	
	- e-mail newsletter	

3.	Education – formal education	US\$ 5.000
	Modulos	
	Aqua 2007	

4.	Co-financing costs	US\$ 5.000
----	--------------------	------------

Total		US\$ 85.000
-------	--	-------------

## Activities

	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
PhD Rp	■								
PhD AG	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		
PhD JB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Workshop / event	■	■	■						
Aqua 2007						■	■	■	■
Financing	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Land use plan (Bogotá)	■	■	■	■	■	■			
Case studies	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Interacting with									
- Beijing				■	■	■			
- Alexandria				■	■	■			

# Hamburg

## Proposed interim city coordinator:

Problems identified as challenges:

- Balance storm water, waste water, water supply in an integrated system with multiple benefits
- Flood management in the river basins
- Groundwater management
- Environmental qualities (pollution)
- Water as system of urban design
- Water management in the growing city
- Financing development and maintenance

Drivers:

- Creating open spaces in existing cities with element of water
- City development without expansion
  - “to grow, but not to expand”
  - “growing inside the city, not outside”
- Private money pays for public infrastructure

Water management is part of city improvement, urban regeneration and its wealth

NGOs	Gov't	Private water companies	University	Developers	Users	Co-financers
	Waste management	Water Waste system				

- to identify the stakeholders
- To identify the interest o stakeholders and problems
- To identify the different problems
- To identify them as challenges
- To make the vision

# Lodz

Proposed interim city coordinator:

## Tasks and activities

1. Identification of possible LA leader(s)  
Possibly -> city office based person
  - water / environment experience
  - enthusiastic! With potential to SWITCH
  - 1.a: Training for all LA leaders in IHE
2. Identification of other potential LA members
  - ➔ Stakeholder analysis (include partners)  
From: government, MGOs, researchers, education, planning, city promotion office, users, industry, society, citizens living in the area under implementation activities
  - ➔ Dissemination:
    - Into letter
    - Local media (radio, newspaper, tv)
3. Kick-off meeting  
-> participatory diagnosis of water related issues -> prioritize  
Higher willingness for new solution (mindset for a change)  
Higher awareness of win/ benefits for everyone  
LA -> how does it work (IHE / SWITCH represent)
4. Formalise the Lodz LA

Further LA activities:

- ➔ keep identifying other partners
- ➔ identifying complementary / related ongoing projects and potential cooperation / for complementary research, development, additional financing
- ➔ Dissemination: website + platform for info exchange, folders, tv, site visits, etc
- ➔ Integration of information through LA members for creating a uniform platform for DSS
- ➔ Identify issues for further research, expertise needs, communication process
- ➔ Workshops
- ➔ Exchange of information and coordination with other LAs

## Five years

Personal costs

First 12 months -> full time

Next months -> ½ time 40.000 euro / 5 years

Workshop organisation x 1000 euro / 10

(place, coffee, materials, invitation, expert): 10.000 euro / 5 years

Conference organisation at the end of SWITCH

5.000 euro

Dissemination (website, folders, documentation process)	5.000 euro
--	------------

---

Total	50.000 euro
-------	-------------

In 2006		
Personel costs	7.000 euro	
Workshop 2x	2.000 euro	
Website	1.000 euro	
Total	10.000 euro	40.000 PLN

---



# Tel-Aviv

Proposed interim city coordinator: Avi Aharoni (Mekorot)

Paradigm shift:

Sustainable approach to waste water problem solution

What do we want to achieve?

1. Urban water reuse
  - public education workshop
  - printed electronic dissemination
  - teaching materials for schools
  - workshop for professionals
2. Reduction storm water overloads in WW systems
  - Meeting w city planners & decision makers & law makers
3. Agricultural water reuse
  - Workshop with farmers on
    - Effluent desalinisation & nutrients
    - New sustainable water pricing

Tasks / activities

- Preparation of
  - i. Teaching programmes 4 materials
  - ii. Professional tours
  - iii. Slide shows, presentations
  - iv. Teach the teachers
  - v. Process documentation
  - vi. Internet site construction and maintenance
- Preliminary activities in LA
  - Activity i and iii and meeting with stakeholders.

# Saragossa

## Proposed interim city coordinator:

### Background:

- located in North West of Spain
- 650.000 persons
- industrial and domestic mixed
- supply water 68 hm<sup>3</sup> / year (2005)
- Sewage water 70 hm<sup>3</sup> / year (005)
- All the services about the water are municipals
- Project “improvement and management of water in Saragossa” (2000-2007)

### Changes needed:

- need to inform / motivate people and change policies

### Tools:

- workshops
- education campaigns (schools, media....)
- action research

### Activities:

- Building on current stakeholder groups into a learning alliance, launch SWITCH
- Bring on board citizen groups (neighbourhood associations)
- Exchange of info between city council and SWITCH partners
- Launch information / awareness campaign
- Carry out a case study in Saragossa on current methods of water demand management at utility and household levels and compare with good practices
- Disseminate case study findings to the expanded LA
- Build synergies between SWITCH and xpo 2008 “Water and sustainable development”

## Scaling up at global level

What is needed to achieve SWITCH paradigm?

- Consolidation and integration of SWITCH outcomes through Global Learning Alliance
- Bring in complementary knowledge and resources from other global initiatives through Global Learning Alliance
- Dissemination (standard)

Tasks/activities needed

- Involve city managers and accountants / water utilities
- Identify 40 more cities in Europe where new water plans are under development
  - keep them posted about SWITCH progress
  - invite them to workshops
  - (training??)
- Big event at Zaragoza 2008
- Team up with other major international programmes → joint workshops..
- ICLEI World Congress 2009
- Identify “new” city that is now under construction (China) – “City 10” – all SWITCH aspects.

Concrete activities in 2006

- Global Learning Alliance
  - Task force to prepare proposal (concept, participation, roles...)
  - Seek resources from 2007

Other events

- WEDC Annual Conference Nov. 2007
- Stockholm World Water Week (too late?)

Comments

- Be more modest, consolidate existing project first
- Emphasise role of Global Learning Alliance to bring City Learning Alliance together

## SWITCH Deliverable Briefing Note Template

SWITCH Document D6.2.1 Report of consortium LA training workshop
Deliverable reference: D6.2.1
Author(s) and Institution(s) Marieke Adank, Peter Bury, John Butterworth, Deirdre Casella, Mike Morris, Joep Verhagen
Publication date: 1 April 2006
Audience SWITCH consortium members
<b>Purpose</b> Learning Alliances training and planning sessions formed a core part of the agenda for the SWITCH start-up meeting held in Delft, the Netherlands between the 18th and 21st April, 2006 covering two days of the meeting. This report summarises the discussions during those sessions including copies of all presentations given as part of the training and the results of discussions and planning.
<b>Background</b> SWITCH is based around the development (of learning alliances) to drive more demand-led research processes. Such approaches were new to many of the consortium members, and details and implications unclear for implementation of the project.
<b>Potential Impact</b> Successful learning alliances are essential to the vision of implementation set out in the SWITCH project.

LA Facilitation Training Report

Cairo and Lodz

April 2007



### 5.3. A - General

Title of training	Learning Alliance Development and Facilitation
Place	Cairo, Egypt and Lodz, Poland
Date	24-27 January and 28-31 March 2007
Trainers	John Butterworth, Joep Verhagen (IRC)
Resource persons	<div>Cairo Barbara Anton (ICLEI), Peter Laban (CARE-International/ Empowers), Patrick Moriarty (IRC/ Empowers), Mona Barghout (Empowers), Firas Abd Al-hadi (INWRDAM/ Empowers), Rania Anwar Zoubi (Empowers), Sameera Rifai (Empowers), Galal Moawad (Empowers)</div> <div>Lodz Monika Dziegielewska Geitz (Lodz LA facilitator) , John Butterworth, Jaap Pels and Carmen da Silva (IRC), Alistair Sutherland (NRI), Samira Rifai (Empowers)</div>
Main target audience:	Learning Alliance facilitators
Learning objective for main target audience:	To acquire knowledge and skills to initiate, establish and facilitate learning alliances in their city
Number of participants	Cairo: 15 Lodz: 12
Gender balance	Cairo: 9 female participants; 6 male participants 4 female facilitators/ resource person in Lodz; 6 male facilitators/ resource person in Lodz Lodz: 7 female participants, 5 male participants
Number of participating members of LA teams per city	Cairo: Accra (1), Lodz (2), Belo Horizonte (1), Beijing (1), Alexandria (10) Lodz: Lodz, Hamburg, Birmingham, Tel Aviv No city coordinators were present in Cairo, one was in Lodz.
Location of materials and further information	All information from the course including presentations, photos, city building blocks is available at

[www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1197](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1197)

Cairo city posters:

[www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1218](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1218)

The session plans contain links to many other useful materials.

## 5.4. B - Session outcomes

This report briefly documents the outcomes and key reflections (especially on methodologies used) on the sessions and the overall course. All session plans with objectives, methods, links to background reading and other sources of information can be found on the switch webpages.

Day 1

Session 1: Introduction to this training course

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Professor Zalewski European Regional Centre of Ecology a/u UNESCO*  
*John Butterworth*

The group is welcomed by professor Zalewski, head of the European Regional Centre of Ecology. He stressed the importance of working across sectors to find integrated approaches to complex problems. This, however, is a challenge as most professionals are sectorally oriented.

Feedback/remarks on methodologies

*Welcome, expectations and fears*

Everyone introduces themselves and we do an exercise to record the interest of the group in participating in this course. Participants can physically take a stand on one of four course objectives:

- To meet (other) LA facilitators (John, Jaap)
- To learn about LAs (Carmen, Alistair, )
- To go home with a concrete plan (
- To share my experiences (Samira, Monika)

In Cairo, a core group of participants discussed their expectations before Alexandrian participants joined. The names indicate where people feel their main expectations lay:

- To meet other LA facilitators
- To learn about LAs (Lijuan, Sonia, Bertha, Aga, Barbara)
- To go home with a concrete plan
- To share my experiences (Monika)

These were revisited at the end of the course as part of the course evaluation.

In Cairo, fears were also discussed under the following headings

- Communication will be one way
- Programme is too full
- Training is not practical or applicable enough
- I should have brought other people from my city

The 4 corners method for expectations and feared worked very well and the expectations and fears of participants were revisited at the end of course. While perhaps there was not enough room for participants to introduce other expectations and fears in this exercise, related interviews by the participants did allow for some other expectations to be raised.



### *Introduction to Learning alliances*

Remarks from discussions after the presentation covered:

- Success factors for engaging stakeholders:
  - Clearly communicate benefits
  - Clearly define roles
  - Make sure that ownership will develop
- You have to listen well and be open for concerns
- First change mentality of people (HOW?)
- Involve people early

In Cairo, it was found that the presentation introducing LAs was too long and addressed too many issues. So, in Lodz it was shortened split up with discussion and/or an exercise in between.

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*John Butterworth*

### Session 2

The LA approach and LA activities in SWITCH

John's presentation cites the EC review of current research which highlights some common shortcomings:

Much of current research

- Takes place in institutional vacuum
- Ignores political context
- Does not respond to demand
- has outputs that are not timely or is disseminated in a form that is not useful
- Fails to reflect or accommodate (institutional/sectoral) reality

The approach of applying LAs in SWITCH aims to address these shortcomings through more integrated research which provides innovations that address realities and involve stakeholders and will be implemented, sustained and scaled-up. Through LAs we also aim to build capacity that can be sustained after the project ends.

In short, SWITCH is not just about doing different things, but *doing things in a different way*.

This was a good start-up and gave some background that links well to the next session.

The diagram that John shows (two circles with researchers as part of LA, vs LA as dissemination platform ) reveal two different ways of looking at research. These became apparent in the interviews done by Carmen at the Birmingham scientific meeting (see briefing note 3) and the session on action research revisits this difference.

**Further reading on the LA approach: SWITCH learning alliances briefing note No.1 by Mike Morris <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1347>**

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*John Butterworth*

### Session 3

Current SWITCH LA issues

- What are the mechanisms to link LAs and research?
- What makes LA s different from other stakeholder approaches?

Out of the presentation came a Suggestion to do an exercise on differences LA and other forms of research partnerships/ stakeholder involvement. This was not done separately, although it was explored during the week, and addressed by John on day 4 of the training. I'm not sure it's totally clear to everyone, especially those outside of the participants of this training.

Interview with Carmen Da Silva on findings consortium

For further reading: Briefing note 3  
<http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/content/download/1364/7140/file/LA%20briefing%20note%20>

### *Adult learning (Cairo)*

Key points of discussion were:

- Learning has to do with inspiration; e.g. mixing younger and older generations triggers learning effects
- Proper identification of learning needs is important
- Open issue: How to ensure that accepted knowledge will be applied in the long-run?
- First step of learning is understanding why existing situations/attitudes/behaviour etc. are as they are.

The short 'intermezzo' where Joep asked participants to fold arms; then asks that they should change the order or their arms nicely demonstrated how difficult it is to change routines and to fall back into old behaviours after learning. It triggered some understanding on the issues on adult learning to be addressed even before actual presentation

This session was taken out in the Lodz training.

### Session 4: Facilitation skills for learning alliances

Some reflections on the content of the session were:

- Co-facilitation helps
- Facilitation has two aspects: facilitation of meetings and facilitation of the network as such. Differentiation is necessary
- 'Manipulation' (Steering process, not contents) should be avoided. Transparency is also critical

The intervention exercise was popular in both Cairo and Lodz. In Cairo, three problems were addressed:

- a) sewage sludge disposal not accepted in the elected place in Alexandria
- b) civil servants don't want extra work
- c) how can NGOs/civil society be involved without always being negative

Some key lessons:

- 'No discussion permitted' means a lot of desire for speaking out develops. It's a good exercise before a break where discussions can continue 'freely'. The exercise also encourages listening.
- What to do if other people don't really understand problem? Answer is to arrange as peer to peer - but also tricky if group is too homogenous

## Session

### Learning alliance Facilitation skills and methods

Presentation and short discussion on what facilitation is and what the role, abilities of a facilitator are.

Facilitation: Enable process capacity building in combination with problem solving, consensus building and action learning

A process of 'un-learning' the old and learning through doing something new

Facilitator Notes (with links) can be found at: [www.irc.nl/page/30476](http://www.irc.nl/page/30476)

Background information about facilitation, including concepts of capacity building, learning and facilitation can be found at: [www.irc.nl/page/29186](http://www.irc.nl/page/29186)

Exercise: city building blocks [ongoing] (poster to record learnings)

All participants took part in this exercise to reflect on and document take-home lessons and next steps.

## *Reflections*

Although Monika elicited responses in her presentation, the group was a bit held back in this session, the practical work of starting on the city block worked well and was seen as a useful part of this training.

## Incident/ peer-assist/ intervention

This session was introduced using an animated video, which was quite good and a nice change from the regular powerpoint.

In two groups we practiced with the peer assist method. Two people presented a problem and the group provided possible solutions and ideas. A facilitator assists in the process.

This method was enjoyed by participants.

Some feedback on the method:

- Listening without responding can be challenging
- the exercise really forces you to explain problems clearly in concise and focused way.
- Analysing problem is easier because of questions asked
- it is efficient/ and the quality of information good: each person is confident to have the stage to express thoughts/ideas
- It helps to map yourself in relationship to the problem: who can contribute to the solution?
- It is good to have two rounds, this gives you two opportunities to reflect a bit further and express yourself better.
- The problem owner needs some time to reflect on all the solutions, (s)he shouldn't have to respond right away at the end of the session.

## *Networks*

The whispering chain illustrated how messages change and/or get lost when passed from one to the next. Another interesting example was about Indian cooking. Indian housewives pass

on recipes but they are never fully revealed, one or two ingredients usually remain a secret. This is an example of obstacles and strategies of information-sharing.

**Further reading: Facilitating Networks - a good practice guide (2004, DfID workshop output): <http://www.km4dev.org/index.php/articles/330>**

The outcomes of a buzz group exercise were clustered under the following headings:

#### Costs

- financial barriers
- information costs
- somebody needs money to give you information

#### Knowledge

- not being aware of the kind of information that could and needs to be shared
- inadequate knowledge of the field of our interlocutor

#### Different backgrounds

- different personal interests
- lack of consensus on what constitutes a problem for cultural reasons
- cultural and language barriers impede understanding
- different strategies between organisations

#### Attitude

- Lack of trust that the other party will take your knowledge or suggestion seriously and provide appropriate solutions
- Keep no change
- Personal inhibitions (shyness, low self-confidence)

#### Mechanism

- lack of mechanism for information exchange
- legal barriers
- hierarchy/not clearly defined responsibilities
- technical barriers

#### Political barriers (in between)

#### Power!

- Information is a power
- Keeping information helps you keep your position
- Being miser with information
- Vanity
- Security barriers
- Because people think that others may take their efforts when they give them information

Solutions were brainstormed differently. This time cards were placed on the wall by the facilitator rather than moved around on the floor by all participants. The level of involvement and enjoyment was different.

#### Visit Demonstration projects in Lodz

We made two field trips to demonstration projects, where we learned more about SWITCH research activities in Lodz as well as issues around involving stakeholders. The group also practiced two facilitation methods: interview and buzz groups.

The projects visited were

The Waste water plant and the sludge utilization project

River revitalization and its reservoirs

Methods: the group asked several researchers questions, they had to prepare the answers and illustrations to possible questions beforehand.

For the second visit we worked in Buzz groups, which was a first effort at working together and worked well.

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*John Butterworth*

#### Session

##### Reflection day 1

The plenary discussion brought out some issues about SWITCH and the LA approach:

- The project requires Cross-sectoral work while outside SWITCH there are many practical constraints. This is a tension.
- Stakeholders are involved, but is it a learning alliance?

Participants also shared the following :

- Alistair shared the image of research as a river: it started before SWITCH and is already flowing in a set path, the LA and SWITCH can help create sluices, or keep information in the eddies and share it.
- Bringing together viewpoints
- The visits were very useful as they helped to give a better idea of what is happening in Lodz and it was fun to see a bit of the city

#### Session 6. Day 2 – Thursday 29 March

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Iwona Wagner*  
*Director municipal department of economy [name]*

#### Session

##### Plenary opening: Second Lodz LA meeting

Day 2 brought together the LA in the municipal office. We were welcomed by the Director, whose speech seemed to illustrate that the municipality is well on board on the LA approach. The session started with a speech which highlighted the aims of a LA and welcomed different stakeholder groups; Moving beyond the sectoral approach, communication with researchers,

representatives from municipality, architecture, environmental protection, landscape planning, representatives of sewage treatment and water works, educational sector, private companies and other guests, including NGOs.

‘SWITCH is about Integrating research, the learning alliance approach and implementation.’

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Professor Zalewski*

Presentation on the main theoretical components of the research in Lodz

Several presentations followed. The first was by Professor Zalewski and outlined the *Eco-hydrology* approach. This entails dual regulation : altering hydrology and regulation of hydrology by shaping biota.

*Harmonization*: of hydrological measures with hydrological infrastructure

*Integration*: of various regulations/ measures

*Dual regulation*: solutions for water science, society and ecology

There were also presentations by *Monika Dziegielewska Geitz* [on facilitation], *Barbara Gortat* Lodz departments of Strategy and Analysis, Infrastructure, and a local NGO, the Lodz Destination Alliance and *Dr Wojciech Michalski* [...].

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Jaap Pels*

Facilitating networks/ processes

This session started off with the *Whispering Game* which highlighted how difficult it is to get communication right as well as the importance of developing a common understanding and a common language.

This was a good energizer after the one-way lectures. The space and group were not communicated clearly beforehand, so Jaap had to do some improvising here.

Jaap Pels highlighted a range of issues, such as the basics of *what is facilitation?* And *What is a network?* His presentation contains a useful slide summing up differences between *social networks/ community of practice/ LA networks/ thematic group/ project team*

He also highlighted Activities, Behaviours of a facilitator as well as tools and channels you can use.

Some key messages for LA facilitators in SWITCH: LA isn't a project group, and problems will not be solved within the timeframe of SWITCH, so a strong LA is needed that can be sustained over time.

- Clear communication of who is who and how to reach them is essential for making the LA work. Also, quality of information and constant flow between members of the LA.
- Repeat the message and connect to other initiatives/ projects and heighten visibility of SWITCH. (Sell-sell-sell)
- Make information easily accessible, for example through website
- Informal meetings are important for ensuring communication.

Jaap ended with a proverb: *Tell me and I will forget, teach me and I will remember, involve me and I will learn.*

*Feedback on this session:*

NB: Links are not visible (in green)

Maybe too much focus on facilitator and not on the LA's?, Some of the terms are jargon

Nice with pictures.

The presentation was well received and many people picked up on the importance of social events 'happy hours'

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz

*John Butterworth*

### Stakeholder analysis

Short presentation with key questions for Stakeholder Analysis and for understanding the Institutional arrangements and context/ connections in the system. This is based on briefing note 2

*Further reading:* SWITCH learning alliances briefing note No.2 on stakeholder analysis [www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1439](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1439)

Lesson for LAs: Develop a baseline understanding of current institutional performance, especially relating to integration/ coordination: not how the individual organisations are working, but how the system is operating as a whole.

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz

*Monika Dziegielewska Geitz, Iwona Wagner, Agnieszka Jaszcak*

### Exercise: world café

This session built on stakeholder exercise done in previous LA meeting, discussing 3 questions: 1) Who are other stakeholders in urban water management in Lodz, who could make the project effective? 2) How can these stakeholders be grouped/ categorised? 3) What mechanisms can best be used to engage each of these groups effectively?

Some outcomes:

- Involve more investors and other networks in the LA
- Communication is key in keeping the network active and linking different stakeholders

### *Feedback on this session:*

The method was not clear to the facilitators or participants. The role of participants, kind of participation: the students were not give much room to participate, others dominated the discussion

Phil: more confused, where does LA stop? but also interesting to do this in another city and see that there are many parallels

Jochen: questions usefulness of group tool for finding solutions, often the results don't go beyond the obvious.

Samira: this structure is a good way to build on initial question to avoid all group coming up with same general answers.

### Reflection day 2

It was nice to spend the day with insiders as it gives you a better feel for the issues and also for the city. Working in the world café was good. There seemed to be consensus in the groups, also the method helped to keep identifying new stakeholders even at regional level or with another key focus (secondary and tertiary stakeholders)

The stakeholders present were enthusiastic and urged the LA coordinator to involve them more, speak to their bosses to help explain the LA approach and importance of being

involved. The students were also very eager to be involved, although less confident about talking in the groups.

Monika remarked that LA facilitation could be a full-time job, this is a difficulty

The day was very full, the process was well revitalised by the whispering game, which got people out of the passive listening role and got people laughing. The large table increased the formality of the session. It is important to provide water during such a long day, especially for the speakers.



## Session

### Learnings from the Empowers approach

Samira showed a film made for TVE about the project (see [www.earthreport.tve.co.uk](http://www.earthreport.tve.co.uk)).

Empowers (2003-2007) has been implemented in Jordan Egypt and Palestine. The countries are facing a water crisis, which is aggravated by centralist approaches, fragmentation of responsibilities and conflicts between different stakeholders. The Empowers project worked at national level (steering committee with stakeholder representative from all levels) as well as intermediate (governorate) and local level as well as regional exchange once a year. Involving end-users in water planning and decision-making is key to the approach. This involves bringing end-users and government officials together in partnerships like the LAs.

The film is one of the process documentation tools the project used and highlights problems around water-scarce regions but also the different institutional levels involved. The Empowers partners are to maintain partnership beyond current project. 80% of the funding is directed towards capacity building and stakeholder involvement.

TVE has offered to do the same for SWITCH, but budget would need to be arranged for this.

Samira also had a detailed powerpoint presentation, describing some of the approaches used in Empowers to involve stakeholders and to measure progress.

Some key *lessons learnt* relevant for SWITCH:

- stakeholders must be involved from the beginning, before any action is taken in implementation
- Institutional hosts are needed to sustain process.
- Different solutions/ techniques needed for involving people equally (social inclusion).
- Communication between stakeholders is crucial for finding solutions that work for different stakeholders and for developing joint strategies.
- End users are also important resources for sharing innovative solutions.
- Quality of participation is central as well as actions being taken, and improvement of communication between stakeholders.
- Sustainability and Scaling are sought through regular involvement of national level as well as an extensive communication strategy: manuals have been given to governorates and national level

Empowers applied a stakeholder analysis with attention to social inclusion and developed participatory methods. The key activities were focused around Stakeholder dialogue and concerted action. Their participatory water planning cycle (6-step) can be found on the website. [www.empowers.info](http://www.empowers.info)

Process documentation was applied to observe the progress in active participation by stakeholders, especially for empowerment of marginalised groups.

Empowers focused on action-research and capacity building: Demonstration projects were broken down to implement and build skills for team this was then replicated in other villages.

## Ongoing exercise

### City building blocks

The group spent some more time on developing the building block. The group felt that this is useful to make sure that all the ideas and issues discussed can be converted into action

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Kinga, John Butterworth*

### Exercise:

#### Visioning and scenario building (posters)

#### Why visioning and scenario-building?

Working on immediate problems as well as aiming at changes for the future. For this we need to think about future trends, global pressures and uncertainty.

#### Key concepts:

- *Vision*: where we want to go
- *Scenarios*: possible future situations
- *Strategies*: medium to longer-term planning framework.
- *Plans*: coherent set of decisions about activities

We are close to the starting point in developing scenarios and strategies to achieving the vision. The vision should be developed together with the LA. Vision scenarios and strategy need to be consistent

The presentation provided examples for Lodz. In 2007 a series of workshops on visioning and scenario building supported by WP1.1 and 6.2 are planned, which will lead to a SWITCH book. Where are the cities going and why.

### Session:

#### Presentation

Building on EMPOWERS methodology that helps think about future in planning

[www.empowers.info](http://www.empowers.info)

#### *further reading:*

Empowers working paper No.4 on Visions, Scenarios and Strategies at [www.empowers.info/page/1057](http://www.empowers.info/page/1057)

Key lesson for LAs: Give thought to briefing and awareness-raising to inform dialogue on vision development and also how to disseminate vision once it has been agreed on by stakeholders. Considerations include timeframe, issues and policy

#### *Comments from the group:*

#### *Legitimacy and mandate to do this as SWITCH*

Will stakeholders accept us as the right people to design a vision for the whole city?(probably not in all places). For Hamburg, perhaps we need to focus on the island only as others have already developed it for the city. Birmingham stakeholders have seen LA as platform/ conduit for visions to be aligned and tested.

*General vision following city vision ? deal with scale, legitimacy and scope. Connect to channels who have more legitimacy.*

For SWITCH, focus on the city make vision more around areas that council could need some help on.

*Involve professional facilitator/ outsider for main events this is provided for to a certain extent in budget.*

*Indicators and M&E? What about guidance on indicators, why are there no inputs from other WPs?*

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Alistair Sutherland*

Session:

Action research

Is learning the same as research?

Differences action research and 'conventional' research ,

To what extent does current research have characteristics of action research and how could the principles be integrated into IWRM.

Exercise in Buzz groups

In SWITCH we want to contribute to problem solving and also contribute to sustainability by increasing ownership and ensuring that the research being done is not in isolation from the institutional context in the cities. Action research is also about documenting and sharing the research and its outcomes

*Key lesson for LAs:* The LA is supposed to be a mechanism for doing the research, not a separate aspect: the challenge and complexity of IWRM requires integrated solutions, so research also has to be grounded in city reality.

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Jaap Pels*

Exercise:

Open space on SWITCH Zaragoza 2008 Protocol

*Open space* is an exercise that leaves a great deal of freedom to the group to fill a period of time according to their needs, problems and issues that exist.

There is no fixed agenda, only time slots. The group identifies issues to discuss and then these are matched to the time-slots available.

This requires time and a certain level of trust and ease within the group.

How:

Create a physical open space

Collect issues: Create ownership by the cities and mayors

Steps:

1) Gather topics

- Group topics

- Diverge

2) Explore problem

- List participants of the topics

3) Converge

- groups make action list

- plenary discussion

*Feedback:*

This method worked quite well. Useful as well as blue-skies ideas were generated and it felt relaxed as the group was already comfortable working together.

Session 8. Day 4 –

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Agnieszka Jaszcak*

Opening

The last day started with a reflection on lessons learnt so far using music and words on cards that were passed around: participants pass around these cards and when the music stops, the person with the cards reads out and says what it relates to in the training

*Feedback:*

This is a good and creative way to get people thinking about what they experienced the day before.

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Alistair Sutherland*

Introduction Monitoring & Evaluation

M&E for documenting how learning alliances work, for learning and replication.

Alistair describes the differences between monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment in terms of timing, focus, responsibility and feedback.

(How) can we demonstrate the effect of Las? Without a framework for LA, it will be difficult to monitor.

Monitoring can focus on external issues: *accountability*, as well as internal reflection on performance, with a focus on *learning*.

Learning occurs especially through looking at WHY did change occur or not.

Indicators for measuring change imply also a theory behind what you're doing. Therefore it is important to reflect on the rationale behind LAs

*Participatory M&E* has an emphasis on actor participation in design and implementation of the M&E system. Participation is used in generating indicators as well as data.

For example in Empowers the stakeholders produced their own monitoring report on progress experienced.

Different methodologies outlined in this presentation include:

- *Logframes*,

- *Impact pathway* (how do activities lead to impacts?)

(research planning and management tool, especially for scaling up)

- *Outcome mapping*: monitoring what actors outside of your direct sphere of influence are doing, which is linked to your outcome.

(developed by IDRC): WHY, HOW, WHO, WHAT?

- *Social change networks*

Performance indicators and operational dimensions

- *Balanced scorecards*: start off with vision and goal and then try to balance different perspectives

- *Actor network maps*: Social networks can be visually represented, with attention to different kinds of relationships and also different strength of relationships.

Some basic and easy to use tools for monitoring that might be applied by the city LAs include:

- *Mood maps*: visualising how people feel

- *Participation spreadsheets*: tracking various issues relating to meeting attendance

- *Progress reports*: individual members could report or whole alliance could report.

#### *Feedback:*

Using logframe could be useful for monitoring LAs

Outcome mapping: LA can focus on the primary stakeholders within their sphere of influence in order to look at achievable goals: however, our goals are often outside of our sphere of influence. This can also be used to show changes in learning and could be part of the LA documentation.

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Carmen da Silva*

#### **Session:**

Outlining one method for monitoring using ladders with 4 indicators ranking from 0 (no change) to 100 (ideal situation). This method is used in participatory monitoring approach for tracking changes in the quality of interactions/ participation. For analysis of the ranking the reason for the score is an important piece of information to document.

Exercise and discussion: The group developed one objective and 4 indicators.

For more information:

Method for Participatory Assessment guideline (includes examples of mini-scenario tools)  
<http://www.wsp.org/publications/mpa%202003.pdf>

European Commission Project Cycle Management guidelines (includes how to do logical framework) [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/qsm/documents/pcm\\_manual\\_2004\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/qsm/documents/pcm_manual_2004_en.pdf)

*Action points* for follow up by WP6.2:

Possible formats and examples of objectives for SWITCH will be developed by LA support group (WP6.2) Cities can then adapt and develop indicators.

Write BN 4 on M&E

WP 6.2 Develop 10 objectives and indicators (keep it simple! Max: 3 cross-cutting Outputs, 4 indicators)

These should link to City storylines, which have some objectives.

There should also be an avenue for discussion between cities the progress of monitoring.

Somewhere around November: workshop of all LA facilitators (funding has been allocated) look at what's happening.

1<sup>st</sup> annual meeting of the group (November), focus could be on M&E

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Jaap Pels*

Learning and sharing mechanisms

How are LAs going to organise communication? For the cities it is important that there is a central place to post and share information.

## Presentation

Jaap showed different web-based communication tools. We looked at the structure of the SWITCH website and then practiced loading one picture on the internet.

Posting on the SWITCH website is an issue that must be taken up by IHE.

## Action point

The LA facilitators/ city coordinators must indicate that this is a priority. All the cities will use the same template for publishing on the SWITCH intranet website

## Lessons:

- keep it simple, not many empty folders!
- Think of the user: how will they search information, how can you interest them in reading on (sales-pitch: a short paragraph on the document you have published, with a link underneath)

## Feedback:

Several times the need for publishing on internet has been brought up. Communication is needed with IHE on this to ensure quick action. LA facilitators need password and will then need to start creating a city website

## LA city websites

Some issues discussed:

*For whom*

*What language?*

Most things will be in the language of the LA, others that are relevant for wider audience could be summarised and translated in English.

*Content:*

What info

Local homepage (local language) with *introduction of the project* and activities in the city

*Upcoming events,*

*How people can participate*

Lodz: profile of stakeholders of the learning alliance, with what they can offer, links to their institutes.

*About the project: planning, results,*

*News* monthly story/ photo this could be rotating

Or you could publish link to news/ publicity ), audio/video/photos

*Space for comments/* forum- needs to be moderated!

*Q & A section*

*Contact form*

The website should contain text and pictures, but also audio could be published

## Lessons:

A technical manual can be found on internet:

[www.ez.no](http://www.ez.no)

However, the technical skills are less important than skills in making information interesting, journalistic skills. ICLEI has budgeted for a short training, which possibly could be linked to process documentation training in July.

If you just publish things, people will not automatically use the internet site, you supplement this by email: regularly prompt your community that there are new things to read, including the link to the site.

Facilitator/resource person in Lodz  
*Monika*

### Completion city Building blocks

This was seen as part of the process documentation of LA planning. The facilitators will add the outcomes to their city story line.

We ended the last session by completing our city building blocks posters and explaining them to the group. Some key points are summarized below:

#### *Hamburg:*

Jochen has mapped the process of LA development and research up until the training and the things he will take home, international building exhibition 2013.

At the present state of planning process there are questions:

The LA is now being facilitated by two planners, it is unclear if what they are doing is a planning process with stakeholder engagement or a LA?

*Feedback:* Difference between stakeholder planning process and LA process: planning process doesn't usually have scope for innovations or pilots.

Also: SWITCH is about innovation for scaling up, which goes further than mere planning.

#### *Action points*

- Refine planning IUWRM
- Establish LA as exchange forum using conferences and newsletters etc.

#### Tel Aviv:

##### *Action points*

- Meet with LA to develop vision and identify problem analysis
- Look for a start up activity that can be easily implemented: success story
- Start website
- Share city story report among LA and outside
- Technical workshop for LA
- Communicating with other LA facilitators to discuss issues arising

#### Lodz: revisit goals

Now we have stakeholders together, we need to work on actually building and strengthening the alliance: communication is key, using different tools

##### *Action points:*

- re-inspiring, building the group spirit
- internal organisation of the team, communication within the team
- Supporting LA participants in communicating with their institutions
- ambassadors needed within LA
- moving outside of demonstrations to ask stakeholders what they want so that we increase ownership

- Keep connecting SWITCH events to city events
- consolidate different planning processes

#### Reflections on expectations of the course

We went back to our posters stating the four objectives. Most participants felt that they had been met. There was less sharing of experiences than expected. This had to do with there only being four cities present.



Session 3: Key methods in initiating learning alliances

Session 4: Experiences in using a learning alliances approach

Session 5: Introduction to action research

Session 6: Introduction to monitoring for learning alliances

Session 7: Experiences in monitoring for learning alliances

Session 8: Communication skills for learning alliances

8.1. C. City building blocks

8.2.

8.3. D. Results of evaluation

8.4.

8.5. D. Appendices

- Final announcement for course including list of participants
- Session plans

Participants and contacts  
Cairo Course

	Name	Email	Role
1	John Butterworth	<a href="mailto:butterworth@irc.nl">butterworth@irc.nl</a>	Facilitator
2	Peter Laban	<a href="mailto:plaban@palnet.com">plaban@palnet.com</a>	Empowers Resource person CARE
3	Patrick Moriarty	<a href="mailto:moriarty@irc.nl">moriarty@irc.nl</a>	Empowers Resource person IRC
4	Bertha Darteh	<a href="mailto:berthadarteh@yahoo.co.uk">berthadarteh@yahoo.co.uk</a>	LA facilitator – Accra
5	Li Lijuan	<a href="mailto:lilj@igsnr.ac.cn">lilj@igsnr.ac.cn</a>	LA facilitator – Beijing
6	Monika Geitz	<a href="mailto:info@revitalized-lodz.org">info@revitalized-lodz.org</a>	LA facilitator – Lodz
7	Ms Agnieszka	<a href="mailto:sekretariat@mcepan.lodz.pl">sekretariat@mcepan.lodz.pl</a>	Studying LA process in Lodz
8	Sônia M.M. Knauer	<a href="mailto:knauer@pbh.gov.br">knauer@pbh.gov.br</a>	LA facilitator - Belo Horizonte
9	Barbara Anton	<a href="mailto:barbara.anton@iclei.org">barbara.anton@iclei.org</a>	SWITCH Training coordinator and resource person
10	Mona Barghout	<a href="mailto:monainw@nic.net.jo">monainw@nic.net.jo</a>	Empowers Resource person - Jordan
11	Firas Abd Al-hadi	<a href="mailto:firasinw@nic.net.jo">firasinw@nic.net.jo</a>	Empowers Resource person
12	Rania Anwar Zoubi	<a href="mailto:rania@care.org.jo">rania@care.org.jo</a>	Empowers Resource person Jordan
13	Sameera Rifai	<a href="mailto:rifai@carewbq.org">rifai@carewbq.org</a>	Empowers Resource person - Palestine
14	Joep Verhagen	<a href="mailto:verhagen@irc.nl">verhagen@irc.nl</a>	Facilitator
15	Helaly Helaly	<a href="mailto:drhelalley@hotmail.com">drhelalley@hotmail.com</a>	Alex. wastewater company
16	Akram Arif		Alex. sanitation drainage company
17	Hanan Fouad Taha		Alex. water company
18	Noha Sabry	<a href="mailto:nohasabry22@hotmail.com">nohasabry22@hotmail.com</a>	Alex. water company
19	Hany Mohamed		Alex governorate
20	Galal Moawad	<a href="mailto:gmmohamed@egypt.care.org">gmmohamed@egypt.care.org</a>	Empowers Resource person
21	El Beyaly	<a href="mailto:elbeyaly@tedata.net">elbeyaly@tedata.net</a>	Consultant to wastewater holding company
22	Nadar Elmasry	<a href="mailto:Nader_mwri@yahoo.com">Nader_mwri@yahoo.com</a>	Ministry of water resources and irrigation
23	May El Soda	<a href="mailto:melsoda@egypt.care.org">melsoda@egypt.care.org</a>	Empowers Resource person - Egypt

24	Nermin Riad	<a href="mailto:nriad@cedare.int">nriad@cedare.int</a>	Cedare water management programme assistant
25	Ashley Good	<a href="mailto:ashley_good@hotmail.com">ashley_good@hotmail.com</a>	Cedare programme assistant
26	Ahmed Hammam	<a href="mailto:Ahmed_Hammam007@hotmail.com">Ahmed_Hammam007@hotmail.com</a>	Ministry of water resources and irrigation
27	Sanaa Elshamy	<a href="mailto:wdisti@mwri.gov.eg">wdisti@mwri.gov.eg</a>	Ministry of water resources and irrigation
28	Saha	<a href="mailto:sezz@cedare.int">sezz@cedare.int</a>	Cedare
29	Dr Khaled Abuzeid	<a href="mailto:kabuzeid@cedare.org">kabuzeid@cedare.org</a>	Cedare water management programme MD

Participants and contacts  
Lodz Course

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Role</b>
1	John Butterworth	<a href="mailto:butterworth@irc.nl">butterworth@irc.nl</a>	Facilitator
2	Monika Dziegielewska Geitz	<a href="mailto:empower_consulting@yahoo.de">empower_consulting@yahoo.de</a>	Facilitator/ host
3	Iwona Wagner	<a href="mailto:iwwag@biol.uni.lodz.pl">iwwag@biol.uni.lodz.pl</a>	Facilitator/host
4	Agnieszka Jaszczak	<a href="mailto:a.jaszczak@erce.unesco.lodz.pl">a.jaszczak@erce.unesco.lodz.pl</a>	Facilitator/ host
5	Barbara Gortat	<a href="mailto:infrastruktura@uml.lodz.pl">infrastruktura@uml.lodz.pl</a>	LA Lodz member
6	Jochen Eckart	<a href="mailto:switch@tu-harburg.de">switch@tu-harburg.de</a>	LA facilitator Hamburg
7	Alistair Sutherland	<a href="mailto:A.J.Sutherland@greenwich.ac.uk">A.J.Sutherland@greenwich.ac.uk</a>	Facilitator
8	Philip Sharp	<a href="mailto:Philip.Sharp@arup.com">Philip.Sharp@arup.com</a>	LA facilitator Birmingham
9	Carmen da Silva	<a href="mailto:dasilva@irc.nl">dasilva@irc.nl</a>	IRC resource person
10	Jaap Pels	<a href="mailto:pels@irc.nl">pels@irc.nl</a>	IRC resource person
11	Avital Ehre	<a href="mailto:avitald@raanana.muni.il">avitald@raanana.muni.il</a>	LA facilitator Tel Aviv
12	Samira Rifai	<a href="mailto:rifai@carewbq.org">rifai@carewbq.org</a>	Empowers Resource person in Palestine



# Training Report

July 2007

## Process Documentation for Learning Alliances and Action Research

Lodz, Poland

1 to 5 July 2007

Report written by IRC international Water and Sanitation Centre, Delft. The training workshop was organised by the innovative communications group at the IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre ([www.irc.nl](http://www.irc.nl)), the SWITCH project ([www.switchurbanwater.eu](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu)), the European Regional Centre for Ecohydrology under the auspices of UNESCO (an international institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences in co-operation with the University of Lodz, [www.erce.unesco.lodz.pl/](http://www.erce.unesco.lodz.pl/)) and the EMPOWERS partnership ([www.empowers.info](http://www.empowers.info)). Financial support was also provided by the CTA, Netherlands.

For comments or questions:

Carmen da Silva: [dasilva@irc.nl](mailto:dasilva@irc.nl)

## Introduction

The training on Process Documentation for Learning Alliances and Action Research lasted for five days and involved a wide range of participants from different countries and professional backgrounds. Each day had a specific focus and was structured around one or more sessions.

*Day 1* (sessions 1-4) focussed on setting the scene: introducing the objectives, main concepts and course agenda. Participants were provided with a folder with handouts including session plans and further reading. Several presentations were given about process documentation and its use, particularly in the EMPOWERS project in the Middle East. The informal evening programme provided further opportunity to the group to get to know each other.

*Day 2* (sessions 4 and 5) focussed on the media (photo, video and writing), the processes in Lodz and various dissemination mechanisms for using in Learning Alliances and other networks. In the afternoon of Day 2 the group split up into the three subgroups on continued working on unpacking the processes, getting to know more about the use of photo video or writing and making a PD plan for the week.

These subgroups continued with practical process documentation using their medium of choice during *Day 3* (session 6a/6b/6c) and *Day 4* (session 7a/7b/7c).

The photography group worked on developing photo essays around social inclusion in Lodz, while the video group worked on two short videos on restoration of the city's rivers and the writing/voice group conducted interviews with members of the learning alliance and general public around issues of water management in the city.

*Day 5* brought the subgroups back together to share their products and discuss the process of developing them. There was animated feedback and discussion both in the plenary and in small group sessions. The final products of each of the media groups were then presented to Lodz Learning Alliance members and other interested citizens of Lodz at the Lodz Promotion office in the afternoon.

Throughout the week, participants also acted as reporters and documented the training process itself, an exercise that gives insight into the training process in the subgroups and also helped to stimulate reflection and documenting skills. These 'blogs' as well as the course materials and final products are available online. This document provides a record of the training and highlights where the materials used and produced during the week.

At [www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2013](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2013) you can find the final versions of the outputs the participants produced as part of the course.

## Reading guide

Section A- General (p3): gives the general information about the training


Section B- Session outcomes (p4- 31): documents the outcomes and key reflections (especially on methodologies used) on the sessions and the overall course.

This report follows the training day by day, describing sessions, methods and key findings.

### 8.6. Section C- Results of evaluation (p32)

#### Section D- Appendices (p33-64)

1. Final announcement of the workshop, including agenda
2. List of participants and contact details
3. SWITCH Aide memoir (where to find website, blog, picture gallery etc.)
4. Fears and expectations
5. Process documentation plan photography group
6. Process documentation plan video group
7. Process documentation plan writing & voice group

 indicates that the weblog contains the document described.

The **session plans** with objectives, methods, links to background reading and other sources of information can be found online.

## 8.7. A - General

Title of training	Process Documentation for Learning Alliances and Action Research
Place	Lodz, Poland
Date	1 to 5 July 2007
Trainers	John Butterworth, Ton Schouten, Dick de Jong (IRC), Joshka Wessels (Sapiens Productions)
Resource persons	Monika Dziegielewska Geitz (LA facilitator), Agnieszka Jaszczak, Iwona Wagner, Kinga Krauze, Stella Szewczyk, Aleksandra Skoron, Katarzyna Izydorczyk (Lodz University / ERCE); Filip Drozd, Piotr Zaton (National Film School); Carmen da Silva Wells, Jaap Pels, Ewen Le Borgne (IRC); Joanna Grabowska (Gazeta Wyborcza).
Main target audience:	Learning Alliance facilitators, IRC partners, other participants interested in the process documentation work.
Learning objective for main target audience:	Acquire knowledge and skills to undertake high quality and innovative documentation of learning and change processes
Number of participants	48
Gender balance	27 female participants; 21 male participants 8 female facilitators / resource persons; 7 male facilitators/ resource persons
Number of participating members of LA teams per city	Accra (2), Lodz (9), Belo Horizonte (1), Beijing (1), Alexandria (2), Hamburg (1), Birmingham (1). Including LA facilitators from Accra, Lodz, Belo Horizonte, Beijing, Birmingham. Including city coordinators from Lodz and Birmingham.
Location of materials and further information	All information from the course including presentations, photos, city building blocks is available at: <a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/processdocumentation">http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/processdocumentation</a> And on: <a href="http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/">http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/</a>



## 8.8. B - Session outcomes


[Day1]

### 8.9. Session 1: Welcome and Introduction

<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-1-introduction>

In this session, John Butterworth introduced the rationale and many issues around the framing of the event:

- Welcome word;
- Logistical issues;
- An introduction to SWITCH and to the city of Lodz (interview by Dick de Jong);
- Explanations about the programme;

This session helped set the scene, explain the rationale of organising the workshop in Lodz, linking up with the ongoing SWITCH activities, with a view to presenting the final results to the Lodz Learning Alliance stakeholders and the public at large. It was also a good occasion to explain that each group was supposed to prepare a Process Documentation plan following the template provided  (*see* filled examples in appendices 5 to 7)

The second part of this session helped the participants get to know (some of) each other by an innovative exercise titled the 'river of life' whereby participants sat in tables of 6 to 8 participants and drew their background leading them to this workshop as well as their expectations of the results of the workshop and how they're hoping to use the results back in their daily work situation. The rivers of life also led the table groups to come up with a list of fears and expectations presented here as clusters.


Expectations:

- *Learn more about process documentation in general*
- *Learning new skills (with video, photo, writing), tools, approaches*
- *Exchange of experiences, ideas, examples + networking*
- *Address community information, relevant tools for work at grassroots level*
- *Improve work and satisfaction of partners, clients etc.*

Fears:


- *Timing / tight programme / Not enough time to practice*
- *May not be applicable to local context when back from workshop*
- *(lack of) Integration between the media groups*
- *Language issues*

 Introductory presentation by John Butterworth,

 Results of all rivers of life

 And the list of all participants are presented here:

<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-1-introduction>

 The full list of fears and expectations is introduced in appendix 4.

At the end of the workshop, the pressure to produce outputs and attend the public exhibition of the final products left little time to come back in plenary to fears and expectations, but the final evaluation, handed out to all participants, gives some indication of satisfied expectations and/or concerns come true. 🔍 The final evaluation is available in appendix 8

## 8.10. Session 2: An introduction to process documentation

Ton Schouten led this second session and presented the background paper that was included in the participants' information package. This general presentation, which touches upon the key concepts, questions, issues and ideas around process documentation (according to IRC), was swiftly followed by a presentation from the EMPOWERS team in the Middle East, where process documentation has been used as part and parcel of the 5-year project.

🔍 This presentation is available on:  
<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-1-introduction>

8.11.

## 8.12. Session 3: Sharing experiences - the EMPOWERS project case

Buthaina Mizyed from Palestine went through the challenges, success stories and challenges around process documentation in EMPOWERS, among which:

- How to keep silent in discussions as a process documenter, when one has also something to say as a participant.-> balancing roles is a challenge.
- Men and women interaction-> this is difficult to achieve at times, but P.D. can help stimulate reflection and build stakeholders' capacities ( for more on this *see* article in handouts).

🔍 This presentation is available on:  
<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-1-introduction>

Group work followed to address some of the participants' burning questions:

### *How to deal with politics?*

There are reports that are done for certain purposes, containing info as is. But for local communities or district authorities, there is a need to show information in an indirect way. Usually one needs to check if the person agrees with the text (article, interview transcript etc.) before publishing it. You need to avoid passing judgements or putting people in a vulnerable situation.

### *Did you have any problem to ask questions at community level with men? If problems, how did you deal with it?*

Coming from another city, being an outsider is easier. In Palestine, it's not difficult to work in communities as a woman.

### *How did you use the EMPOWERS P.D. toolbox?*

All tools were used and tested to find out which ones work. But focussed observation is most important. Portraits were used but didn't help much because direct questions about personalities don't work. Usually the most interesting stuff comes out when the camera is off.

### *What did you use the P.D. materials for?*

There are different outlets possible:

- Website for building information, experiences in English and Arabic, spread success stories, to announce publications etc.
- Hard copy (magazine, project brochures etc.) used for project information, milestones about project etc.
- Much information from the country teams is used to give feedback to country teams and stakeholders that worked on project progress. P.D. is then used as mirror to reflect progress, obstacles met etc. P.D. can be used for internal learning and for adjusting the fieldwork.

### *Which methods were most practical?*

The diary was very rewarding, video was a good tool to track change, photos too. For the inventory of P.D., a good P.D. plan and filing system are key, otherwise, you collect lots of information, but cannot use it properly.

Other points made:

- P.D. is key to monitoring as it helps us understand key issues from the M&E framework of a project. M&E usually focuses more on outputs, while P.D. looks at the process to getting there (or not), look at change in levels/ kinds of interactions, participation, confidence.
- Process documentation can involve stakeholders and can help direct attention not just to the outcomes but also to changes in the way stakeholders interact, empowerment and participation.
- It takes time to build trust with communities to do good process documentation with them.
- [question related to women's participation] There are some examples of women resistant to participating in Learning Alliances because they thought the Learning Alliance would be a talk shop without useful impact. This changed over time and women felt more and more motivated to take part and speak up, because they also saw things changing in their lives.
- The purpose of P.D. dictates the end result: one may use P.D. for general learning, as a tool to promote one's project, to document success stories, perhaps also failures...

Two key questions:

- What to document / whom to target?
- How to use the material?

One participant pointed out that it should be possible to document the process after the project. As many changes take more time than a 3-year project, documenting change should include change happening after end of the project.

After this general sharing session, participants were invited to form / confirm the three groups (writing / voice, photography, video).

We then watched a video made for EMPOWERS, on water scarcity and stakeholder involvement in Jordan. Rania Al Zoubi gave a short introduction.

Participants ended the working part of day 1 with a one-word take home message organised spontaneously by Bertha Darteh from Ghana. After that, the group was invited to the garden for a barbeque dinner.

The take home messages were:

Number of cards	Word expressed
Cluster of five cards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trust</li> <li>• Energy</li> <li>• Open-mind</li> <li>• Openness</li> <li>• Responsibility</li> </ul>
Cluster of three cards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whose agenda?</li> <li>• Expectations??</li> <li>• Think about different expectations</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New ideas, experiences, inspirations</li> </ul>
Clusters of two cards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus 2X + theory of change</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PD Plan</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target!</li> <li>• Channel</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water</li> <li>• Water = power</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring</li> <li>• Monitoring -&gt; process documentation &lt;- journalism</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Networking</li> <li>• Let's work</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tools</li> <li>• Diary</li> </ul>
One cards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tension is good</li> <li>• Interesting</li> <li>• Nice group</li> <li>• Impact</li> <li>• Process</li> <li>• EMPOWERS approach</li> <li>• Incompatibility between PR and empowering communication</li> <li>• PD is not product driven but “lessons learned”, “significant change” driven</li> </ul>

 The general feel of the first day is documented on the Process Documentation blog: <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/01/switch-lodz-pd-day-1/>


[End of day 1]

[day 2]


The second day of the workshop started with a (well appreciated) short summary of the previous day's discussions and some ideas for improvement. We then went on with the scene of the workshop.

#### Session 4: Introduction of media, processes and dissemination mechanisms

John facilitated this session with help from the SWITCH Lodz team, who offered a general presentation of the city of Lodz and its past, of the SWITCH project and the particular water challenges that the SWITCH project is trying to tackle in Lodz.

 These presentations are available as follows [name of the presenter] on <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-2-practicing>:

- City of Lodz, general presentation [Kinga Krauze / Agnieszka Jaszcak]
- The SWITCH project in Lodz [Iwona Wagner]
- The Learning Alliance in Lodz [Monika Dziegielewska Geitz]

 The Lodz learning alliance also has a weblog: <http://switchlodz.wordpress.com/>

These presentations sketched the historical, social and political situation of Lodz, general water management issues in Lodz the focus of the SWITCH project, and finally the SWITCH Lodz learning alliance and its particular concepts, management issues and the required faculties for its facilitator.

Some questions were raised during the session:

##### About Lodz:

- *Where is industry going in the future?*

Unemployment has decreased in the last 10 years or so after rising rapidly post-1989. After factories closed down, people started looking for other opportunities to make money. They created small businesses, family-ran textile workshops. Now these companies are changing into importing companies from other countries. In parallel, there is a successful transformation of the city, attracting major investors. People employed in textile industry are hoping to turn Lodz into a fashion capital. There are no more major textile-producing plants, it is all about processing textile in Lodz from now on. On the other hand, the biggest employer in Lodz at the moment is the University.

##### About the water management situation In Lodz and for SWITCH:

- *How are the water systems funded?*

For a long time, the city of Lodz invested in some ponds. They started with basic investment but now have a large budget for research and for implementation. There are PPP initiatives, leading to private money pouring into the system's funding well.

##### About the Learning Alliance:

- *What is not going so well in the learning alliance?*

There are lots of challenges in getting through to people, setting appointments, although there are certain ways to achieve this anyhow, using some tools. Many LA stakeholders are, in

parallel to SWITCH, busy with creative industries. With a need for a very complex management structure for the LA, non violent communication (NVC) turns very helpful.

- *How are you collaborating with the government and many different stakeholder groups?*

So far, the learning alliance in Lodz has concentrated its efforts on the dialogue with partners in Lodz, including local government. Vertical communication (including with national government) is yet to start. With the civil society too, the link has been established but mostly at local level.

- *Does your learning alliance suffer from staff turnover issues?*

« There is no problem of turnover. There are different meetings and some staff is swapping but in general staff is fairly stable. The key is to sustain the participants' enthusiasm.»

#### About process documentation:

- *How to portray stakeholders if they want to be portrayed in a way that does not appeal to the process documenter?*

« This is a difficult question to answer. In Lodz, video has not been used yet and it might be skipped altogether. It can be rather invasive/ manipulative. The question is: "How political do you want your Learning Alliance to be?" »

#### Other issues raised:

- *Do you have any other example of collective action around water resources apart from the SWITCH project? ->Not that we know of.*
- *Was the buy-in strategy different for one or other stakeholder?* « "It is important for us to help different stakeholders come together. With non violent communication (NVC) as is used in the LA in Lodz, one avoids certain terms and focuses on needs, strategies and requests. This seems to go faster than delving into power issues. »
- *Are the learning alliance members holding a high position in their organisation?* « Yes. It's important to relate this to the degree to which they represent and can take decisions on behalf of their organisation, institutionalising the L.A.

In the second part of the session, each group leader introduced their group in a 10-minute presentation and pitch, both to inform the groups about their intentions in the 2.5 group work days planned and maybe to convince still some indecisive participants about their final choice.

After this session, again some points and questions came up from the participants – to be addressed in the coming days. Maybe we can come up with some ideas on this?


- *What is the difference between these tools?*  
The discussions and presentations helped participants start to get an idea of the tools and how they could be used in their own work
- *Not all of us are storytellers. Is there something in common between the media?*  
It is about telling a story, but photos or video can speak for themselves to a certain extent.
- *How to tell good stories using these media?*  
Plan well for use/ keep users in mind, make it interesting and clear, leave room for interpretation.

- *What would be the facilitator role after this training course?*  
This would differ in different situations.
- *What is the link with participatory videos?*  
*see* handouts: Joshka's guide for DV and article by D. Snowden
- *How to make sure that everybody understands what message you are trying to convey?*  
This is very difficult as you can never fully control, pre-testing, asking feedback and involving stakeholders helps.
- *P.D. is a matter of resources*  
resources must be allocated. Producing a professional video is quite costly, but lower-tech P.D. can also be done. Be creative!

The core interest is how to combine the three media. A critical assessment of budget and skills available, P.D. aims and stakeholders (i.e. who will use the materials and for what), and the context, will help determine what tools are used.

Finally, for the third and last part of the morning session, Jaap Pels gave a presentation on the various virtual SWITCH tools we will use for this process documentation course: the website, the blog, the mailing group etc.

 Jaap's presentation is available at: <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-2-practicing>

 The links, logins and passwords for these tools are available in Appendix 3 (aide memoir).

Key points:

- *The applications mentioned in the presentation (Blog, website etc.) are not always readily available because of bandwidth issues; some are even blocked by institutions*
- *Are there any cheap ways to document processes?* During the week we will enlist the help of several institutions in the city. There are many tools to do PD and different levels of technicality. It is however important to budget for documentation, because it takes time and financial resources (see Ton Schouten's Briefing Note and the Empowers P. D. toolbox)
- RSS (Really Simple Syndication) allows you to import news items like news headlines from any website to any other website or onto one's email address.
- The Process Documentation blog is public, but for videos and photos, it is reserved to SWITCH participants;

The morning session ended with this presentation and all participants were invited to blog their impressions and the results of the group work (coordinated by appointed 'reporters') during the week, up on: <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com>

Session 5: Group work in parallel streams focusing on specific media and tools

- Session 5a: Photography group
- Session 5b: Video group
- Session 5c: Writing and voice group



Titled “Unpacking processes, developments of skills and planning”, this session saw the group split into 3 subgroups and work on their Process Documentation plans (as outlined in the introduction session on the objectives of the workshop).

This day unfolded obviously differently for each group:

#### In the Photography group:

[13 people facilitated by Ton Schouten, Piotr Zaton, Kinga Krauze and Agnieszka Jaszcak]



#### Introduction to Photography

First of all the group got to know Piotr a bit better, while he was showing us some of his work, amazing pictures from nature, with waterfalls, drops of water, rivers. He also showed us the pictures made on Sunday, during our workshop. People and situations, and their pictures, from different angles, teaching us the most important lessons on photography:

- *Come close to your object*
- *Change perspective, keep both object and context in mind*

Ton introduced us into the method we are going to use during this workshop: the method of the *photo essay*.

#### Social Inclusion & Space

As the *social inclusion* component of SWITCH in Lodz has not been worked out yet. We discussed a long time on what it could mean. Is it about participation in general? Or about participation of some marginalized groups?

Soon we moved our discussion to the concept of space, public space and what it is and how it can affect quality of life and give you a sense of belonging, or not belonging. How people create their own space, by making a painting on the wall in the street, by putting flowers outside, or by not doing that and not cleaning up the environment.

Soon we concluded that space and no space was going to be our theme and would lead to photos and materials that can really back up the plans that SWITCH has in the city of Lodz. Giving people a voice about how they think about their space and what it does to them and their quality of life.

#### Plan

We made a plan for Tuesday and split ourselves up into two groups, which will walk throughout the city focusing on making

- 4 portraits of people, of which 2 in space and 2 in no space
- 8 visuals of what space for people is

#### Comments and impressions of participants

##### *Why did we choose the photography group?*

- I normally take a lot of pictures, but, they are not necessarily always good
- I am really interested into the social inclusion theme

- I always made photos as illustrations to my work, yet I never used photography as a process documentation tool.
- Photo is not so persuasive as film
- I would like to improve my skills
- I always found myself more comfortable in documenting by writing, this is a challenge for me.



In the Video group:

[12 people facilitated by Joshka Wessels, Filip Drozd and Iwona Wagner]

- 🔍 The Group exercises of the training day (day 1)
- 🔍 Joshka's presentation on 'Using digital video (DV) as a medium for process documentation
- 🔍 The results of the first day's work for this group are to be found at: <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/video/>
- 🔍 The Process Documentation plans of the video sub-groups are presented in appendix 6.

In the Writing & Voice group:

[12 people facilitated by Dick de Jong, Joanna Grabowska, Monika Dziegielewska Geitz and Ewen Le Borgne]



Joanna Grabowska from the Gazeta Wyborcza (a national and regional daily newspaper where the group worked for the 3 days) gave a presentation about the article she wrote about the SWITCH project.

Joanna also mentioned some key elements that help her write an article:

- Feeling
- Interest in the subject written about
- Emotions
- Easy and simple words
- Attention grabbing headlines and lead
- 5 W's (Who, what, where, when, why + how)
- Diagnose and solution
- The SWITCH project appears only at the end of the article (it's not interesting for the wider audience)

Joanna's article generated 80 reactions on the webforum of the newspaper, a majority concerned that this work would never be finished. The Municipality did not react.

The group members asked further questions about this presentation (the list of these questions is available with Ewen Le Borgne: [Leborgne@irc.nl](mailto:Leborgne@irc.nl))

The rest of the afternoon, the group:

- Discussed what process documentation means and who are we doing it for:
  - *What issues to focus on?*
  - *What gets the reader's attention?*
    - *Flooding issues in the areas concerned?*
    - *Reluctance towards retention reservoirs?*
    - *Awareness raising around heat islands and climate change?*
  - *People's experience with L.A.?*
  - *Topics – interviewees – experiences – audiences*
  - *Municipal / Deliverers / Community (including NGO activist and individuals)*
- Came to the conclusion that there would be two sub-groups:
  - An internal group, focusing on documenting the lessons learnt of the Lodz LA approach for the LA members in Lodz and in other projects and countries
  - An external group, focusing on “how much have we engaged with the people occupying the space?”
- Worked out their P.D. plan and some key questions to prepare for the interviews of the next day and figured on the map how to find the people to interview and who would interview whom.

The first group work day ended with this group with a quick evaluation:

😊 (that was good)	☹ Let's change this / do it differently next time
Very nice group at the Gazeta Wyborcza	We should exchange plans with other groups
Interesting presentation by Joana from Gazeta Wyborcza and very interesting questions asked about it	We need more information on interviewing techniques
Good ideas exchanged today	Would have been good to have more discussion around Dick's presentation (writing format and guidelines)
Interesting group dynamics changing through the day	The lunch was too light
Plenary summary in the morning to address loose ends	Confusion around unanswered questions in the morning
Longer time for discussions, compared with yesterday	Missing link between day 1 guidelines and execution in day 2 (for this group)
Innovative planning	We want more discussions, fewer Q&As in the plenary session (role of facilitator here!)
Presentation of the 3 media	Long day
Length of outputs is unclear? Should we aim at short or long outputs?	
When does the sharing and consolidation happen?	

- 🔍 The Process Documentation plans of the two writing & voice sub-groups are presented in appendix 7
- 🔍 And a general impression of this second day was blogged 'Lodz Workshop Process Documentation day 2 - Voicing writing issues': <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-2-practicing/>

[End of day 2]

[Day 3]

Session 6: Group work in parallel streams focusing on specific media and tools

- Session 6a: Photography group
- Session 6b: Video group
- Session 6c: Writing and voice group

This second group work day (and third workshop day) started directly with group work and went on in this fashion through the day. Here is an account of what happened in each group.

In the Photography group:



And then there was rain, a lot of rain, but the photographers couldn't be stopped by this. By taxi we moved in different groups to different parts of the city. It turned out to become a very nice day, with interesting encounters with beautiful people from Lodz, sharing with us their life stories, or their opinions about public space in Lodz, sometimes causing a tear in our eyes.

*'We were invited into this man's garden and we drank water from his well, and he offered us wine'.*

*'The entire day we were on the street, collecting stories and taking photos'*

*'It was the nicest day of all'*

During lunch, we discussed strategy. What more do we need? The plan was, to make four portraits of people, of which two in space and two in no space and eight visuals of what space actually means for people.

Did we have enough pictures and stories? We decided to move to another part of the city, the area close to the renewed shopping complex Manufaktura, where alongside there are nearby streets with people living in poverty.

At the end of the day, we learned that, although it isn't always easy and not all goes as planned (not everybody was interested to talk with us; not being able to speak Polish is a problem) we had more material than we could ever have imagined, with some very good photos as well as very nice stories.

### In the Video group:



The video group produced lots of work and provided useful tips for wannabe movie makers.

After an introductory presentation given by Joshka Wessels, the group discussed the most important topics of the introduction:

#### Creating an audiovisual story:

- who, what , when, where and why (the same questions as when writing a story)
- Protagonist, antagonist, plot, setting, turning point, dialogue, introduction, conclusion, narration and points of view
- Think 4D. Moving image, music and sound design, space, people, duration, location
- Two styles of approach: storyboard and script (the group used the storyboard approach)

#### The basic team for a shooting session should consist of:

- Camera operator (does not have the time to focus on the sound)
- Sound person
- Director (it is the creator behind the story)
- Producer (manager and fund raising person)
- Editor (who compiles everything)
- Executive producer (someone who guides the process and preferably has a recognized reputation and a link with the producer to look for potential sponsors).

With the digital participatory video there are usually 3 people: the cameraman, the sound person and the director.

#### Some tips for filming (*see also* Joshka' s guidelines in the folder with handouts)

- Begin with a wide shot
- Use Different. camera angles
- Establish a shot
- Cut away or insert
- Shot/reverse shot
- Over shoulder shot

#### Important suggestions for filmmaking:

- Think about the 180 degrees rule (when two people are talking to each other, the moment you cross the axe you disorient the viewer).
- Don't let people look out of your shoot. When two persons are talking they should keep eye contact (especially in interviews).
- Avoid crossing behind someone's back while filming.
- In the editing process, it is difficult to cut a moving scene. It looks better when your object moves towards you or the other way around.

- Do not follow persons while shooting, unless it is strictly necessary. In the editing process the audience can fill the gap of this movement. You can better go to your object/persons instead of zooming. Zooming can look intimidating and amplifies your movement.
- Avoid the use of automatic focus. The camera will not recognize, if you are not shooting at the right place, what your main object is; and your person will go out of focus.
- Do not leave the blue parts in your tape. To avoid this you should play back or rewind and start again your tape before it ends. Try to film a bit more than what you need before cutting.
- Logging is a way to reference the time in your tape. You need to organize your work and have a unique reference.

1. **Game:** The group stands up. They are asked to take a pose without moving. Every person leaves the group to film a shot of a few seconds. The last person only films the wall. This exercise shows the “jumping cut effect” or in other words what happens when you cut a scene and restart...
2. **Suggestions for the shooting session of the following day:** Every participant will get one tape to film 5 min and should take into account:
  - The amount of material to shoot: the more you shoot the more editing it takes
  - You do not need to film chronologically. Think linear and 4-dimensional
  - Work with structure and layers
  - 1 timeline with shots down to 25 frames in a second
3. **Splitting the group:** The group was divided into 2 groups with the aim of creating two different products at the end of the workshop.

The video group ended the day with preparations for the last group work day and prepared process documentation plans

The second day of work by the video group ‘ Silence-action-cut’ is viewable from:

 <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-3-field-work/>

#### In the Writing & Voice group:



The talking (and writing) group started the day on a very dispatched note with each interviewing team flying to their interviewees.

The Lodz team (Monika and Stella) had planned six appointments for interviews:

- Andrzej Czapla (Waste water treatment plant Lodz)
- Dr. Jan Degirmendzic (University Lodz)
- Monika Dziegielewska Geitz (SWITCH LA facilitator Lodz)
- M. Tomaszewski (Deputy Mayor)
- Przemysław Senderecki (Water company Lodz)
- Prof. Zaweliski (Technical University Lodz)

All interviews have been formatted consistently by Alistair Sutherland and Jochen Eckart on:  
 <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/writing-voice/>

The group had agreed to meet at 15:00 back at the Gazeta Wyborcza to share impressions and results. The following debriefing session put out these points:

*What is the most amazing thing from this morning?*

- “There’s no climate change”;
- Water is a blessing and a curse;
- All interviewees separated themselves from any political opinion;
- All see themselves as operators;
- There is a tension between turning the clock back and turning it forward, i.e. getting back to good old days or being impatient for the future of Lodz: SWITCH should be moving faster. SWITCH is seen as a platform to discuss across the globe. And there is interest in international contacts. A global learning alliance is still to be shaped.
- The translation of *Learning Alliance* in Polish is a difficult issue.
- Participation of private sector? How to involve more groups? Change of attitude, looking beyond your silo etc. is very important.
- Institutionalisation of L.A. → There is a need to carry out effective reporting as in a normal institution. But who keeps record of meetings and all ideas in the L.A.?
- The institutional landscape in Poland could change quite rapidly. River basin management plans have to be drawn. Poland is somewhat behind with the EU guidelines on establishing catchment authorities.
- Privatisation? Sewage and water companies are privatized but are tied to public pricing policies. There is no possibility for any private company to take over these companies. There is no capital recovery; a pricing policy has to be established.
- L.A. has to do more on tying hands with policy. Stronger buy-in thought from all stakeholders who would enjoy the benefits: communities etc. SWITCH is looking too much at technical solutions and not enough at social inclusion in the results from the project. Social aspects are the gap: *we need more engagement from the community*;
- When people don’t take action, they feel like others are also not taking action. But when they take action, they see that there is some commitment and engagement from various stakeholders.
- Engaging students in working with communities? The “SWITCH extension workers”? They are very committed and enthusiastic about this.
- Professors in Lodz should be working on a master plan to avoid floods etc. SWITCH should be the instrument to bring to light this kind of issues and needs for the cities.

After this discussion which went on to the format of the workshop and participants’ expectations about a training course or a workshop around a concept in the making.

Soon after, each participant went on his/her own track or in small groups to write a thought piece based on the interviews collected during the day.

Around 17:00, the writing and voice group stopped to meet the other groups at the Book Art Museum for an interesting learning and sharing session with the rest of the process documentation community.



## Intermezzo: Sharing information and discussion

In a beautiful old venue expected – by its old owners – to be turned into a museum, the three groups were supposed to share some thoughts before sharing some wine and cheese.

As all participants were already well underway with the production of their *procdoc* outputs and therefore mostly absent for a long while, the sharing took place originally between four members, on the sofa of the Book Art living room, providing an extra touch of informality that seemed well needed on this hard working and confusing day.

Each group recounted how the past two days had gone for them, what lessons they had learned and members of other groups were invited to ask questions.

### From the photography group:

- We found lovely people and good stories about how people are using space and how they feel about their place in the city.
- There are now 500 to 600 pictures to sort out and 8-10 stories; the group now has to find the red thread among them.
- We have been in a busy mode, but with the knowledge of what we want to achieve, but I didn't feel like we empowered anybody
- *What was the purpose of the story?*  
To get a sense of the place, obstacles in the way of people to have a good living... interactions with neighbourhood.
- *Who are the stories meant for?*  
Anyone who seeks to live in the neighbourhood. Some encouragement is needed to stimulate thoughts.
- *Does water feature in any of the stories?*  
Yes, in quite a few.



### From the video group:

- Video seems more efficient than other mediums because of image, voice;
- Video in P.D.: it is powerful for P.D. but if you miss a sequence, the story is incomplete and the story doesn't become a whole.
- It's exciting: everybody wanted to be behind the camera;
- You can show the situation and it's live. It seems more convincing than to read an interview: one can see the context. One of the most important goals of P.D. is to convince people so it's good at that.
- It is about a team effort with different roles;
- It is a good exercise in being silent
- *How did you select what to capture?*  
During the planning, we decided what to ask to whom. In the process, we realized what to ask to whom.






- There is a danger about the power of video: one has to balance what they're showing so people keep an overall picture.

From the writing and voice group:

- Process Documentation takes (*certainly took*) lots of planning;
- What matters: Reflect on the plan and work on it;
- There are two schools of thought in our group: process-oriented people (collecting info, how is SWITCH going etc.), output-oriented people. In other words, there are two sets of stakeholders: SWITCH people interested in outputs and others more in the learning process. It's interesting to use this project for the learning and the outputs.
- It's always important to have a plan – but keep it flexible for any surprises.
- P.D. is less structured than reporting and monitoring, so it's better to keep it flexible.
- When doing process documentation, one should revisit their work for trends, patterns etc.



 The sharing session was documented on the blog at:  
<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/02/end-of-day-3/>

 More generally...

Participants feelings about the third day and their ideas were documented on:  
<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/04/slodzshop-day-3-rain-chaos-flu-in-the-heart-of-darkness/>

### *8.13. Article: Ekowarsztaty: Jak sprzedać mediom naukowe wizje*



Local newspaper covers SWITCH activities in Lodz during process documentation workshop.  
<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/04/ekowarsztaty-jak-sprzedac-mediom-naukowe-wizje/>

[End of day 3]

[day 4]

The fourth day started again in media stream groups and consisted in compiling all information and finishing off the outputs.

As in the other days, the groups worked harder and harder, to ensure that the products would be delivered, on time and remain of high quality.

#### Session 7: Group work in parallel streams focusing on specific media and tools

- Session 7a: Photography group
- Session 7b: Video group
- Session 7c: Writing and voice group

##### In the Photography group:



This morning we went through the *Process Documentation Plan* and asked ourselves, did we manage to do what we had planned during the field work yesterday? Did we capture stories on people and their space, and how they create space and how it affects quality of life?

We thought we did so, and after sharing photos and stories we collected, we started probably the hardest work of all: selecting the right photos and stories for the public exhibition of tomorrow. This selection process, and writing up of text to go with the photos took us the entire day.

At 18:00 hrs we were sent away. Ton, Piotr and Aga, were going to give a final touch to our work, before sending it off to the printers that night.

Everybody was anxious to see what the end product would look like.

##### In the Video group:



The video group shot and shot and shot and edited, edited, edited, and occupied the School of Journalism until after closure times, giving the final touch to their products at about 22:00, ready to enjoy some well deserved sleep.



Transcription of film made by Group B:

<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/04/transcription-of-film-made-by-group-b/>

##### In the Writing & Voice group:



For the Writing and Voice group, this final day of work would start with a plenary discussion and presentation on how to write for different target groups and for different mediums.

To give a more concrete impression, Dick de Jong guided the group through

his article on the EMPOWERS project and another article prepared for a media training course in Indonesia.

- *Is it for internal or external public?*

It's not relevant, because it's important to write in an attractive way for both audiences;

- On Internet, break up the text in shorter paragraphs;
- Feelings, emotions should feature in an article; we use photographs to stress this;
- The story should end (not start) with a short description of the project and with contact details.

How to prepare a conference paper:

- More or less 800 words
- Punchy heading
- Use of keywords (useful to find information), abstract, references.
- Always have an outline for your article, including key points you want to raise for an article: think about your audience.

How to prepare a Policy brief:

- Never more than 4 pages: policy makers have little time to read.
- IWMI developed one policy brief which was not deemed appropriate. In one African country, they wanted no longer than two pages. In other countries, they would not consider reading anything under 20 pages.
- In one example, one used large fonts so the policy maker could read the brief out loud in front of an audience;
- The key lesson: *know your audience!*

Editing rules:

- When in doubt, cross out...
- Don't be afraid of bullet points...
- Short sentences are good
- Active verb in sentences!
- Text justified on all sides makes it difficult to read sometimes [but there are cultural differences on this issue: in French, texts are generally justified].
- Write figures below 10 in words and above 10 in figures. [You figured what happens to 10]
- Headlines should not use starting capital letters for all words because the text size is increased anyway.

Questions and main points around the article about Indonesia:

- *What is of interest to your readers?*

In this example, the use of financial statistics to attract interest of ministers to read about health.


- *How do you write statements to engage behaviour change without being prescriptive and offending people?* I [Dick de Jong] proceed with a situation analysis first and then develop statements, with different messages for national level, meso-level and local level. I prepare key points for each audience: health points for health minister.

- *What is the difference between process documentation and communication?*  
P.D. is part of the communication work. A successful project requires a communications strategy, and information will be collected and documented for M&E purposes as well as for process documentation
- *What do you do with your diary and other internal learning channels to bring it to the organisation(s) involved in the project to inform implementation*  
We apply learning.
- One should use internal learning points and integrate them to reports (to keep an impression in time).
- *Does P.D. differ from documentation? Is it related to action research?*
- As outlined in the briefing note, P.D. is about bringing the learning in the alliance. By specifying the change process and looking at how things happen (or don't), reflection and learning can be stimulated and the activities can be adjusted.
- The only reference for our group is EMPOWERS. This is confusing.

Again dumb-founded on some subtle issues of process documentation, the group left those issues aside for then and decided to summarize what outputs they would produce:

- Article: *Who stops the flooding in Lodz: views from visitors* [Dick]
- Article: *Building bridges over the Sokolowka river* [Philip]
- Article: *Visiting Lodz, the water city* [Martin]
- Article: *Lodz, a water city today, a water city tomorrow?* [Martin]
- Article: *Olechowka river: a blessing or a curse for the neighbourhood of Kowalszczyna* [Laurence]
- Article: *Olechowka river: "We are waiting for the next floods"* [Alex]
- Article: *Bringing back the true wealth of Lodz* [Baker]
- Article: *Na Mlynku condemned?* [Patrick]
- Article: *Lodz, the city of sad faces* [Rania]
- Story: *From the end of the pipeline* [Jochen / Alistair]
- Article: *"No time to talk, but to work!"* [Simret]
- Report on the LA approach in Lodz for other learning alliances (lessons learnt based on interviews) [Nadia]
- Summary of the benefits and challenges of the writing approach for P.D. [Nadia]

Two outputs were blogged on the day itself:

 8.14. Olechowka River: a blessing or a curse for the neighbourhood of Kowalszczyna?

 8.15. Na Mlynku park condemned?

8.16. all outputs from the writing group can be accessed at;  
<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/writing-voice/>

Later that night, Dick de Jong worked until dawn with Monika and a team at the Gazeta Wyborcza to get the final articles published in a special edition following the Gazeta's graphic identity.

Due to the high pressure to finish the products, there was no account of the day posted on the blog by this group .

[End of day 4]

[day 5]

The fifth and last day had three objectives:

- Bring the groups together to present their final works (the final outputs and the process to achieve these outputs);
- Get the groups to discuss more in-depth issues around process documentation that they could have been faced with during the workshop.
- Present the final outputs to the public (learning alliance members and visitors coming to the public gallery located in the busiest high street of Lodz).

## Session 8: Sharing of experiences and outputs from groups, feedback and discussion

Each group presented their plans, products and the process of documenting processes using their media, although these three aspects turned out to be meshed in the presentation.

- Session 8a: Video group



The video group was first to introduce the results, showing the making-of/behind-the-scene and the final video (output) of the two groups that played around with this medium in the week.

The process documentation plan was presented (see appendix 6)

The group then presented their key learning points – around process– from working with a video camera:

- No storyboarding is possible without having a feel for the context and practical situation on location;
- The group stopped for a long time on the ‘processes’ that P.D. will capture. No particular event or action was taking place in the Lodz L.A. so what is it they were trying to capture?
- There was no real structured planning process, although planning was very important. It is what distinguishes (video) process documenters from other type of filmmakers (e.g. anthropological).
- Information from the field makes mockery of planning – it disrupts the planning ideas and points at the unrealistic aspects of it when it comes to implementing the plan.
- The group underestimated the time it takes and the complexity of video work: It is now easier to understand why it costs so much to produce videos. It takes about four hours of editing for 10 minutes of film. Many things captured cannot be used.
- The video group was generally pleased with their final product, even though an external editor told them it would take him another week to edit their work and turn it into a good final product.
- Advantages / disadvantages of the medium:


- Context and direct contact with informants makes it more powerful than other media
- Some people are more inclined to participate
- Storytelling conflict vs. non violent communication: one needs a bit of a conflict to make the story interesting
- Video is more time-consuming than other media
- Consequences of manipulation are potentially large
- Team work is essential

Other group members asked a few questions:

- *To what extent was the plan influenced by the dynamics of the workshop and the idea of reporting in the discussion as compared to what the Lodz people would have done?*  
“We didn’t think about today’s reporting. With more time, we would have done pre-interviews, finding people, we would have prepared a schedule to come back to people etc. and would have taken a lot more time.”
- *How did you decide on 2 groups?*  
“The process is difficult with one camera and 10 people so we split up at random. Roles divided (sound, editing etc.).”
- *How did the dynamics of team affect production process (PPT question)?*
  - One group came to recognize the limitations of democracy
  - Hardship brings social capital (bonding)
  - The flexibility of roles was higher than we expected
  - For one group, there was more consensus in decision-making
  - We challenged each other on decisions / assumptions of documenting
- *To what extent could you apply the plan and did it help you shoot? Did you experience many deviations from your plan?*  
“The weather conditions made us change our plans. We knew what we wanted to achieve so we could rearrange our plans”. “The community portraits did not happen.”
- *In real conditions of film-making, how much flexibility is allowed?*  
“It is very similar but there is more flexibility about how to shoot etc. Professionals have studied for a long time and know about the technical issues of shooting.”  
*Comment: It is important to know the place in order to follow your plan.*
- *Are these films useful to the Lodz SWITCH team?* [Question to Iwona]  
“Definitely, and we will make a Polish version, better edited. Etc. Some complementary text is still needed. The English version could be used for international dissemination. For the LA, this could be a cementing piece of work (to strengthen the group). It will bring new ideas about the needs of the society. The school of journalism could be part of the LA group”.

The video group also put a series of questions up for the other groups to answer:

- *How important was the planning?*
- *What were your expectations – and how far were they met?*
- *How did the dynamics of working in a team affect the production process? And did we think there are any advantages of documenting processes as a team?*
- *What would you say are the advantages and disadvantages of video for process documentation*

 There are several videos on the weblog:

- Film output video group A "*Expectations for Sokolowka*"
- The "making of" videoreport "*OK, I think I found the river*"
- Film output video group B "*Sokolowka: back to life*"
- The "making of" videoreport "*The Shooting Day*"
- The process documentation plans of the video group are included in the presentation by Caridad and Nick.

All can be found at <http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/video/>

- Session 8b: Photography group



The photography group focused on social inclusion for their process documentation plan. The idea was generally to make portraits of people who are connected to their city, to document how they feel about living here, what they like about their city etc. and the overall importance of space in the city.

The group showed the final pictures on the video projector and on printed pictures circulating around the room.

Key learning points for the photography group:

- Problem of documentation: there is no social inclusion work in the Lodz LA yet.
- Language problem: the group sometimes had to use drawings to explain what they were after (for instance drawings of a chimney).
- Group members met people with no opinion. It was difficult to get something out of some people interviewed.
- It was also hard work to select pictures and the lines going with pictures. And in addition, on Wednesday evening, the group was left without seeing the end product.
- Key messages from this group: *Everything is possible. Come closer and watch your background.*
- Some material is not usable because it does not fit in the framework: for instance "there was this happy guy in his garden: the best shot of him was melancholic and we couldn't use it."

As with the video group, other group members had a chance to throw some questions at the photography group:

- *Was it an easy process to develop the plan?*  
The group had quite a long discussion about what is going on in Lodz, what is social inclusion etc. while this part of the work is in its initial phase. It is important to develop something that makes the people of Lodz realise about the meaning of space... using a public exhibition, and create a feeling of participation, before going more in-depth in what it means for social inclusion in the Lodz LA.
- *What was the biggest deviation from the plan?*  
The group got pretty close to what they planned.
- *How about the subjective interpretation of the plan?*  
The three photo groups had different interpretations of reality and the photos they chose from 600 pictures. It's all narrative and subjective. [Comment] "*The pictures*



*show what social inclusion is about and I get a feeling from this. There is no feeling of frustration coming out of the photos. Quite a few people may be moved by these pictures.”*

- *Do you have any idea about who the audience is?*  
General public, reach people through public presentation, schools, health clinics.
- *How did you arrive at captions with the pictures? One of the captions shows aggression (protective title about ‘this is my water’). Sometimes I miss the connection of the captions with the pictures*  
The feeling expressed here was pride. The person was protective but proud.
- *Do you have examples of how to differentiate pictures for fun and more professional pictures?*  
In photography, ones tries to capture feelings and get pictures to speak. Interesting stories of people are coming out this way.
- *If you were using a slideshow, would you use the pictures in the same way or would you change the process/ presentation?*  
Our purpose was the open space exhibition, and the focus on posters came at the end - in the last hour of the work. With a poster, the poster itself is a small story, with a different format, positioning etc.
- *How did the group come up with the captions (mental connections)*  
On the basis of stories, we took notes of people talking and re-read notes several times. We wrote short stories for each set of notes. We decided to keep short descriptions for the pictures; otherwise people wouldn’t focus on the pictures but rather on the captions. The idea was to gather the essence of the pictures in a few words. But there is definitely a tension to use more text or play on the impressions of viewers; different interpretations are possible.
- *Were people aware that the pictures would be published?*  
Yes, most of them. But we didn’t ask them which pictures they would like to see in the exhibition. For the few people who refused to be photographed, we didn’t use their pictures.

Some more tips and the (brilliant) final results of the photography are available here:



#### 8.17. Posters and the photo’s behind them



<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/tag/day-5-exhibition/>

#### 8.18. Photo tips: change perspective / coming closer

<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/09/photo-tips-change-perspective-coming-closer/>

- Session 8c: Writing and voice group



The last group to give an account of their past three days of work was the writing and voice group.

The group turned out to be the most heterogeneous and proved very schizophrenic throughout the working week, with for instance:



- One group working on internal processes and the other on external processes;
- One group coming up with a good P.D. plan and the other starting off on a completely different track;
- The beginning of the week with two fairly defined groups and the end of week resulting in each individual working on their own;
- A fairly relaxed work at the beginning and the hardest / latest working group in the end;
- Tensions between participants who wanted to be trained and participants who wanted to improve the concept and work on it in the making.

In 3-4 days, the group felt like it was going through a real process documentation cycle with a fair portion of confusion, frustration but also solutions that characterizes process documentation.

The group introduced four outputs to the rest of the workshop participants:

1. A presentation featuring challenges and benefits of writing / voice:

Challenges	Benefits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What products to produce</li> <li>• Limited by language and literacy</li> <li>• How to analyse data for input into writing</li> <li>• How to balance conflicting information and avoid bias</li> <li>• Having to interpret from interviews- decide what to present</li> <li>• How to create suitable product for different audiences</li> <li>• Translating technical language</li> <li>• People don't like to read—so how to make the writing product exciting</li> <li>• How to choose topics to focus on- out of massive amounts of information</li> <li>• Sorting out information to write from the vast amount available</li> <li>• How to make sure the documents are useful, read and not just put on the bookshelf or in a file system</li> <li>• You cannot be everywhere during the process, so how to gather information coming from others and how to have them do this in a systematic way</li> <li>• How to avoid mechanistic writing- understanding flexibility</li> <li>• Developing a clear vision on what we can expect to achieve</li> <li>• Un-realistic time frame or poor use of time</li> <li>• How to capture changes and learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Able to capture a range of information</li> <li>• Can work individually</li> <li>• Fairly low tech, low cost</li> <li>• Can use/distribute in multiple formats</li> <li>• Quick(er) production</li> <li>• Can reach more people</li> <li>• Can capture longer time series</li> <li>• More accessible/available</li> <li>• Exploitation of individual skills and creativity</li> <li>• Builds individual confidence</li> <li>• Getting to know each other</li> <li>• A different view</li> <li>• Sharing experiences with people through closer interaction with subjects and co-workers</li> <li>• Addresses tacit knowledge</li> <li>• More precise?</li> <li>• More flexible for changes- can make adjustments as you go</li> <li>• Easier to edit</li> <li>• Easier connections between thoughts, other topics and other media</li> <li>• Central role of writing and voice even in other media.</li> </ul>

in writing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding motivation and time to write on regular basis</li> <li>• How to achieve expected consistency of writing style</li> <li>• Where to store all of the documentation</li> <li>• Data analysis challenges</li> </ul>	
--	--

Questions for the other groups and some issues around the integration of media; Some were answered during the presentations of group work, some others were taken up in the world cafe exercise that followed.

- Any questions still about process documentation? Any gaps in knowledge/understanding?
- How did the other groups find the thread to connect their stories?
- Did the other groups create plans? How useful were these? Did they keep to them?
- How did you find a balance between documentation for external or internal purposes /audiences?
- What were your group dynamics like? What influenced this? How did these dynamics influence your process?

There were several questions were not addressed in plenary, but that came back in the evaluation.

- What will you take back to your own countries from this training course?
- How would/could we use all of these various media for achieving process documentation?
- If you had to do this all over again what would you differently? What would you want to be different?
- And finally: Is there/could there be a standard for process documentation for SWITCH? This is clearly a question that needs further exploration within the project.

2. A public reading of one of the articles written (*Building bridges over the Sokolowka river* by Philip Sharp);
3. The final collection of all articles formatted as a special issue of the Gazeta Wyborcza.

Key learning points for the group:

- The struggle about communication and process documentation: internal reports (often considered boring but probably very useful) on the one hand vs. glossy communication products on the other hand. What should process documentation focus on?
- The group was not quite sure about outputs and what to present in the end. “Writing articles was about how we felt in this City, a series of bridges. A community building bridges within itself, scientists talking to administrators etc.”

- Internal – external loops: There are questions around accountability: how can we communicate at different levels from the centre to the periphery; to what extent can we use the results of P.D. and share them with all L.A. members, with interviewees, with the external public and so on.
- Under time pressure, one needs to get on with his/her bias anyway.

Dick de Jong presented a summary of all articles written and a statement regarding the quality of the outputs on the blog:



### 8.19. Gazeta Wyborcza: SWITCH learning in Lodz

<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/05/gazeta-wyborcza-switch-learning-in-lodz/>

All final outputs from the writing and voice group are available on the process documentation weblog:

Selections from training result makes Gazeta Wyborca



<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/05/selections-from-training-result-makes-gazeta-wyborca/>

Session 9: Concluding session: politics of process documentation, becoming a process documentation specialist, evaluation and follow up, certificates

This was the last internal session of the day and of the workshop and was meant to discuss deeper issues around process documentation such as the politics of it, the skills of a process documenter etc.

This session was structured as a world café – whereby people talk in groups of 5-6 around a table and switch to another topic. Participants themselves were invited to suggest topics they wanted to address and in the end the following subject tables were arranged:

- What are the differences and similarities between the media that can be used for P.D.?
- To what extent is P.D. useful for external communication?
- What is your take on cost vs. benefit of P.D.?
- Skills required for P.D. specialists?
- To what extent is P.D. useful for internal learning?
- Politics of P.D.?
- [And a mixed bag of] Unanswered questions

Results from the flipcharts are presented here:

What are the differences and similarities between the media that can be used for P.D.?

- P.D. is a methodology but it's the regularity of information gathering that makes it interesting.
- The P.D. plan is/should be linked to the overall communication strategy
- For text and film: one has to write a plan etc.

To what extent is P.D. useful for external communication?

Unanswered questions

- Planning is not easy
- A Tool box should be developed – the Empowers tool box should be complemented.

- Analysis of information gathered is critical

What is your take on cost vs. benefit of P.D.?

- Stop focusing only on outputs; focus also on processes. P.D. is a new way of thinking rather than a new thing to do.
- Define P.D. as part of principles to safeguard LA approach: it puts the learning in the learning alliance. It should be a crucial part of P.D.
- How to allocate resources to that: emerging industry standards: 40% on emergence issues and 10% on communication. P.D. could be
- Does it depend on the place and time? Or is it a question of political commitment
- How to measure resources: personnel hours, opportunities with partnerships, media etc.
- Process documentation as a tool for M&E, this helps keep the costs down (because M&E is already part of the project in principle)
- How exactly do you articulate the link between M&E and P.D.? Is it a tool / side of M&E? It is a site for M&E and adjustments
- Adjustments → mapping the theory of change and putting the power in the learning in the L.A.

Skills for P.D.

- Whoever does it should be observant, listen well, reflect, see connections, leadership skills, facilitation skills, restrict bias (consciousness), analytical, verbal communication.
- Work in a team → hence the need for leadership
- Some technical skills (understand concept and process, able to evaluate quality, P.V. [participatory video] less technical skills + individual (no need for big team)
- Journalism vs. P.D. (depends on outputs, produce different types of products, PD as collective task)
- Creativity
- Team effort: P.D. team to combine all skills required, not just one person.
- Expectations to produce self or to coordinate.
- Challenges: resources (financial, technical).

To what extent is P.D. useful for internal learning

- What is internal learning? Comes from different sources, from different team / community members → share lessons learnt which feed into internal learning
- How to build capacities of local communities for P.D
- How to stimulate people to reflect on their own action to share with others?
- Organising these lessons learnt is important
- Link between internal learning and M&E:
  - Internal learning is an analysis (soft information, intangible aspects, new insights, process);
  - M&E: measuring. Check if indicators are complied with.
- Process documentation is related to action research and communication


Politics of P.D.

- Role and influence of politics;
- Need to challenge systems → find ways to do so.
- What is the truth?
- Who is accountable? Responsibilities for P.D> and how to use it for a useful product?
- Impacts wanted from the products and what you may get?

### Session 10: Public exhibition of the final outputs

A reception was held at the City Promotion Office to present the final results: the articles written, the photographs displayed in A2 format and the two videos. The Lodz LA team introduced these results to the members of the Learning Alliance that attended this exhibition and to the public that was gathered in the room. Ton Schouten also paid tribute to the organising team and to all people that helped make this workshop a successful event.

Around 16:00, the (remains of the) group dismantled and brought an end to the Slodzshop (SWITCH Lodz workshop).

 *The last day* was obviously documented – mostly on pictures – on:  
<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/2007/07/05/the-last-day/>

## 8.20. C. Results of evaluation

### 8.21.

**19 completed evaluation forms were returned to us. We appreciate the detail with which many of the forms were filled in, providing us with concrete ideas and reflections for further improving the course. The main outcomes from these evaluations, especially addressing course content and methodology are summarised below. A compilation of all scores and comments has been made and can be requested from Carmen: [daSilva@irc.nl](mailto:daSilva@irc.nl) (approx 10 pages).**

In general the course was evaluated quite positively. The organizing team was very impressed by the amount of motivation and hard work put into the products by the participants. The energy levels were amazing, there were fruitful discussions and the outputs were of high quality considering the short time. The group was also a pleasant group, people were open and some nice connections were made.

The participants expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to do hands- on work. Especially the work in smaller groups and the support by the local experts in understanding the processes was rated highly.

The subgroup work stimulated exploring the meaning and use of process documentation. Many participants would have liked more time to discuss this and exchange experiences. The world café on day 5 was highly valued and the small group discussions during the week also provided space for reflection and discussion.

More space/ time for participants to talk and reflect could be created through: world café at the beginning to discuss these conceptual issues, and revisit them again; Quick recap every morning, After action review/ short evaluation every day; a session for participants to share/ show in their background, experiences, tools; more time on day 5 to discuss follow-up and learnings.

Polish was a problem for the course participants!; so the excellent preparations by the Lodz team and help in the field work were essential. In general, ownership of your host is important to ensure the products will contribute to the host project's process documentation. The Lodz team very happy about the results. Within ERCE, they will explore how the materials can be used for further communication within the LA and with the public.

There were quite varied expectations about the course and the amount of practical skills (for example in writing) to be trained. This also was reflected in the fears and expectations and in the end-evaluation. Issues that participants would have liked to learn more about focused mainly on how to integrate PD into their work eg: How to systematise PD Differences/ relation/ contribution with M&E and improving the impact of projects, more about Community involvement in the PD process

The use of web-based tools could be improved by more practice , through a practical blog session at the end of the day. The issue of access to internet and resources could merit more discussion, as well as appropriate or alternative ways of documenting at community level (drawings other ways of presenting info besides through internet),

## **8.22. D. Appendices**

- 1.Final announcement of the workshop, including agenda
- 2.List of participants and contact details
- 3.SWITCH Aide memoir (website, blog, picture gallery etc.)
- 4.Fears and expectations
- 5.Process documentation plan photography group
- 6.Process documentation plan video group
- 7.Process documentation plan writing & voice group



## Appendix 1: Final announcement of the workshop



### **Training workshop on ‘Process documentation for learning alliances and action research’**

*Organised by the IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre, the SWITCH project, the European Regional Centre for Ecohydrology under the auspices of UNESCO (an international institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences in co-operation with the University of Lodz) and the EMPOWERS partnership*

Lodz, Poland (1-5 July 2007)

#### *Background*

Process documentation is a tool that helps project staff and stakeholders to carefully track meaningful events in their projects. It enables reflection and analysis of these events in order to understand better what is happening, how it is happening and why it may be happening. We document for different reasons. Most importantly, we aim to improve the quality and impact of a project. We also need to share and disseminate relevant knowledge and experiences in effective ways. The insights provided by process documentation are crucial in taking innovation processes to scale and adapting them to other locations and contexts.

#### *Objective of training workshop*

The objective of the training workshop on ‘Process documentation for learning alliances and action research’ is to equip participants with the necessary skills to undertake high-quality and innovative documentation of learning and change processes. This documentation will have advocacy and policy impact and will lead to the improved dissemination of research results and uptake of findings. The training workshop will develop the skills of participants through hands-on experiences with appropriate methods. It will enable participants to undertake appropriate documentation for multi-stakeholder focused research processes or learning alliances that are now becoming accepted approaches to improve the uptake of research.

#### *Who should attend?*

The training workshop is aimed at professionals involved in facilitating or documenting action research processes that typically involve a wider range of partners than traditional research. You will be interested in documenting not just what happens in your work, but also *how* innovation happens – or why it does not happen. It is not necessary to have attended any previous courses to be able to participate. A maximum of 30 participants are expected (the course is now fully booked). The language of instruction will be English.

### **The SWITCH project**

The Sustainable Water Management Improves Tomorrows Cities Health (SWITCH) project ([www.switchurbanwater.eu](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu)) is a research partnership funded by the EC undertaking innovation in the area of *integrated urban water management (IUWM)*. The project aims to carry out more demand-led, action-orientated research in cities with a view of effecting greater integration of urban water management, and ultimately more beneficial impacts. This is to be done under the auspices of city learning alliances, independent multi-stakeholders platforms at different levels, which the project is helping establish. Rather than focusing on new research, the project is encouraging city learning alliances to concentrate on putting *research into use* across different aspects of the urban water cycle to help improve integration. The cities involved are Accra, Alexandria, Beijing, Belo Horizonte, Birmingham, Hamburg, Lodz, Tel Aviv and Zaragoza.

### *Training methodology*

The training workshop will combine specialist presentations from key resource persons with practical exercises in groups where creativity will be encouraged. Participants will put theory into practice using a range of media to document an ongoing action research process. This will involve undertaking interviews, visiting field sites and documenting activities through photography, video, writing and voice recording. The workshop is convened with the SWITCH research project that is focused on urban water management, and the activities currently being undertaken in the city of Lodz in central Poland will provide the focus of the practical aspects of the training. On the final day of the course, participants will exhibit their work to communicate their findings to co-participants and residents of the city of Lodz.

### **Urban water management in Lodz, Poland**

The presence of 18 streams has been a key factor in the history of Lodz. Providing an essential water resource, they were part of the reason why Lodz was transformed from a provincial town to major manufacturing centre. Rapid industrialization and growth of the textile industry in the 19<sup>th</sup> century led to the city being nicknamed ‘the Polish Manchester’. Lodz has seen times of feast and famine. The 1930s depression and collapse of the Soviet empire after 1989 both decimated the eastern markets for the cities products. None of the 50 major textile mills enterprises are left. The population, still almost 800,000 persons, is declining.

Efforts to revitalize the city are again looking to water to provide inspiration. The polluted streams that were once canalized and buried underground are being recovered and cleaned. A city whose symbol is a boat, is searching for its rivers. Alliances of city managers, academics, activists and investors are aiming to utilize the power of these restored rivers as an attractive centerpiece for new development. Ecologically-focused restoration of rivers and associated green spaces will help to reduce flooding risks, improve the water quality of streams and habitat for wildlife, and provide a spur to economic development and regeneration.

## Outline programme

Time	Session	Topic / details	Facilitator
<b>Day 0 - Saturday 30 June</b>			
20.00	Welcome event	Drinks in Lizard King (62 Piotrkowska St.- second floor)	
<b>Day 1 – Sunday 1 July</b> <i>Introduction</i>			
<b>Conference centre of the University of Lodz</b>			
9.30	Departure	Bus: Ibis Hotel – Conference Center (Rogowska St.)	
10.00-11.20	Session 1	Welcome and introductions	John Butterworth
11.20-11.35	Coffee/tea		
11.35-13.00	Session 1 continued		
13.00 – 14.30	Lunch	Dworek Restaurant	
14.30-15.00	Session 2	An introduction to process documentation	Ton Schouten
15.00-16.30	Session 3	Sharing experiences - presentation and discussion of examples including the EMPOWERS project in the Middle East (Jordan, Egypt and Palestine)	Carmen da Silva and EMPOWERS team
16.30-16.45	Coffee/tea		
16.45-17.15		Formation of subgroups	
18/19 – 22	Grill	Conference Center Garden	
22.00	Departure	Bus: Conference Center - Ibis Hotel	
<b>Day 2 – Monday 2 July</b> <i>Practising process documentation</i>			
<b>Conference centre of the University of Lodz</b>			
08.40	Departure	Bus: Ibis Hotel – Conference Center (Kopcińskiego St. )	
09.00 – 13.00	Session 4:	Introduction of media, processes and dissemination mechanisms	John Butterworth
10.30-10.45	Coffee / Tea		
10.45 – 13.00	<i>Group work in parallel streams focusing on specific media and tools</i>		
13.10	Departure	Bus: Conference Center – restaurant	
13.30 –	Lunch	“U Fabrykanta” restaurant	

14.30		Zwycięstwa 2 square	
15.00	Continuation of <i>Group work in parallel streams focusing on specific media and tools</i>		
<b>The National Film, Television &amp; Theatre School in Łódź ; 61\63 Targowa St.</b>			<b>Wyborcza Newspaper Head Office: 72 Sienkiewicza St.</b>
<i>Photography group</i> (Facilitators: Ton Schouten, Agnieszka Jaszcak and Kinga Krauze) Session 5a: Unpacking processes, development of skills and planning		<i>Video group</i> (Facilitators: Joshka Wessels and Iwona Wagner) Session 5b: Unpacking processes, development of skills and planning	<i>Writing and voice group</i> (Facilitators: Dick de Jong and Monika Dziegielewska Geitz) Session 5c: Unpacking processes, development of skills and planning
20.00 Dinner 97 Pub (97 Piotrkowska St. – outdoor garden)			
<b>Day 3 – Tuesday 3 July</b> <i>Practical work in the city</i>			
09.00- 17.00 <i>Group work in parallel streams focusing on specific media and tools</i>			
<b>The National Film, Television &amp; Theatre School in Łódź ; 61\63 Targowa St.</b>			<b>Wyborcza Newspaper Head Office: 72 Sienkiewicza St.</b>
Session 6a: Practical work with photography following processes in Lodz city		Session 6b: Practical work with video following processes in Lodz city	Session 6c: Practical work writing following processes in Lodz city
<b>Book Art Museum 24 Tymienieckiego St.</b>			
17.00 – 19.00 Sharing information and discussion			
19.00 – 21.00 Cheese and wine evening in Book Art Museum			
<b>Day 4 - Wednesday 4 July</b> <b>Analysis, editing and designing a presentation of our work</b>			
<i>Group work in parallel streams focusing on specific media and tools</i>			
09.00- 17.00			
<b>The National Film, Television &amp; Theatre School in Łódź ; 61\63 Targowa St.</b>			<b>Wyborcza Newspaper Head Office: 72 Sienkiewicza St.</b>
Session 7a: Analysis, editing and designing presentation of processes in Lodz city using photography		Session 7b: Analysis, editing and designing presentation of processes in Lodz city using video	Session 7c: Analysis, editing and designing presentation of processes in Lodz city using writing/voice
Lunch:			
20.00 optional reservation Pepe Verde Tavern (Manufaktura)			

<b>Day 5 – Thursday 5 July</b> <i>Sharing skills and experiences</i>			
<b>Conference centre of the University of Lodz /</b> <b>Department of The City of Lodz: Lodz City Promotion Office</b>			
8.40	Departure	Bus: Ibis Hotel - Conference centre	
9.00–10.30	Session 8:	Sharing of experiences and outputs from groups, feedback and discussion	Carmen da Silva
10.30-10.45	Coffee / tea		
10.45-11.45	Session 9:	Concluding session: politics of process documentation, becoming a process documentation ‘specialist’, Evaluation and follow up, certificates	Ton Schouten and Empowers team
11.45-	Departure	Bus : Conference centre - Lodz City Promotion Office	
12.00		Sightseeing Piotrkowska St. And Final adjustments for public presentation by task team	
14.30-16.30	Lunch and Session 10:	Presentation of work by participants in collaboration with city of Lodz SWITCH learning alliance Closure	Monika Dziegielewska Geitz and Iwona Wagner

### *Workshop organisation, themes and expert resource persons*

The training workshop is organised by the innovative communications group at the IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre ([www.irc.nl](http://www.irc.nl)), the SWITCH project ([www.switchurbanwater.eu](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu)), the European Regional Centre for Ecohydrology under the auspices of UNESCO (an international institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences in co-operation with the University of Lodz) and the EMPOWERS partnership ([www.empowers.info](http://www.empowers.info)) that has undertaken extensive process documentation to promote improved local water management in the Middle East (Jordan, Egypt and Palestine).

### *Photography group*

Ton Schouten will lead the photography group. Ton coordinates the innovative communications group at the IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre where he has developed his thematic expertise in issues of scaling-up rural water services and learning alliances. He is trained at Wageningen University, the Netherlands in rural sociology and communication and innovation sciences. Previously he had more than 20 years experience as a documentary film maker for Dutch television and as an independent producer. He has been

an advisor for communication and dissemination programmes in a wide range of developing countries.

Social deprivation, like in many European cities, is a major problem in the city of Lodz. There are high rates of unemployment, poverty and many people are struggling to find their place in a city that has lost much of its industry and jobs. The SWITCH project is involved in case studies to understand how redevelopment and restoration projects around water can be made more socially inclusive. What links can be built between these projects and the communities, especially poorer and marginalised groups that live nearby? How can restoration and environmental projects provide jobs and new opportunities, as well as attracting new investors to the city?

Agnieszka Jaszczak from the UNESCO European Regional Centre For Ecohydrology and working on the monitoring and evaluation of the social aspects of the SWITCH project in Lodz, and Kinga Krauze also from the centre and working on interactions between society and economy within a long-term ecological project (ILTR) will coordinate links between the group and these activities in the city. This group will hold its workshops within a local arts centre.

#### *Video group*

Joshka Wessels will lead the video group. Joshka trained as an applied anthropologist, but later specialised in water issues and the use of film in development. She has been involved in media production for international broadcast television for 15 years and regularly provides training and advice on media and communication, community-based development and participatory approaches, such as the use of video and theatre in development projects. She has regularly provided training courses in the use of audiovisual media for research and process documentation.

This group will focus on restoration of the Sokolowka River where an ongoing programme, with the involvement of the SWITCH project, aims to improve the water habitat along one of the main, but badly degraded, watercourses running through the city. The group will visit sites where the river channel is being made more natural, with the construction of ponds with natural engineering techniques to create habitats and reduce flooding, and new wetlands.

Iwona Wagner, the Deputy Director of the UNESCO European Regional Centre For Ecohydrology and a lecturer in the Department Of Applied Ecology at the University of Lodz will coordinate the links with the ongoing activities in the city. The group will work in collaboration with the famous National Film School that is based in Lodz and the group will be housed and share facilities within this centre.

#### *Writing and voice*

Dick de Jong will lead the writing and voice group. Dick was trained as a journalist and has over 30 years experience as communication specialist, including seven years in international and national journalism and three years in the field of information and communication with UNICEF in Bangladesh. In his current position of Information and Communication Officer, he is responsible for IRC's public information, advocacy and marketing programme and also provides support and training to Southern partners in communication, information management and public relations.

This group will focus broadly on urban water management in the city, aiming to capture stories about change linked to the SWITCH project and beyond. The group will interview key members of the SWITCH learning alliance to find out how they are working to improve water management in the city and the challenges they face, and also members of the public who have stories to tell about water in their city and lives.

Monika Dziegielewska Geitz, facilitator of the SWITCH learning alliance in the city of Lodz, part-time English teacher and passionate activist for the revitalisation of the city will coordinate the groups work linking to activities in the city. The group will work in collaboration with the national daily newspaper “Gazeta Wyborcza” being partly based in their Lodz office, and with the national radio “Złote przeboje”. Stories from the group will be published through these media at the end of the week.

The overall coordinator of the training workshop is Carmen da Silva ([dasilva@irc.nl](mailto:dasilva@irc.nl)) at the IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre.

### *Logistical arrangements*







The training workshop will be held at various locations in the city of Lodz, Poland. As the five course days (1-5 July) will be full, participants are recommended to arrive in Lodz on 30 June and to leave from there on 6 July. Lodz is located about 120 km to the west of Warsaw. There are international flights to Warsaw from many countries and it takes 2-3 hours to travel from Warsaw by taxi, coach or train. There are a few domestic flights each day with LOT Polish airlines from Warsaw to Lodz. Some low cost airlines (flying from London and Nottingham in the UK, Dublin, Paris, and Rome) do also have direct flights to Lodz. If you have extra time, allow some for a visit to the city of Warsaw or other centres like Krakow.

All participants will stay at the IBIS hotel in Lodz and bookings will be made by the organisers. Participants will be responsible for paying their own travel and expenses (accommodation, meals and all other costs). **We recommend that participants allow €100 per day to cover these costs and up to €100 for airport transfers from Warsaw depending on the arrival time, totalling €700 for six nights and the transfer costs.** There is a workshop fee of €150 which covers the cost of materials for the course (this is waived for participants from the SWITCH project consortium) that must be paid on arrival. You will be asked to contribute to airport transfer costs and the costs of any shared meals on a shared basis. You will receive a receipt for the workshop fees and contribution to shared expenses.









Scholarships covering the course fee, accommodation and travel costs for participants from developing countries are only available for participants who applied and whose scholarship has been confirmed in writing.









All participants must ensure they have completed the registration form (available at [www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances)) and have sent it to the course coordinator Carmen da Silva ([dasilva@irc.nl](mailto:dasilva@irc.nl)). Registered participants will be sent further information by email, including confirmation of airport transfers and hotel. Further information will also be published on the website.









Appendix 2: List of participants and contact details









N°	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Resi- dence Country	e-mail address	Telephone	Who is that?
1	Agnieszka	Jaszczak	European Regional Centre for Ecohydrology / UNESCO	Poland 	<a href="mailto:a.jaszczak@erce.unesco.lodz.pl">a.jaszczak@erce.unesco.lodz.pl</a>	+48 42 681 70 07	
2	Ahmed	Essam	CEDARE (SWITCH Egypt)	Egypt 	<a href="mailto:switch_cedare@yahoo.com">switch_cedare@yahoo.com</a> , <a href="mailto:ahmed_hammam007@yahoo.com">ahmed_hammam007@yahoo.com</a>	+202 245 444 83 +202 245 139 21/2/3/4	
3	Aleida	Martinez	Honduran Social Investment Fund	Honduras 	<a href="mailto:amartinez@fhis.hn">amartinez@fhis.hn</a>	+504 234-5231 +504 9967-3696	



















4	Alex	Mbaguta	Uganda Water and Sanitation NGO Network (UWASNET)	Uganda 	<a href="mailto:mbaguta@uwasnet.org">mbaguta@uwasnet.org</a> / <a href="mailto:ngocoord@uwsnet.org">ngocoord@uwsnet.org</a> / <a href="mailto:mbaguta@yahoo.co.uk">mbaguta@yahoo.co.uk</a>	+256 772 666240 +256 41 223135	
5	Alistair	Sutherland	National Resources Institute	UK 	<a href="mailto:a.j.sutherland@gre.ac.uk">a.j.sutherland@gre.ac.uk</a>	+44 164 388 3884	
6	Baker Matovu	Yiga	WATERAID Uganda	Uganda 	<a href="mailto:bakeryiga@wateraid.or.ug">bakeryiga@wateraid.or.ug</a> ; <a href="mailto:ybaker71@hotmail.com">ybaker71@hotmail.com</a>	+256 41 50 57 95	
7	Bertha	Darteh	SWITCH LA facilitator Accra (Department of Civil Engineering KNUST)	Ghana 	<a href="mailto:berthadarteh@yahoo.co.uk">berthadarteh@yahoo.co.uk</a>	+233-24-4594829	









8	Buthaina	Mizyed	CARE International Palestine	Palestine 	<a href="mailto:mizyed@carewbq.org">mizyed@carewbq.org</a>	+972 599 210513 +972 9 2672498	
9	Caridad	Machín Camacho	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:camacho@irc.nl">camacho@irc.nl</a>	+31 152 192 939	
10	Carmen	Da Wells Silva	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:dasilva@irc.nl">dasilva@irc.nl</a>	+31 152 192 939	
11	Dick	De Jong	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:jong@irc.nl">jong@irc.nl</a>	+31 152 192 939	









12	Ewen	Le Borgne	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:leborgne@irc.nl">leborgne@irc.nl</a>	+31 152 192 955	
13	Feifei	Zhang	SWITCH Beijing (Chinese Academy of Sciences)	China 	<a href="mailto:zhangff.04s@igsnrr.ac.cn">zhangff.04s@igsnrr.ac.cn</a>	+86 133 113 262 03	
14	Filip	Drozdz	National Film School	Poland 	<a href="mailto:fildro@wp.pl">fildro@wp.pl</a>	+48 665 914 201	
15	Firas	Talat Abd-Alhadi	INWRDAM	Jordan 	<a href="mailto:firasinw@nic.net.jo">firasinw@nic.net.jo</a>	+962 796 438 885	

16	Galel	Moawad	CARE International	Egypt 	<a href="mailto:gmmohamed@egypt.care.org">gmmohamed@egypt.care.org</a>	+ 210 7003147	
17	Grit	Martinez	independent consultant	Germany 	<a href="mailto:Grit.Martinez@t-online.de">Grit.Martinez@t-online.de</a>	+49 30 437 35 880	
18	Iwona	Wagner	University of Lodz / European Regional Centre for Ecohydrology / UNESCO	Poland 	<a href="mailto:iwwag@biol.uni.lodz.pl">iwwag@biol.uni.lodz.pl</a>	+48 426 817 007	
19	Jaap	Pels	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:pels@irc.nl">pels@irc.nl</a>	+31 15 215 29 39 +31 6 19 164 195	

20	Jochen	Eckart	SWITCH LA facilitator Hamburg	Germany 	<a href="mailto:switch@tu-hamburg.de">switch@tu-hamburg.de</a>	+49 (0)40 42878 2657	
21	John	Butterworth	IRC	Poland / NL 	<a href="mailto:butterworth@irc.nl">butterworth@irc.nl</a>	+48 426 371 109	
22	Joshka	Wessels	Sapiens Productions	NL 	<a href="mailto:joshka@sapiensproductions.com">joshka@sapiensproductions.c om</a>	+31 43 3101919	
23	Kabou	Kambou Kadio	CREPA Centre Régional pour l'Eau Potable et l'Assainissement à faible coût	Burkina Faso 	<a href="mailto:kadio.kabou@reseaucrepa.org">kadio.kabou@reseaucrepa.or g</a>	+226 50 36 62 10 or +226 50 36 62 11	









24	Katarzyna	Izydorczyk	University of Lodz	Poland 	<a href="mailto:kizyd@biol.uni.lodz.pl">kizyd@biol.uni.lodz.pl</a>	+48 691 435 271	
25	Kinga	Krauze	European Regional Centre for Ecohydrology / UNESCO	Poland 	<a href="mailto:kingak@biol.uni.lodz.pl">kingak@biol.uni.lodz.pl</a>	+48 42 681 70 07	
26	Latifa	Bousselmi	CERTE, Laboratoire Traitement et Recyclage des Eaux Usées	Tunisia 	<a href="mailto:latifa.bousselmi@certe.rnrt.tn">latifa.bousselmi@certe.rnrt.tn</a>	+216 714 107 40	
27	Laurence	Gilliot	The Constellation for AIDS Competence <a href="http://www.aidscompetence.org">www.aidscompetence.org</a>	Belgium 	<a href="mailto:laurencegilliot@skynet.be">laurencegilliot@skynet.be</a>	+32 486 29 02 42	

28	María Luisa	Pardo	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, SDC	Honduras 	<a href="mailto:mlpardo@cosude.hn2.com">mlpardo@cosude.hn2.com</a>	+504 221 – 2109 +504 9969-8969	
29	Martín	Rivera	Peace Corps, USAID	Honduras 	<a href="mailto:mrivera@hn.peacecorps.gov">mrivera@hn.peacecorps.gov</a>	+504 265-4157 (504) 9998-2413	
30	Monika	Dziegielewska Geitz	SWITCH LA facilitator Lodz	Poland 	<a href="mailto:empower_consulting@yahoo.de">empower_consulting@yahoo.de</a>	+48 660 392 171	
31	Nadia	Manning	IWMI	Ethiopia 	<a href="mailto:n.manning@cgiar.org">n.manning@cgiar.org</a>	+251-(0)11-6463215	

32	Nermin	Mamdouh Riad	CEDARE (SWITCH Egypt)	Egypt 	<a href="mailto:nriad@cedare.org">nriad@cedare.org</a>	+*20224513921/2/ 3/4 # 659  Fax: +*20224513918	
33	Nicholas	Ishmael-Perkins	Healthlink	UK 	<a href="mailto:perkins.n@healthlink.org.uk">perkins.n@healthlink.org.uk</a>	+44 773 333 8722	
34	Ola	Skowron	University of Lodz	Poland 	<a href="mailto:Aleksandra-skowron@wp.pl">Aleksandra-skowron@wp.pl</a>	+48 784 136 956	
35	Patrick	Vanderhulst	ATOL (NGO, Belgium) <a href="http://www.atol.be">www.atol.be</a>	Belgium 	<a href="mailto:Patrick.vanderhulst@atol.be">Patrick.vanderhulst@atol.be</a>	+32 16 498307	



36	Pawel	Kuczynski	Warsaw Art Museum	Poland 	<a href="mailto:pawel.kuczynski@gmail.com">pawel.kuczynski@gmail.com</a>	+48 692 427 487	
37	Petra	Brussee	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:brussee@irc.nl">brussee@irc.nl</a>	+31 152 192 939	
38	Philip	Sharp	SWITCH LA facilitator Birmingham	UK 	<a href="mailto:Philip.Sharp@arup.com">Philip.Sharp@arup.com</a>	+44 121 213 3000	
39	Piotr	Zaton	National Film School	Poland 	<a href="mailto:piotr.zaton@pepo.net.pl">piotr.zaton@pepo.net.pl</a>	+48 603 383 561	

40	Rafael	Carías	National Autonomous University of Honduras	Honduras 	<a href="mailto:Tonycarias15@yahoo.es">Tonycarias15@yahoo.es</a>	+(504) 408 0683 +(504) 9781 8175	
41	Rania	Anwar Zoubi	CARE International/ Jordan	Jordan 	<a href="mailto:rania@care.org.jo">rania@care.org.jo</a>	+962 777 679 694	
42	Simret	Yasabu	RiPPLE Office	Ethiopia 	<a href="mailto:Simretyasabu@yahoo.com">Simretyasabu@yahoo.com</a>	+251 114 160 075 (office) +251 911 662 511 (mobile)	
43	Sonia	Knauer	SWITCH LA facilitator BH	Brazil 	<a href="mailto:knauer@pbh.gov.br">knauer@pbh.gov.br</a>	+55 3277 8170	

46	Stella	Szewczyk	SWITCH Lodz	Poland 	<a href="mailto:stighelmer11@o2.pl">stighelmer11@o2.pl</a>	+48 889 295 252	
47	Theophilus	Otchere Larbi	IWMI (SWITCH)	Ghana 	<a href="mailto:t.larbi@cgiar.org">t.larbi@cgiar.org</a> <a href="mailto:tolarbi@yahoo.co.uk">tolarbi@yahoo.co.uk</a>	+233 244 739 564 +233 217 847 53/4	
48	Ton	Schouten	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:schouten@irc.nl">schouten@irc.nl</a>	+31 15 215 29 39	

### Appendix 3: SWITCH aide memoir

What	URL	Login	Password	Why
SWITCH Website	<a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu">www.switchurbanwater.eu</a>			Consolidate SWITCH information; send to CMU (Adje Kerkhof)
SWITCH Learning Alliance	<a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/la">www.switchurbanwater.eu/la</a>			Consolidate SWITCH information on Learning Alliances (contact John Butterworth)
SWITCH Intranet	<a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/intranet">www.switchurbanwater.eu/intranet</a>			Consolidate SWITCH information; send to CMU / see site instructions
SWITCH city section (example)	<a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/lodz">www.switchurbanwater.eu/lodz</a>			Consolidate SWITCH information city Learning Alliance (contact Adje kerkhof)
	<b>Replace 'lodz' with 'accra', 'hamburg' etc.</b>			
City weblog (Wordpress)	<a href="http://www.switchlodz.wordpress.com">http://www.switchlodz.wordpress.com</a>			Weblog for city Learning alliance (CityLA)
City Gmail account (Google)	<a href="https://www.google.com/accounts/ManageAccount">https://www.google.com/accounts/ManageAccount</a>			CityLA Gmail account needed for group e-mail / picasa
City group e-mail (Google)	<a href="http://groups.google.com/group/switchlodz">http://groups.google.com/group/switchlodz</a>			CityLA group e-mail
City photo album (Picasa)	<a href="http://picasaweb.google.nl/switchlodz">http://picasaweb.google.nl/switchlodz</a>			CityLA photo album
City movie channel (YouTube)	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/switchlodz">http://www.youtube.com/switchlodz</a>			CityLA movie collection
City file box (The Box)	<a href="http://www.box.net/">http://www.box.net/</a>			CityLA file collection (when needed)
Processdocumentation weblog	<a href="http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/">http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/</a>			Workshop weblog

## Appendix 4: Expectations and Fears

### Expectations

- Learning new skills
- (continuous) Exchange of experiences
- Meeting people
- Creative and innovative ideas
- Find a standard for process documentation in SWITCH
- Networking
- Magnifying our impact
- Improving comm. in our projects work
- Satisfy our clients through better use of comm. channels
- Master techniques
- Capture practices on the ground
- Take home and apply lessons
- Inspired with simple feasible ideas to implement (buy in) with colleagues
- Better theoretical understanding of how documentation can add value to the process
- New ideas
- Practical examples
- New technologies easy to use
- Meeting new people with new ideas
- Know what P.D. is all about
- Learn from others' experiences
- To get to know each other
- Learn more about process documentation
- Find some creative ways of documenting the process in Accra
- To acquire more skills in P.D. that will enable me to improve my day to day communication / information duties of my organization
- How to use photographs + writing in order to promote / increase information dissemination + NGOs, CBOs and development partners
- Learn from other people 's experiences and try to adapt and replicate ideas when I return to my country
- ➔ strengthen communication skills and documentation process
- Networking / partnership / future collaboration/ information exchange
- Consolidate knowledge on process documenting
- Learning about journalistic style
- Learning sharing, creating
- Learn to use video camera
- Working together to improve something
- Improving tools and techniques especially video because it shows reality
- How can we help communities to learn for themselves
- How can we match communication with oral tradition
- Documentation is contradictory
- Learn about methodology, tools, techniques
- Spending time in nice company, learn to know each other

## Fears

- Language
- Time
- Applicability to different contexts
- No time for shopping
- Separation of media
- Losing the bigger picture
- Process documentation Vs. deliverables
- Resources, practicality for local application;
- All the three media are important and often used in a combination. However, each team will handle one aspect hence with other aspects
- Not enough time
- Too many things on the agenda
- Time to practice
- Too many ideas!?
- Design of workshop will not allow us to share between the different groups
- Project oriented: we observe people, communicate what they do for donors
- Limited time to see the city
- Rain might interrupt the work we do
- Long hours of work
- Not enough time to achieve objectives or process the learning experiences that we have during the workshop
- Very focused on what some of you have already achieved, less space for those who are aspiring
- Transposing and using the learning
- Seeing processes that I know/feel will not work in my environment maybe
- Will time be enough to go through all items on our programme?
- Cannot divide myself (to be in different groups)
- Very tight schedule

## Appendix 5: Process Documentation Plan Photography group

Date: 02 July 2007

Project: SWITCH

Issue: Social inclusion

Author(s): Kinga Krauze, Agnieszka Jaszczak, Maria Luisa Pardo, Firas Abd-Alhadi, John Butterworth, Pavel Kuczynski, Petra Brussee, Carmen da Silva Wells, Ton Schouten, Grit Martinez, Rafael Carías, Piotr Zaton, Galel

Theory of change [purpose of the project, focus of the project i.e. SWITCH Lodz]	SWITCH's goal is to improve integrated urban water management.
What are the specific challenges / processes at hand [write in detail what the challenges are]	<p>This plan concentrates on one of the themes in SWITCH and that is social inclusion. Social inclusion has been adopted by the Lodz-SWITCH team very recently. It has two components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• (the lack of) public participation</li><li>• and the exclusion of marginalised groups.</li></ul> <p>Both need to be worked out in more detail.</p>
Which are the processes this plan will capture [write in detail which processes this process documentation plan will capture]	<p>For the moment, the interest of the Lodz-SWITCH team goes to the public participation side of social inclusion. It is in this area that they are most interested and about which they are most passionate.</p> <p>Their analysis of the process in public participation is: Citizens of Lodz do not have a feeling of belonging to their city. Not only because parts of the city are in a bad shape, but also because in the past they could not take own initiatives and were not included in the projects of the city. They have lost faith in having a role in city development. They have not been and are not involved in <i>creating their own city</i>. There are two sides to this: the fact that there are no platforms for citizen participation (social exclusion) and the lack of awareness and faith. For citizen participation in water projects in the city – to increase quality of life - an intermediate step is needed: making people aware of the importance of <i>creating (public and private) space in your own city</i>.</p>
With whom, where, when can these issues be captured [people, places to go, events, meetings]	For the shooting, the Lodz SWITCH team has selected two neighbourhoods where space is available and two neighbourhoods where space is non-existent. We will go to these neighbourhoods to talk to people (young, old, children, women etc) about what the meaning of space is and if and how they create space for themselves. If we can

	organise it in time, we will also go the organised efforts (concerted action) which try to create or influence the creation of space in the city.
Purpose of the plan [describe what you want to achieve; also is it for internal learning, for external communication, learning with stakeholders or all]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the plan is to make the public in Lodz aware of the meaning and importance of space in the city and that they can play a role in creating public and private space in their city. This should stimulate the feeling of belonging to the city.</li> <li>• The purpose of the plan is also to inform authorities about what people consider to be the meaning of space in the city, how they try to create it, and how they could participate in making water plans to satisfy their needs for space (inclusion).</li> </ul>
If the purpose is for internal learning describe formats, outputs, methods and events	We did not pay enough attention to the internal learning component. We decided to contribute to the vision of the Lodz SWITCH team. Documenting processes will be used for a target of the team: sharing its vision and stimulating a sense of belonging of citizens. There is a strong and passionate drive of the Lodz SWITCH team, a vision, to improve the quality of their city and make people aware that it is their city and that they can change it. Question is if that drive finds resonance in the city and in particular in the LA. Without a platform for the passion the drive of the team will not be sustainable. So it would be good for internal learning to have a look at this.
If the purpose is for external communication present a communication strategy [describe aim, target groups, formats and channels]	Target groups are the general public and the authorities. There will be a photo exhibition in public spaces (schools, city hall, social serves etc) and in open space: outside in the city centre and in the neighbourhoods that we will portray. We will also see if we can publish in the local newspaper.
Which tools will be used for capturing [photo, video, observation, interviews etc]	Photography.
How will the captured information be organised [in an article, in a case study, in a photo book for the web, in a photo exhibition, in a radio report, in a video film]	In an exhibition that should be built for use outside (open space) and inside (public spaces). The exhibition will also be summarised in the newspaper.
How will the captured information be analysed [editing of the captured information or analysing with the project team]	When we are going to edit the captured information (100s of photographs and quotes of people), we will also analyse the captured information.
How will the captured information be disseminated [channels]	Exhibition in open space and in public space. Newspaper articles.
Who will do the process	The participants in the training course process



documentation [outsiders, stakeholders, insiders]	documentation. In particular the following people: Kinga Krauze, Agga Jaszczak, Maria Luisa Pardo, Firas T. Abd-Alhadi, John Butterworth, Pavel Kuczynski, Petra Brussee, Carmen da Silva Wells, Ton Schouten, Grit Martinez, Rafael Antonio Carias Altamirano, Piotr Zaton, Galel
How will the purpose of this plan be monitored	This will be done by the Lodz SWITCH team in their LA and by interviewing the public and the authorities if indeed the exhibition has created the desired impact.
<b>More ....</b>	We will work in two smaller groups, each group going to its own neighbourhood. Each group is supposed to come back with 4 portraits of people (photographs and interviews) telling what space means to them, where they find it, how they create it, what it should look like, what they can do themselves to create it. Each group also has to deliver 8 photographs showing the meaning of (lack of) space in the city.

## Appendix 6: Process Documentation Plan video group

*Storm water management for life's water improvement.*

Focus : life quality improvement

Problem: The river can not take the storm water

Date: 2.7.07

Author (s): Latifa, Nermin, Aleida, Larbi, Caridad and Iwona.

<i>Theory of change</i>	Storm water management through construction of reservoirs
<i>What are the specific challenges/ processes at hand (write in details what the challenges are)</i>	Solve problem of pollution (heavy metals) Social acceptance (what happened in the past? Changes operated in people's mind?)
<i>Which are the Process this plan will capture (write in detail which processes the documentation plan will capture)</i>	Different ideas concerning the conception of reservoirs and the impact in the population (social and pollution impact)
<i>With whom, where, when can these issues be captured (people, places to go, events, meetings)</i>	Where: concrete reservoir, park, dry part (if time allow us) With Whom: Locals: using the concrete reservoir With Whom: Mrs. Lukasz for photo remediation With Whom: Mrs. Teresa Wozniak what: the major problem Who: who had major role. The project responsible When: Started point and within 10 years
<i>Purpose of the plan (describe what you want to achieve; also is it for internal learning, for external communication, learning with stakeholders or all)</i>	External ( to show how successful the process has been)
<i>format</i>	Documentary, interview.
<i>Purpose is for external</i>	Not necessary to make strategy know
<i>If the purpose is for external, present a comm. strategy</i>	NAP
<i>Which tools will be used for capturing Photo, video, observation, interviews</i>	NAP
<i>How will the captures information be organized (in article, in a case study, etc)</i>	
<i>How the info will be disseminated (channels)</i>	
<i>Who will do the process documentation (outsiders, stakeholders, insiders)</i>	
<i>How will the purpose of this plan be monitored</i>	
<i>More...</i>	

Highlights: Before starting the interviewer will inform on the purpose of the interview. The intention is to cut the interviewer and only show at the end the interviewed person.

Time: 9:00 am

Who: Local people (look for a young and an old person)

Objective: Find contrasts and different points of views.

Question for both: how long have you been leaving in this area? (as a kind of introduction making people comfortable )

Young:

1. What are you doing there?
2. Do you know what is happening here?

Old:

3. How do you feel with this reservoir?
4. How was in the past?
5. Do you know what is happening here?

Students:

Time: 11:00 am

1. What are you doing here?
2. Why are you doing this?
3. Why did you use to work on this topic?

Time: 3:00pm

Background: Mrs Teresa.... Is considered the mother of the revitalization of the river. She is a champion. She was very much after the project idea since the beginning together with prof. "Salesko"?

1. What is the major issue the city face of this Sokolówka river?
2. What are the implementing solutions?
3. How sustainable are the solutions?
4. Who has been involved in this programme?
5. When: How do you see this place in ten years time?

Roles of every member of the group

Director: Latifa

Editing: Nermin Riad and Aleida Martínez

Cameras: Larbi (camera) and Caridad (sound). Possible will Exchange roles

Writing and taking pictures: Iwona

Planning the sequences of shooting (begin /middle/end)

Leave the hotel at 7:30 am.

Where: Will be informed in the narration (wide shoot)

Shooting: Start with surroundings (river from above). Beautiful green areas (wide shooting)

Interview of local people: We record the sound of the journalist and we shoot the interviewed.

Concrete reservoir: Wide shoot (reservoir and the city). Focus on some activities (fishing, equipments, and children)

- Pictures from others:  
<http://picasaweb.google.co.uk/processdocumentation/PicturesFromOthers>
- The official [;-)] Process Documentation blog:  
<http://processdocumentation.wordpress.com/>

## Appendix 7: Process Documentation Plans Writing & Voice group

### Group 1: internal focus (learning around L.A.)

#### Objectives:

- To explore and document ‘lessons learned’ from Lodz LA approach
- Capture experience of LA after 3 months
- Expectations of L.A. from different stakeholder perspectives
- Understanding of L.A. objectives

#### How?

- Methods:
  - Interviews
  - Observations
  - Voice recording
  - Project / LA documents
  - Transcripts in English
  - Photos
- *How did you get involved in the Lodz SWITCH Learning Alliance?*
- Expectations:
  - *What did you expect of the LA approach?*
- Experience:
  - *What have your experiences been so far?*
  - *Is there something you found useful from the LA that you can share with your organization?*
  - *Costs / benefits?*
- Future
  - *Ideas for improvement of L.A.?*
  - *What would you consider success to be?*

#### Outputs:

- Report for Lodz SWITCH team (more specific, internal, interviews as annex) → Jochen / Alistair
- 1-page report for SWITCH website aimed at LA facilitators → Simret / Bertha / Nadia
- Stories of our own experiences from interviews (Blog) → Rania + all
- Video / sound recording of 1 key common question to all interviewees

Theory of change	After three months, the LA stakeholders have some perception of the effect that the LA has had on their work
What are the specific challenges?	Early days, translation of language, short amount of time, high expectations of process documenters, different perceptions of P.D.
Which are the processes this plan will capture?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To explore and document ‘lessons learned’ from Lodz LA approach</li><li>• Capture experience of LA after 3 months</li><li>• Expectations of L.A. from different stakeholder perspectives</li><li>• Understanding of L.A. objectives</li></ul>

With whom, where, when can these issues be captured?	Internal LA stakeholders, facilitators.
Purpose of the plan	Capture experiences and lessons learnt for internal learning and sharing
Communication strategy	N/A
Which tools will be used for capturing?	Video cam, camera, digital voice recorder
How will the captured information be organised?	Transcripts of interviews, soundbites,
How will the captured information be analysed?	Direct feedback after interview and group work after 2:30 pm. Work in pairs to produce the outputs.
How will the captured information be disseminated?	GoogleGroup, Website, blog.
Who will do the process documentation?	We will.
How will the purpose of this plan be monitored?	Stories of our experiences.

Group 2: external focus (ownership of people in the change process in Lodz)

Theory of change	Ownership of the people → level of engagement of the people, process of change in awareness. How much have we engaged with the people who live in the place?
What are the specific challenges?	
Which are the processes this plan will capture?	Process of dissemination → vertical communication / horizontal communication. Impact on community building?
With whom, where, when can these issues be captured?	NGO, people who have been affected and people who will be affected, scientists
Purpose of the plan	400 words for the general article, 90 seconds for radio → 200 words for internet article
Communication strategy	Newspaper, radio → general public Internet
Which tools will be used for capturing?	Observation, interviews
How will the captured information be organised?	Observers, writing, asking questions
How will the captured information be	By process, by documenting people's perception of change. Thoughts about their future (hopes, dreams, vision, fears)

analysed?	
How will the captured information be disseminated?	Journal, radio, website
Who will do the process documentation?	WE
How will the purpose of this plan be monitored?	AAR: what was supposed to happen? / what happened? / Why was there a difference? What can we learn from this?
Additional notes	Are the people proud of living in the <i>city of water</i> ? How much are they aware of the water management? Change in the way they see the SWITCH project? Hopes for the future? Can this connect to income generation?



# Training Workshop Report

Draft January 2008

## Learning Alliances: sharing lessons after one year

Sogakofe, Ghana

11 – 14 December 2007

Report written by IRC international Water and Sanitation Centre, Delft. The training workshop was organised by IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre ([www.irc.nl](http://www.irc.nl)) and the SWITCH project ([www.switchurbanwater.eu](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu)).

For comments or questions:

Marieke Adank: [adank@irc.nl](mailto:adank@irc.nl) or Ewen le Borgne: [Leborgne@irc.nl](mailto:Leborgne@irc.nl)



# Introduction

## Reading guide

Section A- General (p2): gives the general information about the training

Section B- Session outcomes (p3- 13): documents the outcomes and key reflections on the sessions of the workshop.

This report follows the training workshop day by day, describing sessions, methods and key findings.

### 8.23. Section C- Results of evaluation (p14)

#### Section D- Appendices (p15-40)

D. Appendices.....	27
Appendix 1: Final announcement of the workshop .....	28
Appendix 2: Detailed agenda .....	32
Appendix 3: List of participants and contact details .....	38
Appendix 4: Warm-up exercise on monitoring and evaluation .....	44
Appendix 5: Links to resources on Outcome Mapping and MSC .....	46
Appendix 6: Most Significant change stories from the participants .....	47
Appendix 7: End Evaluation .....	48

Hyperlinks to website or appendices of the text are indicated in [blue](#). Use CTRL + Click to follow the link.

## 8.24. A - General

Title of training	Learning Alliances: sharing lessons after one year
Place	Sogakofe, Ghana
Date	11 to 14 December 2007
Trainers	Day 1 and 2: Bertha Darteh (SWITCH Accra), Phil Sharp (SWITCH Birmingham), Monika Dziegielewska-Geitz (SWITCH Ludz), Day 3 and 4: John Butterworth (IRC), Joep Verhagen (IRC),
Resource persons	Alistair Sutherland (NRI), Nadia Manning (IWMI)
Main target audience:	Learning Alliance facilitators from the SWITCH project, the RiPPLE project and the TPP project, local LA members; other participants interested in aspects of making learning alliance approaches work, such as city coordinators, researchers, and programme managers.
Learning objective for main target audience:	To advance and consolidate the establishment of learning alliances in SWITCH through sharing lessons between the cities (and other similar projects), to introduce useful tools and approaches that facilitators may use to improve monitoring and evaluation of learning alliance outcomes and impacts, and to develop draft monitoring and evaluation plans for each learning alliance platform.
Number of participants	22
Gender balance	11 female participants; 11 male participants 3 female facilitators / resource persons; 3 male facilitators/ resource persons
Number of participating members of LA teams per city	Accra (5), Lodz (1), Belo Horizonte (1), Alexandria (1), Hamburg (1), Birmingham (1), Zaragoza (1). Including LA facilitators from Accra, Alexandria , Lodz, Belo Horizonte, Birmingham, Zaragoza. Including city coordinators from Accra.
Location of materials and further information	All information from the course including presentations and photos is available at: <a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/home/learning_alliances/capacity_building/sharing_lessons_after_1_year">http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/home/learning_alliances/capacity_building/sharing_lessons_after_1_year</a>

## 8.25. B - Session outcomes

### Summary of day 1

One year after kick-off, members from seven SWITCH cities<sup>2</sup> came together in Villa Cisneros by the River Volta in Ghana, to share lessons and experiences with the key driving mechanism of the project (learning alliances) and to develop plans to monitor changes linked to SWITCH in all these cities. The Ghanaian event opened its doors to two other projects that are following a learning alliance approach: the Tri-partite Partnership Project (TPP) in Ghana focused on urban water in small towns and the RiPPLE (Research-inspired Policy and Practice Learning in Ethiopia and the Nile Region) focusing on improving rural water and sanitation in a region with still very low levels of access to these basic services.

Birmingham, Lodz and Accra took the initiative to facilitate the first two days of the workshop and took over as facilitators after an introduction presentation by John Butterworth on Learning Alliances in SWITCH<sup>3</sup>. The first day aimed to shed light, from experience across SWITCH and similar projects, on the issues of incentives to motivate real engagement with learning alliances, effective communication and demonstration projects that involve implementers.

### Sorry, it is not us! Incentives to get the learning alliance going

Phil Sharp presented the challenges of institutional disconnection in Birmingham<sup>4</sup>, dealing with time constraints, the necessity to find incentives, to use local champions and to keep integrating new members into the learning alliance. The participants made the following recommendations based upon discussions in work groups:

- Personal incentives are necessary. These may be networking, access to information, access to good quality research etc. Incentives should also be attractive to institutions, to engage them beyond individual members.
- Getting support from influential members is critical.
- Participating in the learning alliance, planning and implementing together, and being part of a larger process is an incentive in itself.
- Process facilitation is vital but it takes time, arguably as much as the implementation or technical activities. There should be a 50:50 balance.
- We focused a lot about incentives for the involvement of non-traditional stakeholders in research. But perhaps scientists themselves, and their incentives to engage in learning alliances, needs even more attention?

### Confessions from a non-technical person: the power of communication

---

<sup>2</sup> Accra, Alexandria, Belo Horizonte, Birmingham, Hamburg, Lodz and Zaragoza

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2355>

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2352> and <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2354>

Monika Geitz from Lodz continued with a presentation on the necessity of interpersonal communication, leaving prejudices behind, managing and resolving conflicts, explaining very well what the project and the learning alliance is about and understanding each other's needs<sup>5</sup>. Group discussions shined a light on the communication challenge:

- Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders need to be very clear to all.
- Conflicts should be managed but they can also be used as drivers of change.
- Communication, and producing communication outputs, is important and helpful but it takes time and a lot of resources guided by a strong communication strategy (that is based upon the way we try to work with a learning alliance approach).

### **Show me what you're worth: the demonstration challenge**

To close the day, Bertha Darteh presented a case study of the learning alliance in Accra and the importance of having a good demonstration project to generate buy-in and further down the line to influence policies<sup>6</sup>. Other insights shared within the larger group were:

- Demonstrations are the real test. It is more difficult to work together than to sit together and talk. At this stage you have to give more weight to costs, user acceptability etc as well as technical performance.
- SWITCH can have impact by focusing on real life-changing issues for its demonstrations, as opposed to research agendas cooked up in a remote laboratory.
- The demonstration possibilities in SWITCH are limited. Scaling up resides more in the process of the learning alliance itself than in these small projects.
- Process documentation will add a key layer of understanding to demonstration.
- Demonstration can be about implementation of technologies, mechanisms or policy influence.
- Scaling up the SWITCH work can be a delicate balancing act as implementation of research findings in a demo will depend upon similar institutional, economic, environmental context etc.

We need more attention to cost analysis, and the human resources and other capacities needed to scale up innovations.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2353>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2372>

## Summary of day 2

### Learning and sharing from other projects: the RiPPLE experience

The second day of the workshop was kicked-off with a video film and a presentation<sup>7</sup>, which gave an introduction to the RiPPLE project, a research project in Ethiopia on “money onto water, water into money”, which also uses a learning (and practice) alliance approach.

Some of the lessons that SWITCH could learn from RiPPLE that came out were:

- Demos linking research with implementation are very important
- The activities in between learning alliance workshops, like research and implementation, are key.
- Good communication with and between the LPA members between meetings is very important
- It is very valuable to involve members of the learning alliance in the research

Although the both SWITCH as well as RiPPLE are using a learning (and practice) alliance approach, there are big differences between the two. RiPPLE is focusing more on governance and policy, while switch looks more at technical innovation. In RiPPLE, there is no direct funding from the project for implementation, but links are made with implementers through the learning and practice alliance. RiPPLE undertakes research on practical problems to come with practical solutions. Expectation is that LPA members will take over the findings and implement it in their work.

### Research, demos and integration

The participants were divided into groups to discuss about what they perceived research and demonstrations to be and how the two could be integrated. The common definitions that came out the group work were:

Research: Identification of problems, problem solving and reflection on action. Scientific tools are used and needed for the application of the solution to a problem on a realistic basis.

Demo: Application of research results to contribute to solve problems / practical translation of a research finding on a small scale to test efficiency. One of the working groups noted there is a difference between pilots (trying it out) and demos (for scaling-up).

On the point of how to integrate research and demos, the groups mentioned the following:

- Practitioners and researchers overlap + integrate mindsets.
- Research and demo as one: action (demo) + research = action research

Recommendation to bring about the integration included:

- Need for flexibility, in outcomes and within budgets
- Day to day facilitation
- Documentation
- Good communication strategy
- Scientists coming to non-scientific meeting
- Cross WP disciplinary working

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2357>

- City team meetings
- Joint planning of data collection

### Working with parallel platforms for mutual benefits

To stimulate discussion and sharing about how we can work with other platforms in our work, Phil gave a presentation on platforms to which the Birmingham learning alliance links<sup>8</sup>.

In the groups, the participant shared experiences with working with other platforms. Some point that came out of the group work included:

- Different ways of using other platforms:
  - o Sharing experiences and findings by being involved in other platforms
  - o Having representatives of other platforms in LA
  - o Using platforms for advocacy
  - o Using other platforms for getting / sharing resources
  - o Collaboration in implementation
  - o Sharing in international platforms
- Linkages through personal relationships. Active individuals are important.
- Sometimes people can be platforms (e.g. Nadia Manning, who is involved in knowledge management component of a large number of different projects).
- The LA wiki as a platform for sharing between LAs
- Platforms do not always work. One reason for that can be “stakeholder fatigue”.
- Platforms should bring about change. If not, it will lead to disappointment.
- What is SWITCH going to do different to stimulate social inclusion?
- How to use resources best? How to get most value?

### Stakeholder analysis: the why and how

Monica told about her experiences with the stakeholder analysis. She participated in the first LA facilitators training, in which the stakeholder analysis was explained and she had read the briefing note, but found it very difficult to get started and feared it would be much too time consuming. However, after seeing Bertha’s example, it became much clearer to me what was expected.

When the deadline approached, she decided she would have to do it one way or another. As a first action, she explored info that she found on websites and printed reference materials, which took a long time. This was followed by a survey, per e-mail, in person and/ or by phone.

In the end, the stakeholder analysis gave her a much better insight in who the stakeholders are etc. One of her main conclusions from the stakeholder analysis was that there is a lot of overlaps of what stakeholders do.

The main challenge she faced was the time it took to do the stakeholder analysis.

Issues raised from the question and the group work that followed Monica’s story:

- The usefulness of the stakeholder analysis: According to Monica, there was interest in the stakeholder analysis from the side of the stakeholders, since something like that was not done before. For Monica herself, the stakeholder analysis gave an excellent opportunity to learn a lot more about the stakeholders, which she feels would help her

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2356>

in her work in facilitating the LA. John explained that stakeholder analysis at the beginning is crucial in this kind of process. Hopefully the information will be internalized.

- A stakeholder analysis is dynamic and will need regular updating.
- Involvement of the LA: Feedback from the LA and their active involvement in the stakeholder analysis was considered important. The issue of sharing potentially sensitive information was also raised.
- Sharing the stakeholder analysis with other LA facilitators (e.g. via google group) and with researchers (e.g. via website / summary of the stakeholder analysis). Having seen the example of Bertha's stakeholder analysis helped the LA facilitators realize what the stakeholder analysis should / could be like
- Boundaries and time: Stakeholder analysis raised fundamental questions for SWITCH on boundaries of the cities.
- Who are considered in the stakeholder analysis: all stakeholders, not only the LA members.
- Using visual methods for mapping stakeholders
- The follow-up: Institutional mapping / governance analysis -> going beyond the stakeholder analysis.(power relations etc)(might be bigger issues on what to share and what not)
- Other tools than stakeholder analysis: If switch wants to be more integrated, there might be other tools than stakeholder analysis to engage researchers, e.g. impact pathway analysis.
- Stakeholder that are missing in the stakeholder analysis: banks, consumer groups, etc

## Summary of day 3

The third and the fourth day of the workshop were dedicated to Monitoring and Evaluation. In the morning session of day three, participants were given a flavour of different monitoring approaches, while the afternoon session focused more on the development of a realistic monitoring framework for the Learning Alliance process within SWITCH (and other projects).

### Warming-up: introduction to monitoring and evaluation

As a warm-up exercise, participants were asked about their experiences with M&E, their expectations for M&E for the Learning alliances and the incentives for M&E. Though this exercise, it became very clear that the experiences of the different participants were quite diverse and wide. Participants expected that M&E would be useful for accounting and reporting on projects and programmes, and to serve as management tools, stimulating steering and learning. Incentives that the participant identified included accountability related incentives, learning and improvement processes, and method / guidance related incentives.

The typed out cards from this exercise can be found in [Appendix 4: Warm-up exercise on monitoring and evaluation](#).

This exercise was followed by a short presentation by Alistair Sutherland, who gave an introduction to core concepts like planning, monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. He stated that M&E is important both for accountability reasons (to prove), as well as for learning (to improve), and that these two should ideally be balanced.

### Monitoring through Outcome mapping

After this introduction, Nadia Manning gave the participants a crash course on outcome mapping<sup>9</sup>. Outcomes were defined as changes in behaviour, relationships, activities, actions of people, groups, and organizations that program targets. Outcome mapping can be used in project planning, monitoring and evaluation as an approach for mapping, supporting the development of and capturing desired outcomes (changes) as they unfold. Outcome mapping requires engagement with partners in relationships that support behavioural changes leading to outcomes indicating progress towards impact. In order to do so, it is important to identify the boundary partners of a project or programme. The participants were given the opportunity to map the boundary partners of the project (in their respective cities or regions).

After this exercise, Nadia continued her presentation, explaining about Outcome Challenge (the ultimate, most ideal change in the boundary partners, like changes in behaviours and attitudes, activities and actions, but also in policies, laws, regulations and ways of working) and Progress Markers (list of gradually developing changes of each boundary partner towards targeted Outcome Challenge). Process makers are about what you expect, like , and love to see in the boundary partners, as the project exerts its influence. The participants practiced identifying progress markers by doing a group exercise.

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2358>



The exercise was followed by the continuation of Nadia's presentation on outcome mapping, in which she talked about how strategy maps can be developed for activities that cause change, persuade, support individual partner and partner's environment.

Nadia explained about the need to also be critical about the project itself: to see the project / programme as a boundary partner.

Challenges of Outcome Mapping include time and resource constraints, and lack of commitment. On a question of a participant about how much time would it take to carry out OM in an average project, Nadia explained that it would start with a 3-4 day workshop with a few team members/stakeholders, after which it would take another 5 days to refining results, figuring out roles and responsibilities another 5 days. In the years that follow, 2 yearly workshops of about 5 days each are organized to collect information. The analysis of this information takes about 5 days per workshop. The total number of days per year is therefore about 20 days plus some extra days at the beginning of project.

Finally Nadia briefly introduced possible monitoring tools, like outcome journals for monitoring boundary partner progress, strategy journals for monitoring programme strategy, and performance journals for monitoring program organizational practices. Nadia closed the presentation by remarking that it is recommended to combine the OM approach with other M & E approaches to make the process inclusive and the results more acceptable.

#### What is the Most Significant Change?

The following monitoring tool that was introduced was the Most Significant Change Method. Though a brief presentation, Nadia described how writing down most significant changes by individuals and having these discussed in groups can be an effective monitoring, or rather, evaluation tool.

[Appendix 5](#): Links to resources on Outcome Mapping and MSC gives an overview of links for most information on outcome mapping and Most Significant Change.

As an exercise, the participants were asked to write down their Most Significant Change from the past 3 days. Though this exercise, participant observes that the MSC method is very easy to apply and that it is very helpful in reflecting and evaluating a process from the perspective of the "stakeholders". An overview of the Most Significant Change stories can be found in [Appendix 6](#): Most Significant change stories from the participants.

#### Monitoring the LA process by using Micro scenarios

Within the LA work package of SWITCH, the micro scenario method will be used to monitor the progress of the Learning alliances. This method will take about 5 days per year, instead of the 20 days per year that Outcome Mapping would take. It facilitated quantifying qualitative data by using micro scenarios.

Under Work Package 1, sustainability indicators will be monitored. However, these are more long term indicators, looking at the effects of the project, which can only be measured after 10-20 years. The monitoring of the LA process on the other hand, should focus on outcome level M&E.

John gave an introduction to the use of micro scenario<sup>10</sup>. In this method, first change objectives (vision) are identified together with the relevant stakeholders. Then micro-scenarios are defined, with a key word distinguishing each level. (Each level has a score on a scale of 0-100). The benchmark, which is the minimum acceptable level we would like to achieve, is set, usually at a score of 50. In the beginning of a project or process, the baseline situation has to be identified, after with monitoring will take place at regular intervals, by recording the ranking according to the micro scenarios and reflecting and discussing why has change taken place or not.

The proposed objectives and indicators for monitoring the Learning Alliances were presented. After this, participants were teamed up to discuss the relevant and less relevant objectives from the briefing note for their own city situation, and identify gaps in the objectives. All cities identified the 5 most relevant objectives. From this exercise, 4 common objectives were identified that featured most prominently. These were:

- Objective 1: We know LA members and how they communicate effectively
- Objective 4: Regular effective and innovative events capture interest of LA members
- Objective 7: Demonstration activities are undertaken within a framework for scaling up
- Objective 8: We understand why change is occurring in IUWM, not just what happens (linked to process documentation)

The participants agreed that these objectives will be used for monitoring the LA process for the EU and will be the same for all the cities.

---

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2359>

## Summary of day 4

The last day of the workshop was mainly spent continuing the work on the micro scenarios and discussing the way forward for the learning alliances.

### Monitoring the LA process by using Micro scenarios – part II

The day was started with a small presentation of the indicators of objective 1.

A critical note to the use of micro scenarios is that it is better to use the ranking table to monitor progress over time, than using it to compare the ranking of different entities at a certain time. The actual ranking according to the ranking table is less important than the movement up the ranking table over time.

After this, participants were given the opportunity to work on their performance monitoring objectives and micro-scenarios for specific city objectives and to refine these.

Some points coming out of the discussion:

- Differences between developing – developed countries in the way they deal with city planning. However, in many cases there is a lack of enforcement rather than a lack of lack of planning
- SWITCH is an action research process. Action research produces changes at the middle level, which can influence the planning level.

### Action points

- All cities will finalise the micro-scenarios within one week and share with John.
- The objectives will be included in the quarterly reports

### The way forward: sharing spaces

The participants discussed different issues related to sharing of information within and outside the Learning Alliances.

The progress reports are useful, but just information alone is not enough. The learning alliance facilitators need to give interpretation of events as well.

The internet can be used as a place for informing and sharing. ICCLEI is actively supporting the cities now in developing and maintaining the city websites. Another sharing space is the LA Wiki, which was demonstrated by Joep and can be found on: <http://learningalliance.wiki.watsan.net/SWITCH>

Action point that came out of the discussion were:

- John will prepare a format for LA progress reporting.
- John will put the format for the M&E plan as an Annex and everybody will complete it.
- John and Carol will follow up with the cities that are not present.

### The way forward: funding

Funding issues related to the Learning alliances were discussed. The following issues were raised:

- Funding for Learning alliances within SWITCH is only available for 30 months. Detailed budgets are needed, which will be clearly scrutinized. The budgets should be part of the city plans.
- Because not all events are known in the beginning of the year (e.g. this meeting was announced in June), it is recommended to incorporate 2 to 3 of these international sharing meetings year, with a budget of 3000 to 4000 euro per meeting.
- Trainings for LA facilitators will have to come from the city budgets, while training of LA members will be paid.

#### The way forward: Integration

The issue of integration was discussed. Some of the issues that came out were:

- Who is responsible for taking a city forward? Researchers think integration is city coordinators job. City coordinators think it is the researchers job. City coordinator is a voluntary position. The logical person to do this would be facilitator. However, most LA facilitators do not have the clout or the experience to do so.
- Steering committee: In Accra, a Steering committee is supporting the LA facilitator. According to Carol, researchers from themes 1 and 6 could also be involved in a steering committee like this.
- The influence of city coordinators in the management team: However, thematic leaders have clear say in how SWITCH is being run, as they are all represented in the management team. There is one LA facilitator and one city coordinator in the management board.
- In Lodz, the feeling is that many tasks are being passed through to us. The city coordinator just passes through data to researchers without a lack of real ownership.
- Would be very useful to put city coordinators and theme leaders together.
- John came with the idea that it would be useful to bring together key people making the difference within the city + external researchers, for 3 cities at the time.
- If we want to secure enough budget for the LA processes, we will have to make a strong case for it. One way of doing that is through the city story lines.

#### The way forward: Support

For the institutional mapping, it was discussed that the following cities will be supported by the following persons / organizations:

- Alexandria – NRI and IRC
- Accra – IRC
- Birmingham – Collin Green?
- Zaragoza – ICLEI
- Hamburg – ICLEI
- Lodz – ICLEI and IHE (Meine Pieter?)
- Belo Horizonte, Lima – IRC

#### The way forward: Training events for next year

The following workshops / trainings were identified to take place next year:

- June / July: LA Learning and sharing workshop.
  - o Possible theme: mechanisms for scaling up.
- End of the year: scientific meeting, with more integration of the cities / learning alliances

- Need for training on IUWM plan

Any other business:

- Carol reminded the participants about the upcoming photo competition. An e-mail will be sent around about it soon.
- Cities are stimulated to submit proposals for having the SWITCH scientific meeting in their city.
- Expo in June: All SWITCH countries will be represented, expect for Ghana, UK, Israel. A half day seminar will be organized on water in cities.
- There are very little economists in the switch partners, but economics will [play an important role in strategic planning. It is considered useful if the economic guys should make briefing notes on economics

**8.26.**

## 8.27. C. Results of evaluation

On the last day of the workshop, participants were asked to write their main lessons learned of the 4 day training workshop on cards. The typed out cards can be found in [Appendix 7: End Evaluation](#).

The lessons learned were related to:

- M&E capacity
- M&E principles
- M&E tools and methods
- Internal process
- Externals
- New ideas
  - o Ideas for interesting events and communication with LA (ideas for newsletter, conference, contacts)
  - o Demonstration sizes
  - o The demos are very crucial in LA process
  - o It is very good to undertake in RiPPLE too
  - o White man cannot dance!!
  - o A little bit about African dance and singing
  - o “coconut” energizer

Participants were also requested to discuss things they liked about the organization of the workshop and things that could be improved according to them, in buzz group.

Things that were considered good included:

- The variety of participants (participants from different projects)
- The venue and activities outside workshop
- The programme and facilitation of the workshop
- Organization and invitation

Things that could be approved were, according to the participants:

- Diversity of participants (more stakeholders and LA members should be included next time, more engagement of researchers, MT, our director, city coordinators)
- The printing and distribution of materials, like the agenda and discussion points
- The noise level within the venue and its proximity to the city
- Programme
  - o Day 3: Too long and too many presentations
  - o Be clear which parts of the training workshop are useful for all, and which for only SWITCH participants
  - o Pace
  - o Short breaks in the middle of the day – walks, short trips
  - o Field trip
- Facilitation
  - o More change in working groups
  - o Presentation words not large enough
  - o Sharing experience more analytical + critical
  - o Methods which bring out the problems

- Have a real open space session

## 8.28. D. Appendices

D. Appendices .....	27
Appendix 1: Final announcement of the workshop .....	28
Appendix 2: Detailed agenda .....	32
Appendix 3: List of participants and contact details .....	38
Appendix 4: Warm-up exercise on monitoring and evaluation .....	44
Appendix 5: Links to resources on Outcome Mapping and MSC .....	46
Appendix 6: Most Significant change stories from the participants .....	47
Appendix 7: End Evaluation .....	48





**SWITCH training workshop on ‘Learning Alliances: sharing lessons after one year’,  
Accra, Ghana, 11-14 December 2007**

Third announcement with final detailed agenda

Background

The Sustainable Water Management Improves Tomorrows Cities Health (SWITCH) project is a research partnership funded by the EC undertaking innovation in the area of *integrated urban water management (IUWM)*. The project aims to carry out more demand-led, action-orientated research in its nine demonstration cities and study sites<sup>11</sup>, with a view of effecting greater integration of UWM, and ultimately beneficial impacts. This is being done through city learning alliances, independent multi-stakeholders platforms at different levels, which the project has established (see [www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances) for more information). Rather than solely focusing on new research, the project is encouraging city learning alliances to concentrate on putting *research into use* across different aspects of the urban water cycle to help improve integration and *scaling-up* impacts.

Most SWITCH cities established their learning alliances at the beginning of 2007 and, amongst other things, recruited facilitators with specific roles to develop and support the learning alliances and to document the associated learning and change processes. Training was provided for facilitators in general facilitation methods (in Cairo in January 2007 and Lodz in March 2007) and in process documentation (in July 2007).

After one year of running SWITCH learning alliances this training workshop aims to look back at progress made, problems encountered and solved, and to introduce monitoring and evaluation tools that are critical to measure outcomes and impacts, and to improve the effectiveness of learning alliances.

Objective of training workshop

The first objective of the SWITCH training workshop on ‘Learning Alliances: sharing lessons after one year’ is to advance and consolidate the establishment of learning alliances in SWITCH through sharing lessons between the cities (and other similar projects). The second objective is to introduce useful tools and approaches that facilitators may use to improve monitoring and evaluation of learning alliance outcomes and impacts, and to develop draft monitoring and evaluation plans for each learning alliance platform.

Who should attend?

---

<sup>11</sup> Accra, Alexandria, Beijing, Belo Horizonte, Birmingham, Cali, Hamburg, Lima, Lodz, Tel Aviv and Zaragoza.

The workshop is aimed at SWITCH city learning alliance facilitators and other participants interested in aspects of making learning alliance approaches work, such as city coordinators, researchers, and programme managers. Participants from outside the SWITCH consortium that are interested in learning about the programme and bringing in experiences from other projects that follow learning alliance or similar approaches are also welcome. These will include the RiPPLE and TPP programmes.

RiPPLE ([www.rippleethiopia.org](http://www.rippleethiopia.org)) is following a learning alliance approach in research on water and sanitation in Ethiopia and the Nile Region. RiPPLE operates primarily within three regions of Ethiopia, Benishangul-Gumuz in the North-West, Oromia (including Addis Ababa) and The Southern Nations Nationalities and People's Region (SNNPR), where a consortium are developing a new body of high quality policy and practice-relevant knowledge through the establishment of Learning and Practice Alliances (LPA) at different levels.

The TPP (Tri-partite Partnership Project) is a new project about innovative Water supply and Sanitation Management for the Urban Poor (in small towns and urban centres) in Ghana. It aims to strengthen the capacity of the sector to generate and share relevant information and knowledge on innovative pro-poor approaches to WASH services delivery, and to promote increased partnership between public agencies, water and sanitation utilities, NGOS/CBOs and the private sector in the planning and delivery of pro-poor services delivery. In TPP a learning alliance approach will be applied, with learning platforms a national level and at the level of pilot towns and urban centres, to facilitate the generation and sharing of information and knowledge, stimulate partnerships and create an enabling environment to take the innovations to scale.

#### Summary of training programme and methodology

The first part of the workshop will be about *Learning and Sharing between Learning Alliances*. By the end of 2007, facilitators and their colleagues will have gained valuable experience in dealing with the day-to-day realities and challenges of bringing stakeholders together in one or more platforms, maintaining dialogues and initiating collaboration between these stakeholders. A participatory forum will be provided to share and learn within the team of learning alliance facilitators and other colleagues. Practical solutions will be sought where possible, and recommendations synthesised so that the effectiveness of learning alliances can be improved. This part of the workshop will be facilitated by learning alliance facilitators from Accra (Ghana), Lodz (Poland) and Birmingham (UK) drawing upon their own city experiences and others.

The second part of the workshop will focus on *Monitoring and evaluation methods for stakeholder driven research processes*. Monitoring the outcomes and impacts of learning alliance processes is challenging and requires a specific set of tools and approaches. Two days of the training programme are dedicated to monitoring approaches and tools, and participants will be supported in tailoring these tools to the specific requirements in their cities. It will focus on introducing pragmatic and simple monitoring that is realistic with the resources available within SWITCH cities (see a briefing note already available at [www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2104](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2104)) as well as introducing more advanced M&E methods such as outcome mapping and most significant change with the support of the International Water Management Institute and drawing upon the experience of M&E within a recent wastewater project in Ghana.

## Workshop arrangements

The training workshop will be facilitated by SWITCH learning alliance facilitators (the first two days: led by Bertha Darteh, Phil Sharp, and Monika Dziegielewska-Geitz from Accra, Birmingham and Lodz) and members of the SWITCH learning alliance team and IWMI (the second part on M&E).

The workshop will be hosted close to Accra, Ghana from 11-14 December 2007 at Villa Cisneros Resort in Sogakofe by the River Volta. Participants are recommended to arrive in Accra on 10 December before 2100 at the airport (for example for participants travelling from Europe there is a KLM flight from Amsterdam arriving at 1925 and a British Airways flight from London arriving at 2055) and to leave from Accra either very late (after 2200) on 14 December (such as KLM flight to Amsterdam at 2200 or the British Airways flight at 2330) or on the 15 December 2007. Shared transport to Sogakofe will be provided. The four workshop days will be full, and will not include any free time for sightseeing, so you may wish to extend your visit!

There are two optional field visits. On the 10 December (in which case you should arrange your flights to arrive a day earlier) a local host will take you to parts of Accra where SWITCH is working including the low-income settlement area where SWITCH work is focused (Teshie), locations of wastewater reuse in peri-urban agriculture and a visit to AVRIL (the privately-run water utility). On the 15 December, a different field visit will take you to some sites of interest in Accra from an environmental and sightseeing perspective so you can get a feel of the city in its different aspects. As well as some of the water and sanitation issues, you will see different kinds of settlements, historical features, markets etc. The cost of each field trip is 50 Ghana Cedis per person.

Participants will need to cover their own travel and subsistence costs (accommodation/ meals) from their own SWITCH (or other project) budget. An allocation of money specifically for these training events has been made within SWITCH city budgets and can only be used for this purpose. Non-SWITCH participants will need to cover their own costs. Participants will all stay in the same hotel and the booking and transfer arrangements will be made as soon as your travel details have been supplied (date, time and flight number of arrival and departure).

We will book the hotel in Sogakofe (75 Ghana Cedis per night including meals) and if required in Accra (at the Afia Village hotel for 50 Ghana Cedis including breakfast with a nice sea view (see [www.afiavillage.com/](http://www.afiavillage.com/) for directions and a map; tel +233 21 681465; Address is No. 2 Liberia Road Extension Osu in Ministries Area. Directions From Kotoka International Airport are to travel along Independence Avenue towards Accra, and at the National Theatre traffic lights, turn left. Then follow the road all the way to the end. Taxi cost is maximum 10 Ghana Cedis and you need to negotiate).

You can pay by credit card or cash for hotels (Euros work well for changing, also USD). At the latest your travel details must be provided by 9 November 2007 to ensure you have accommodation and airport transfers. The costs of transfers to the workshop hotel will be shared across participants travelling in shared vehicles (expected cost is about 120 Ghana Cedis return).

### *Costs:*

Field visit 10 Dec – 50 Ghana Cedis

Field visit 15 Dec – 50 Ghana Cedis  
Transfers to Sogakofe (return) – 120 Ghana Cedis  
Hotel in Sogakofe – 75 Ghana cedis per night  
Hotel in Accra – 50 Ghana Cedis per night

Exchange rate is about 0.9 Ghana Cedis to 1USD.

Participants are responsible for organising visas, and ensuring they make proper medical arrangements (e.g. for malaria protection).

Participants will be sent further information with more details about the agenda, hotel, venue and travel shortly (also see [www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1854](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/1854)). For more details please contact Joep Verhagen ([Verhagen@irc.nl](mailto:Verhagen@irc.nl)) or John Butterworth ([butterworth@irc.nl](mailto:butterworth@irc.nl)).

## Appendix 2: Detailed agenda

Monday 10 December

- Field visit in Accra (optional)
- Transfer to Sogakofe

Tuesday 11 December – Part 1: Learning and Sharing between Learning Alliances

Timing/ Duration	Activity	Objective/ Details	Responsible
0900-0915	Welcome	A welcome to SWITCH, this LA training workshop and Ghana	Carol/ John/ Esi
0915-0930	Introductions	To get to know each other and our motivations for participating in this training workshop	Monika/ Phil/ Bertha
<b>Learning and sharing #1: Learning from Birmingham</b>			
0930-1000	Presentation	Lessons from the Birmingham Flooding Pilot Study – “ <i>sorry its not us!</i> ”.	Phil
1000-1015	Case study	Incentives to maintain LA interest and how to keep them focused	Phil
1015-1045	Workgroup	Discussions on the theme of incentives in small groups	Phil/ Monika/ Bertha
1045-1100	Discussion	To learn about your experiences with Learning Alliances in maintaining momentum and keeping stakeholders involved. To share handy tips on strategies that have worked well for you.	Phil
1100-1115	Break		
<b>Learning and sharing #2: Learning from Łódź</b>			
1115-1145	Presentation	How to keep up with Researchers and Stakeholders in the process of effective Multi-Stakeholder Engagement? <i>Confessions of a “non-technical person”</i>	Monika
1145-1200	Case study	Effective communication	Monika
1200-1230	Workgroup	Discussions on the theme of effective communication in small groups	Monika/ Phil/ Bertha
1230-1300	Discussion	To bring out examples of effective and ineffective communications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategies that you have used in your groups.</li> <li>• Strategies that we could develop</li> <li>• Differentiation in targeting forms of communication.</li> <li>• Making communications relevant.</li> <li>• Background reading-based discussion – MSEPs – UNDP Capacity Building Report.</li> </ul>	Monika
1300-1400	Lunch		
<b>Learning and sharing #3: Learning from Accra</b>			
1400-1430	Presentation	By Accra LA facilitator	Bertha

1430-1445	Case study	Following up research with demonstrations and change to make a real difference	Bertha
1445-1530	Work Groups	Discussions on the theme of demonstrations in small groups	Bertha/ Monika/ Phil
1530-1600	Break		
1600-1630	Discussion	How to define demonstrations and make them a powerful tool in meeting the LA and SWITCH aspirations? How to manage and document change? How to deal with the unexpected in action research?	Bertha
1630-1700	<b>Reflection on day 1</b>	Summarising lessons learned and challenges faced: Feedback on day 1.	John/Ewen
evening	Side meeting	Discussions on a statement by SWITCH cities at Expo2008 Zaragoza	Carol/ Francesca

### Wednesday 12 December – Part 1 (continued): Learning and Sharing between Learning Alliances

Timing/ Duration	Activity	Objective/ Details	Responsible
<b>Learning and sharing #4: Learning from other projects</b>			
0900-0930	Film	Film about Ethiopia and the RiPPLE project. Questions and answers.	Tamene
0930-1000	Presentation	<i>Learning and Practice Alliances within the RiPPLE project</i> followed by discussion	Tamene
1000-1015	Case study	Integration across research issues and between research and demonstrations	Bertha/ Monika/ Phil
1015-1045	Workgroup	Discussions on the theme of integration in small groups	Bertha/ Monika/ Phil
1045-1100	Discussion	How to make the science work for you and what is appropriate for your environment	Bertha/ Monika/ Phil
1100-1115	Break		
<b>Learning and sharing #5: Working with Parallel Platforms</b>			
1115-1130	Presentation	Regional Climate Change Partnership	Phil
1130-1230	Workgroup	To identify which parallel partnerships would mutually add value to your objectives in your own cities and countries and how linked activities can be made to work	Phil/ Bertha/ Monika
1230-1300	Discussion	On theme of partnerships and linking to other platforms	Phil
1300-1400	Lunch		
<b>Learning and sharing #6: Stakeholder Analysis</b>			
1400-1415	Presentation	Knowing where to start and more importantly knowing where to stop	Monika
1415-1500	Workgroup	Reviewing key outcomes of the Stakeholder analysis in Accra using your own city experience and suggesting how we may go about improving and <i>using</i> the analysis	Monika/ Phil/ Bertha

1500-1530	Discussion	On the theme of stakeholder analysis	Monika
1530-1600	<b>Reflection on day 2</b>	Summarising lessons learned and challenges faced: Feedback on day 1	Joep/ Marieke
evening	Side meeting	Discussion on city plans and budgets	Carol

Thursday 13 December - Part 2: Monitoring and evaluation methods for stakeholder driven research processes

Timing/ Duration	Activity	Objective	Method	Responsible
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of previous day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To remember!</li> </ul>		Tbc
0900-0915 (15 mins)	Opening discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why M&amp;E?</li> <li>Traditional approaches and their limitations</li> <li>New approaches and their opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To put the session into context, to identify issues for which these M&amp;E approaches may provide opportunities, and to set the stage.</li> </ul>	Plenary discussion	Alastair
<b>M&amp;E Approach #1: Outcome Mapping</b>				
0915-0930 (15 mins)	Introduction to Outcome Mapping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where does this come from?</li> <li>What does it offer? What is different?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To introduce the Outcome Mapping approach, provide background, and discuss the gaps it may fill</li> </ul>	Presentation plus some interaction	Nadia
0930-1000 (30 mins)	Vision, Mission, and Boundary Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To introduce the Vision, Mission and Boundary Partner components of the approach</li> <li>To think about what the future should look like due to the project, what the project will do and the people/groups who it will work with</li> </ul>	Presentation	Nadia
1000-1020 (20 mins)	Boundary Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To allow participants to understand this key component through exploring their boundary partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity involving drawing an image of project/site and its boundary partners</li> <li>Discussion</li> </ul>	Ewen/ Nadia
1020-1040 (20 mins)	Outcome Challenges and Progress Markers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To introduce the Outcome Challenges and Progress Markers components of the approach</li> <li>To think about what changes in the Boundary partners we would like to see</li> </ul>	Presentation	Nadia

Timing/ Duration	Activity	Objective	Method	Responsible
1040-1100 (20 min)	Break			
1100-1120 (20 mins)	Trying out Outcome Challenges and Progress Markers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To have a chance to try out this component of the approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity: Progress Marker puzzle game</li> <li>Activity: In groups choose one Boundary Partner for SWITCH and develop OC and 1 PM for each level</li> </ul>	Ewen/ Nadia
1120-1140 (20 minutes)	Strategy Maps, Organisational Practices and Monitoring Journals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To Introduce the Strategy Maps, organizational practices and Monitoring Journals components</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation</li> </ul>	Nadia
<b>M&amp;E Approach #2: Most Significant Change</b>				
1140-1210 (30 mins)	Most Significant Change: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction to Most Significant Change</li> <li>MSC exercise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To introduce the Most Significant Change Approach</li> <li>To try out the approach</li> <li>To explore and discuss it use, benefits and challenges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation</li> <li>Activity: What has been Most Significant Change from being part of this session?</li> <li>Discussion</li> </ul>	Nadia Ewen
1210-1255 (45 mins)	Application of these approaches <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An example from Ghana</li> <li>(RUAF project)</li> <li>Discussion of operation, possible benefits and foreseen challenges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To see the application of these approaches</li> <li>To explore and discuss the actual use, benefits and challenges of these approaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of case study</li> <li>Discussion using World Café type approach- a different table for different questions/themes</li> </ul>	Nadia Funke Ewen
1255-1315 (20 mins)	Session closing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other approaches?</li> <li>Using parts and pieces of approaches</li> <li>Any final questions or comments?</li> <li>Where to find more information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To open up the session to other approaches and experiences</li> <li>To explore further how these and other approaches can be used</li> <li>To cover any final questions or issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plenary discussion and Q&amp;A</li> <li>Presentation of information sources</li> </ul>	Ewen/ Nadia



Timing/ Duration	Activity	Objective	Method	Responsible
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To present ways to access more information</li> </ul>		
1315-1430	Lunch			
<b>M&amp;E Approach #3: SWITCH Indicators and rating tables</b>				
1430-1500	Presentation of SWITCH briefing note #7 on M&E for learning alliances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To share a relatively simple and pragmatic approach to outcome level M&amp;E</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation and discussion</li> </ul>	John
1500-1630	Developing city objectives and indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop for each city a list of possible objectives and indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual/group work</li> <li>Presentation and discussion</li> </ul>	Joep/ Alastair
1630-1730	M&E across cities: Identification of set of common indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To agree on minimum common set of objectives and indicators across the cities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion</li> </ul>	Joep/ Alastair
1730-1745	Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To reflect on the day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	Tbc
evening	End of workshop dinner			

Friday 14 December – Part 2 continued: Monitoring and evaluation methods for stakeholder driven research processes

<b>M&amp;E Approach #3: SWITCH Indicators and rating tables (continued)</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of previous day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To remember!</li> </ul>		Tbc
0900-1030	M&E across cities: development of rating tables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop a set of rating tables for the (small) set of objectives and indicators across cities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>World café</li> <li>Discussion</li> </ul>	Joep/ Alastair
1030-1100	Break			
1100-1230	M&E within cities: development of rating tables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop (partially) a set of rating tables for the other city specific indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual/small group work on city basis</li> </ul>	Joep/ Alastair
1230-1300	Concluding discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of next steps, and roles and responsibilities for M&amp;E</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group discussion</li> </ul>	John/ Nadia
1300-1400	Lunch			
<b>Final session: Planning and next steps</b>				
1400-1530	SWITCH (also RiPPLE and TPP) learning alliance plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To share plans further and identify gaps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of key elements of plan by each city (using posters prepared at</li> </ul>	Carol







			venue) • Discussion	
1530-1600	Workshop reflection and evaluation			Joep
1600	Check out of hotel in time to depart by 1630 for Accra			








Saturday 15 December









- Field visit in Accra (optional)









Appendix 3: List of participants and contact details









**Participants' list for the workshop on Learning Alliance Sharing – Villa Cisneros, Sogakope (Accra) 11-14 December 2007**







N°	First Name	Last Name	Organisation	Country of Residence	e-mail address	Telephone	Who is that?
1	Alistair	Sutherland	National Resources Institute	UK 	<a href="mailto:a.j.sutherland@gre.ac.uk">a.j.sutherland@gre.ac.uk</a>	+44 164 388 3884	
2	Anteneh	Mengiste	RiPPLE	Ethiopia 	<a href="mailto:Anteneh9@yahoo.com">Anteneh9@yahoo.com</a>	+251 915 743 632	
3	Aychew	Adane	RiPPLE	Ethiopia 	<a href="mailto:Aychew12@yahoo.com">Aychew12@yahoo.com</a>	+251 911 750 902	

4	Bertha	Darteh	SWITCH LA facilitator Accra (Department of Civil Engineering KNUST)	Ghana 	<a href="mailto:berthadarteh@yahoo.co.uk">berthadarteh@yahoo.co.uk</a>	+233 244 594 829	
5	Carol	Howe	UNESCO-IHE / SWITCH project director	NL 	<a href="mailto:c.howe@unesco-ihe.org">c.howe@unesco-ihe.org</a>		
6	David	Assan	KNUST	Ghana 		+233 244 418 285	
7	Esi	Awuahrt	KNUST	Ghana 	<a href="mailto:esiawuahrt@yahoo.com">esiawuahrt@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:awuahrt@yahoo.co.uk">awuahrt@yahoo.co.uk</a>	+233 516 0226	

8	Eugene	Larbi	TREND / TPP project	Ghana 	<a href="mailto:eugenelarbi@yahoo.com">eugenelarbi@yahoo.com</a>	+233 243 728 832	
9	Ewen	Le Borgne	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:leborgne@irc.nl">leborgne@irc.nl</a>	+31 152 192 955	
10	Florence	Agyei	EPA	Ghana 	<a href="mailto:fagyei@yahoo.co.uk">fagyei@yahoo.co.uk</a>	+233 244 630 652	
11	Francesca	Schraffl	ICLEI	Germany 	<a href="mailto:Francesca.schraffl@iclei.org">Francesca.schraffl@iclei.org</a>	+49 761 368 9238	

12	Jochen	Eckart	SWITCH LA facilitator Hamburg	Germany 	<a href="mailto:switch@tu-hamburg.de">switch@tu-hamburg.de</a> <a href="mailto:switch@hcu-hamburg.de">switch@hcu-hamburg.de</a>	+49 (0)40 428 782 657	
13	Joep	Verhagen	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:verhagen@irc.nl">verhagen@irc.nl</a>	+31 152 192 942	
14	John	Butterworth	IRC	Poland / NL 	<a href="mailto:butterworth@irc.nl">butterworth@irc.nl</a>	+48 426 371 109	
15	Lama	El-Hatow	CEDARE (SWITCH Alexandria LA facilitator)	Egypt 	<a href="mailto:lelhatow@cedare.int">lelhatow@cedare.int</a>		

16	Marieke	Adank	IRC	NL 	<a href="mailto:adank@irc.nl">adank@irc.nl</a>	+31 15 219 29 59	
17	Monika	Dziegielewska Geitz	SWITCH LA facilitator Lodz	Poland 	<a href="mailto:empower_consulting@yahoo.de">empower_consulting@yahoo.de</a>	+48 660 392 171	
18	Nadia	Manning	IWMI	Ethiopia 	<a href="mailto:n.manning@cgiar.org">n.manning@cgiar.org</a>	+251 (0)11 646 3215	
19	Philip	Sharp	SWITCH LA facilitator Birmingham	UK 	<a href="mailto:Philip.Sharp@arup.com">Philip.Sharp@arup.com</a>	+44 121 213 3000	

20	Pilar	Egea	SWITCH LA Zaragoza Facilitator	Spain 	<a href="mailto:Pilar.egea@unizar.es">Pilar.egea@unizar.es</a>	+34 976 761 809	
21	Sonia	Knauer	SWITCH LA Belo Horizonte facilitator	Brazil 	<a href="mailto:soniaknauer@yahoo.com.br">soniaknauer@yahoo.com.br</a> <a href="mailto:knauer@pbh.gov.br">knauer@pbh.gov.br</a>	+55 31 3277 5185	
22	Tamene	Chaka	RIPPLE	Ethiopia 	<a href="mailto:blesstamene@yahoo.com">blesstamene@yahoo.com</a>	+251 916 823 228	



## Appendix 4: Warm-up exercise on monitoring and evaluation

### Q1 Experience with M&E

- Lots of experience of traditional M&E as external consultant
- Never actually happens
- Underbudgeted, under resourced, undervalued
- Often done without prior baseline assessment at the beginning, nothing to measure parameters against - useless
- Lots of experience of traditional M&E as external consultant
- Project related for engineering - programme cost and performance
- Change, deal/consensus, evolution
- Monthly monitoring of personal lessons learnt during a traineeship
- M&E is one of the key roles and responsibilities of the LPA
- Only a formal step without real results
- Word is often used but only sometimes realised
- Often neglected
- Interesting

### Q2. Expectations of M&E for LAs

- To see how we are doing against our objectives
- Ability to set TORs with lots of stakeholders
- To be incorporated in the process and to be implemented
- Understanding across switch of expectations and progress
- Comparison with other sites
- Should be systematic and rigorous- so we can see if LAs work, costs and benefits
- Benchmarking for planning and budgeting
- Success measured, progress tracked, learning lessons/avoiding repetition of mistakes
- to take measures/corrections
- to draw lessons
- To help to manage the process
- monitoring of process
- Different methods
- Appreciate changes
- No M&E, =no activity, NoM&E=no report, No M&E=no funds, No fund=no project, No project=no We

### Q3. Motivation/incentives for M&E

- A structured place in a project, reporting/budgeting
- Staff time and budget clearing allocated
- to be taken seriously- establish a protocol or template report format for activities
- Guidelines and documentation
- Clear and useful guidelines
- Include research areas of participation as part of evaluation
- Learn to improve the process
- Reflection: insight of what went well, what did not, and how to improve
- Showing evidence of the usefulness of the LA process
- Will help us to guide the process
- Knowing the direction and progress of the project
- A tangible way to capture change/progress, extra evidence of success,
- Exchange of experience sharing visit, training, involve in research activities

### Q4. M&E in Dancing

- Both done in spare time
- Both usually not coordinated (esp white man)

- Spontaneous and free style, but most M&E should be like that
- Capturing moods and satisfaction, seeing things in motion, capturing life in the project seeing that the project is alive
- Steps, creativity

## Appendix 5: Links to resources on Outcome Mapping and MSC

Outcome Mapping	Outcome Mapping website: <a href="http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-26586-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html">http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-26586-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html</a> with link to many articles on Outcome Mapping: <a href="http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-62238-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html">http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-62238-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html</a>
	Outcome Mapping Brochure <a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2361">http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2361</a>
	Outcome Mapping: Building Learning and Reflection Into Development Programs, By Sarah Earl, Fred Carden, Terry Smutylo: <a href="http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9330-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html">http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9330-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html</a>
	Terry Smutylo, Outcome mapping: A method for tracking changes in behavior as outcome in development programs. ILAC Briefs, Issue 7.: <a href="http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/index.php?section=18&amp;subsection=52">http://www.cgiar-ilac.org/index.php?section=18&amp;subsection=52</a>
Most Significant Change	Rick Davies and Jess Dart, 2005, The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique: A Guide to Its Use. <a href="http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf">http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf</a>
	"A Dialogical, Story-Based Evaluation Tool: The Most Significant Change Technique", Dart and Davies, <i>American Journal of Evaluation</i> , 2003; 24: pages 137-155
	"The most significant lessons about the Most Significant Change technique", Juliet Willetts and Paul Crawford, <i>Development in Practice</i> , June 2007, Vol. 17, Issue 3, pages 367-379
	"An Evolutionary Approach to Organisational Learning: An Experiment by an NGO in Bangladesh", <i>Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal</i> , September 1998 Vol. 16, No. 3. Pages 243-250. Also in Published in "Development as Process: Concepts and Methods for Working with Complexity" Edited by David Mosse, John Farrington and Alan Rew, Routledge and ODI.
	Most Significant Change approach 1) Summary document <a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2364">http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2364</a> 2) Steps to using MSC <a href="http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2363">http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/page/2363</a>

## Appendix 6: Most Significant change stories from the participants

- Hearing about RiPPLE and learning about how the LA approach has been applied there;
- Focus not only on the final goal but processes also are very important;
- Seeing the different approaches each city takes with respect to its LA and just how different each of them are
- How the demonstration really needs to capitalize on both the research innovations and their modifications in the process to provide for flexibility and improvement
- Realising to this extent that we need to address the political side of LA projects (and process documentation) in a much more serious and systematic way;
- The forum is helpful to exchange different experiences and methodologies as sharing is important and means to scale up
- To be realistic. I learned that we should be realistic what we can reach with the LA approach. LA is not the answer of every objective we want to reach in the project. Also some objectives do not fit together (scaling up and solving wicked problems do not fit together). LA is a good approach if we recheck our objectives and are more precise what we want to reach. We should have visions.... But let us be realistic. The several tools: stakeholder analysis, communication, outcome mapping could help us;
- Realisation of the potential to integrate research WPs at city level, after group discussions, not just about delivering deliverables.
- Design of research to include impacts
- MSC journals, writing impact stories, case studies
- Demonstration sites
- Having Carol with us and also a senior researcher (Esi) because we haven't convinced some of the key members of our consortium yet about LAs (especially MT and researchers who hold the budgets). I think with help of Carol, Esi and others we can try and involve researchers and MT more. So they understand all this is useful, exciting, innovative (not hopelessly vague) and more willing to put further resources in (more money but also their own time!).
- Deeper learning and sharing resulting from more advanced experiences of the participants and more openness to change
- Learning about revolutionary M&E methods.
- Awareness that in case of some cities more support is needed in terms of city website development not only about technology but a lot about content (what to put and what not?)
- Developing case studies needs especially still and the most powerful tool to impress/reporting;
- Boundary partners identification includes some parallel. Platform groups (formal and informal) criteria expanding acceptance of SWITCH;
- The importance of considering urban water supply and sanitation to be part of RiPPLE. Demonstration is important in some of our approach;
- Why SWITCH are interested in LA → to connect research with real research. Where is going the university research?
- Stakeholder analysis: not really highlighted in TPP; will include a rapid participants' stakeholder analysis in TPP implementation.
- Having different projects together. The 2 days gave me another insight in the similarities and differences in the projects that are represented and made me realize (more) how valuable sharing of experiences in between project.

## Appendix 7: End Evaluation

### Lessons learnt:

#### M&E capacity

- A clear idea how to monitor the LA

#### M&E principles:

- What are the LAs for? Do we know?
- Clear strategies!
- Different approaches and methodologies towards the process – most efficient approach for the specific city
- Realized that thinking about monitoring can be very useful for planning
- M&E have given me a very good lesson to begin develop with ripple team working group
- Identification of objectives and development of indicators, adapted to local context
- Need to find / have a purpose for carrying out activities or producing outputs => link to big picture
- Necessary to accept different formats of LA according to different places, conditions and needs

#### M&E tools and methods

- Outcome mapping! Nice
- Great. Outcome mapping!
- Outcome mapping (planning / M&E)
- Outcome mapping nice approach planning structuring, management and monitor a project
- Outcome mapping
- Outcome mapping
- Outcome mapping
- Stakeholder analysis. Presentation made me to finish my crude ones
- Seeing is believing (stakeholder analysis)
- Stories are powerful . Like Raymond the duck – we remember
- Monitoring significant changes
- Indicators for qualitative objectives -> micro-scenarios and scores
- Micro scenarios
- Progress monitoring
- Case stories are the best for impressions and influencing people
- Most significant change: Easy peasy!
- The end of the doubt – stakeholder mapping
- Interesting innovative M&E methods
- New ways / means to connect for learning and sharing
- Learned about monitoring tools like, outcome mapping, MSC, micro scenarios

#### Internal process:

- We are getting closer together as LA does
- No trainer / trainees soon
- Learning from other projects like TPP and RiPPLE
- Understanding of each other city activities
- Working more closely with LA members
- Learning from partnerships or past projects (learning from past lessons to build upon future)
- Need for integration
- Sharing among LAs very effective
- Sharing is important
- Making LA members understand LA process

#### Externals

- Difficulties!!!
- Researchers are (human) part of the stakeholders
- Need to eliminate researcher / LA distinction
- Identify and work with boundary partners
- Sharing between projects using LA approach is very useful
- How different each of these cities are
- The real challenge is outside this room, esp. other consortium members
- The RiPPLE project and video
- RiPPLe has cool dissemination materials
- Need to identify means for communication according to target group
- Whose water
- RiPPLE
- SWITCH – RiPPLE and learn from each other

#### New ideas

- Ideas for interesting events and communication with LA (ideas for newsletter, conference, contacts)
- Demonstration sizes
- The demos are very crucial in LA process
- It is very good to undertake in RiPPLE too
- White man cannot dance!!
- A little bit about African dance and singing
- “coconut” energizer

#### What was considered good in the organization of the training workshop

##### Participants

- Diversity of participants (different cities, countries, cultures, etc)

##### Venue and activities outside workshop

- Location + ambiance
- The place, Ghana!
- The selected site
- Site
- Site selection
- Training site
- Good entertainment
- Entertainment
- Entertainment
- Fieldtrip was very interesting

##### Programme and facilitations

- Timing is very good
- Group work change to participate
- LA facilitators – facilitating workshop
- Good dynamic sessions
- Posters and cards
- I liked the balance of activities the pace, the agenda
- The sharing, using concrete case stories
- Roles were well spread
- Nice facilitations, different tools
- Balance input and discussion

##### Organization and invitation

- Organization :-)
- Overall organization – sharing was good

- Invitation
- Providing information
- Organization – invitations – information while we were at home

What could be improved in the organization of the training workshop

Variety of participants

- Diversity of participants
- Improve the variety of participants (more NGOs, government etc)
- Composition of participants / from LA
- More stakeholders to be involved
- More engagement of researchers, MT, our director, city coordinators!

Materials

- Basic materials of the agenda
- Distribution of print out
- Distribute discussion points to all
- Logistics - printer

Venue:

- Venue: better to be more in the city, with more to see and do
- Noise level

Programme and facilitation

- Day 3: Too long and too many presentations
- Be clear which parts of the training workshop are useful for all, and which for only SWITCH participants
- Pace
- Short breaks in the middle of the day – walks, short trips
- More change in working groups
- Presentation words not large enough
- Sharing experience more analytical + critical
- Methods which bring out the problems
- Have a real open space session
- Field trip



# Training Workshop Report

8 December 2008

Advancing learning alliances to increase research impact

Ouro Preto, Brazil

26-29 November 2008

Report written by IRC international Water and Sanitation Centre, Delft. The training workshop was organised by IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre ([www.irc.nl](http://www.irc.nl)) for the SWITCH project ([www.switchurbanwater.eu](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu)).

For comments or questions:

Stef Smits: [smits@irc.nl](mailto:smits@irc.nl) or John Butterworth: [butterworth@irc.nl](mailto:butterworth@irc.nl)



## Session 9. Summary

Title of training	Advancing learning alliances to increase research impact
Place	Ouro Preto, Brazil
Date	26-29 November 2008
Trainers	Stef Smits and John Butterworth
Resource persons	Marc Soutter, Barbara Anton and Alison Duffy also organised specific sessions
Main target audience:	Learning Alliance facilitators from the SWITCH project and city coordinators, researchers, and project managers: all members of the consortium interested in aspects of making learning alliance approaches work
Learning objective for main target audience:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) To advance and consolidate the establishment of learning alliances in SWITCH and other similar projects and programmes through sharing experiences and lessons learned.</li><li>2) To address some specific issues that we know are important (and perhaps problematic) through introduction of tools and experiences: i) social inclusion in learning alliance processes, and ii) high quality documentation of learning alliance processes and good communication, iii) joint planning based on visioning, scenario-based planning and use of models, and iv) engaging stakeholders in action research around demonstrations.</li></ol>
Number of participants	27
Gender balance	14 female participants; 13 male participants 3 male facilitators / resource persons; 2 female facilitators/ resource persons
Number of participating members of LA teams per city	Accra (2), Alexandria (1), Belo Horizonte (3), Birmingham (2), Bogotá (1) , Cali (2), Hamburg (2 for limited duration), Lodz (1), and Zaragoza (1 for limited duration) were represented.  Including LA facilitators from Accra, Belo Horizonte, Birmingham and Cali.  Including city coordinators from Accra, Alexandria, Cali, Hamburg (for limited duration) and Lodz.
Location of materials and further information	All information from the course is available at: <a href="http://www.switch.watsan.net/page/2953">http://www.switch.watsan.net/page/2953</a>

## Session 10. Background and objectives

The Sustainable Water Management Improves Tomorrows Cities Health (SWITCH) project is a research partnership funded by the EC undertaking innovation in the area of integrated urban water management (IUWM). In a range of cities, learning alliances (a form of multi-stakeholder platform) have been established by the project (see [www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances) for more information). Rather than solely focusing on new research, the project is supporting city learning alliances to put research into use across different aspects of the urban water cycle to help improve integration and scaling-up impacts.

Since 2006, teams in the cities have been working on the establishment of learning alliances, and to work with learning alliances around research and demonstration activities. In December 2007, SWITCH cities came together in Accra, Ghana to share their experiences in establishing learning alliances. Since then, further activities have been undertaken by the learning alliances, for example around vision-based planning for integrated urban water management. This workshop, almost one year later, aimed to build on the Accra workshop and to share experiences in advancing the city learning alliances since then. The specific objectives of training workshop were

- To advance and consolidate the establishment of learning alliances in through sharing experiences and lessons learned.
- To address specific issues that we know are important (and perhaps problematic) through introduction of tools and experiences on:
  1. social inclusion in learning alliance processes
  2. joint planning based on visioning, scenario-based planning and use of models in these
  3. engaging stakeholders in action research around demonstrations, and
  4. documentation of learning alliance processes and good communication

## Session 11. Participants and modality of the workshop

The training workshop brought together 27 participants (see Annex 1 for details). These included a mix of learning alliance facilitators and city coordinators, but also researchers involved in research in the cities, as well as staff from SWITCH management. This allowed us to address the above objectives from both the facilitation, as well as from the research side. The following SWITCH cities sent representatives: Accra, Alexandria, Belo Horizonte, Birmingham, Bogotá, Cali, Hamburg, Lodz, and Zaragoza. Beijing/Chongqing and Lima sent apologies, the former because of visa problems.

Given the location of the workshop in Latin America, we had a particular strong participation from the Spanish and Portuguese-speaking SWITCH cities (Belo Horizonte, Cali and Zaragoza). Therefore, part of the discussions and group work was carried out in Spanish/Portuguese. Also, various cases from the region were presented so as to particularly address issues relevant to the Latin American region.

The workshop combined presentations from the cities with experiences with the learning alliances, training presentations on the specific topics mentioned above, group discussions and a role play. During the event, participants worked towards a plan for strengthening the learning alliance processes in their respective cities. The final agenda of the workshop can be found in Annex 2.

Training course material has been made available to participants, and will be put on the SWITCH intranet at [www.switch.watsan.net/page/2953](http://www.switch.watsan.net/page/2953)

## Session 12. Proceedings of the workshop

### 12.1. Identifying lessons learnt on achieving a successful learning alliance

The heart of the workshop was presentation and subsequent analysis of learning alliance progress to date. In order to facilitate this analysis, a framework was introduced, which looked into the 4 major expected impacts of learning alliances:

- linking different types of stakeholders
- getting research into use
- facilitating learning by doing around demonstration projects
- getting research into planning and policies

Progress with the learning alliances in each of the participating cities was presented. In group discussions, key lessons learnt on each of the 4 points above were identified, both in terms of what has been achieved to date, as well as on how the learning alliances go about getting the achievements. These included:

#### Linking stakeholders

There has been progress in linking stakeholders and bringing these into the learning alliances. However, some of these platforms are so far communities of practice, mainly with peers from city level institutions. That may itself is not a problem at the outset. However, over time, efforts should go into bringing more diversity, particularly bringing in civil society organisations, neighbourhood groups, but also the political level. At the same time, that may require specific measures and must be done carefully. Cities are also seen to follow relevant opportunities, such as engaging with developers in Lodz. One of the identified impacts of linking of stakeholders is the mobilization of additional funds, which has been pursued with different degrees of success. A question that remains to be answered is whether and how these platforms can be sustained after SWITCH, and whether that is actually required. If stakeholders see benefits, that will probably start to happen.

Establishing learning alliances doesn't mean that all members need to be involved all the time around everything. Various cities have gone the route of developing stakeholder working groups around specific issues, so discussions and learning are more focused. At the same time, it emerges that it is important to get high level political endorsement. This requires a high level of visibility, an activity undertaken in most cities.

#### Research into use

The discussion evolved around the issue of to what extent research can be expected to be put into use by practitioners and policy makers in the cities. It was felt that it should be possible to have achieved a high degree of awareness on IUWM among these stakeholders, and that research would be reflected in city policies. Implementation of IUWM may have also started, but only at small scale at the end of the project. But, an adequate base for scaling up would be found.

Finally, a comment was made that integration of researchers themselves into the process can be improved. Particularly, integration between technological and social and institutional researchers needs to be strengthened.

#### Learning by doing around demonstrations

As demonstrations projects (demos) are still under development, it is felt early to evaluate their impact. But various lessons learnt on how to do them were identified. First of all, the involvement of municipalities is crucial. But, to achieve full impact, training around these demos for municipal staff is important. Training needs for these need to be identified. At the same time, it is acknowledged that not all demos are relevant to all LA members. The method of working groups

(see above) may help getting smaller interested groups going around the demos. Demos are also seen to be very context-specific. That may limit their possibility to be transferred across borders to other cities.

### Getting research into planning and policies

One of the strongest parts of the learning alliance processes so far in the cities has been their involvement in the development of strategic water plans. This is therefore an element that needs to be built upon and strengthened. A very specific expectation of what can be achieved at the end of the project in this field was formulated. It was felt that by the end of the project, learning alliances would have been able to put forward an IUWM vision that is publicly accepted and embraced and that IUWM concepts, guidelines and indicators are included strategic city planning. Secondly, it can be expected that learning alliances will also have achieved a better integration across relevant stakeholder in strategic planning, i.e. more relevant stakeholders are involved in these planning activities.

Various lessons learned, as well as needs, were identified to achieve impact on city plans and policies. First of all, it is crucial to reach out to high level decision-makers and politicians. Because they are often busy, it is not always possible to continuously involve them in the learning alliances, but they need to be briefed by middle-level staff that do have the time and capacity to be involved. For example, there is need for regular reporting back. Secondly, it is important that SWITCH builds upon existing plans and policies, and bring these together for review, so that they can be contrasted and analysed, within the “safe” space of the learning alliance, where there is a neutral facilitator. So far, most of the focus of the LAs has been at city level. Now, various needs to engage national policy makers have been identified, particularly in those countries with more centralised decision-making systems. In order to give follow-up to the strategic planning exercise that have been started, it is important to have access to decision-support tools, particularly to share a common database. It was mentioned in various cities that access to data remains limited despite the learning alliance efforts. A common database might overcome some of these limitations.

## 12.2. Addressing social inclusion

The topic of social inclusion was introduced through a role play with experiences from one of the SWITCH cities on cleaner production in tanneries in Bogotá. This was followed by a more conceptual introduction to social inclusion, and the presentation of results from case studies done in various SWITCH cities.

In the discussion that followed various points were raised:

- Social inclusion can and needs to be addressed at two levels: around the demonstration projects, and within the learning alliances themselves. Although the issue is the same at both levels, the methods and mechanisms for engaging marginalised groups are different. For example, around demonstration projects, participatory methods can be developed to particularly target socially excluded groups. But bringing these to learning alliance fora may be difficult and requires specific measures.
- Power and social exclusion are real issues that researchers and facilitators need to engage with. Negotiation tools, such as the one developed around Bogotá, are important in this respect.
- Participatory methods and mechanisms for community participation in urban areas are different from such approaches in rural areas. Many institutions do not necessarily have urban-focused skills in this issue. Additional training and research on such methods in urban areas is required.
- Addressing social inclusion in learning alliances brings in a higher degree of complexity and conflict. Dealing with that, requires additional skills and resources from the facilitator. It is recommended to bring this in in a step-wise manner, so that these skills can be built, and so that these issues can be addressed in a careful manner.
- A suggestion arose to look into diversity within the SWITCH consortium itself.

On the basis of this discussion, cities identified ways to strengthen social inclusion for as far relevant in their given context. These come back in the results of the session on the way forward (see below).

### 12.3. Linking learning alliances to strategic planning

As mentioned above, the strategic planning exercises which have started in most cities have given an impetus to the learning alliances, as this is a very concrete task around which members actually learn. Likewise, the fact that these were done with the learning alliances, have given the strategic planning a stronger base among city stakeholders. However, these planning exercise are not finished yet, and follow-up needs to be planned. In this, a particular role can be played by decision-support tools. Therefore City Water, the tool being developed in SWITCH was introduced, and a practical session with one of its modules, was held. At the same time, it is important to understand how current planning procedures are organised, and how different city institutions go about planning. Ultimately, approaches and methods for planning developed by SWITCH need to fit into this reality. To that effect, an analysis of current planning mechanisms in three Latin American cities (Belo Horizonte, Cali and Lima) was presented.

On the basis of the various inputs made for this session, discussions were held, and cities looked into ways of strengthening the link between learning alliances and strategic planning, and particularly the role of tools like City Water in this. The following emerged:

- The way strategic planning has been conceptualised and started is considered useful by learning alliance members, and needs to be given follow-up, particularly in the elaboration of detailed plans and identification of specific interventions. Crucial in that will be identifying responsibilities among learning alliance members. But, cities need more support in this. For example, there is need for Briefing Notes on types of technical interventions that can be considered in addressing IUWM. Such information should even be considered as part of the information base of City Water.
- There is an expressed demand from city facilitators for the City Water tool. It is always difficult to know what the specific demand is, until you know what the tool can do. But, at first sight the main interest is on the City Water Information System (CWIS). During the workshop, a lack of access to data was identified as a limitation, and it is expected that CWIS can at least strengthen a common information system across stakeholders. A specific question was raised whether the CWIS can also contain legal and institutional information from the city.
- Demand for the modelling tools within City Water is less clear. Many learning alliance members have their own (advanced) tools and researchers in the cities have been using models as well. Knowing whether the City Water Models (CWM) can provide additional insights to these models, requires first knowing the capabilities of CWM in more detail. A specific suggestion was made to include a simple and flexible modelling tool like Bayesian Networks as tool in CWM, as this is a way of dealing explicitly with uncertainty, which may be useful for long-term strategic planning. It could compliment the deterministic models being developed.
- In order to move forward, it is important to bring demand from the learning alliances in line with supply, i.e. what City Water can provide. It was suggested that the learning alliance facilitators provide a list of typical questions that their learning alliance members would like to see answered. Also, one may revise the strategies from the cities, and see whether City Water can make inputs into these. The City Water team can then look into the capability of the model to respond to these questions. At the same time, the request was made whether the City Water team can provide an (on-line) training course on City Water to facilitators and researchers from the cities, so that these have a better understanding of what the tool can (and cannot) do.
- Finally, a discussion was held on who should be working with City Water in the future: the learning alliance facilitator, learning alliance members, or experts. This discussion was not concluded, but most felt that a small team within the learning alliance should be able to work with this, and shouldn't depend on one person only.

## 12.4. Action research: linking demonstrations and learning alliances

A second way through which learning alliance members can get involved in research is through the demonstrations and the action research activities around them. Some have already started doing this. In order to strengthen this aspect of SWITCH, a presentation was given with key principles of action research, and in particular ways to link action research to demonstration projects and how to involve learning alliance members. On the basis of that city groups developed ways of strengthening this aspect of their work (see further details under way forward below).

## 12.5. Communication, training and learning

The city presentations revealed that most cities had been very active in communicating about SWITCH to the learning alliance members and broader stakeholder groups. This activity is therefore going fine in general. One aspect identified as an area for strengthening was learning and communication on-line. Particular discussions were held on the use of city websites, and on-line training courses.

It was found that most cities have developed their own city specific websites. In general these look attractive and provide a lot of information. Where relevant, information is mostly available in English and the local language. But questions were raised about their use by learning alliance members and their interactivity. In general it was felt that the primary audience of these sites are the learning alliance members themselves. Of course, others can also access the site, but focus should be on learning alliance members. Hence the importance of availability of material in the local language primarily. This also means that it is not much of a problem if the sites are not really interactive. As long as these are strong repositories of information and documentation, learning alliance members can access the information. Most learning alliance members have other means of communicating with the city teams anyway. This doesn't preclude the fact that one may add a Q&A function or so, but that wouldn't be the main focus of the site. Finally, some technical limitations of the current set-up were highlighted, like the fact that WordPress is not everywhere permitted to be used (because of firewall restrictions in some places), and the generally slow internet connections in a number of countries which still limit interaction via websites.

Earlier this year, a first test was made with on-line training, in this case on stormwater management. Although some good results were obtained with this form of e-learning, the evaluation by the team that ran the course wasn't entirely positive. Based on this evaluation, we discussed ways of strengthening such on-line courses, and particularly how to make it more attractive for learning alliance members. Various points for improvement were raised:

- One needs to provide specialised courses, not broad topics. Many learning alliance members are professionals with little time. So they seek specialisation, rather than broad introductions.
- Certification and accreditation of the course are important in order to attract a wider number of participants as well.
- The content and form needs to be internationalised if this is to be taken forward through SWITCH. This doesn't only mean bringing in cases from other countries, but also considering offering the course in other languages. Other SWITCH partners may need to be brought into that for that purpose as well. For students from countries where access to internet connections is a limitation, one can think of putting the course on CD.
- It is easy now for students to drop out or remain inactive. The facilitator would need to instigate discussion and promote active participation.
- Finally, it would be good to ask a financial contribution or registration fee from students, to ensure the participants are serious and finalise their course, and not taking up spaces which they then don't use.

## 12.6. Process documentation

Process documentation is one of the activities that has lagged behind in SWITCH. Although most facilitators did collect a lot of process documentation material and kept registers of what happened, that was not analysed or documented in a structured way up to July 2008. Only through the city assessments carried out between August and October were we able to produce process documentation papers. These proved to be very useful, both as reflection on the process so far for the facilitators and researchers in the city, as well as to show progress to an outside audience including the EC. A discussion was held to analyse what some limitations had been in the past, and what was considered useful to do in the future. The following emerged.

- First of all, it was felt that the city assessments were a very useful exercise that would merit to be repeated. It helped to bring the data collected for process documentation together and thus provide a reflection on the process. By bringing in “outsiders”, it was possible to get a more neutral and outside view on the process, something which is difficult to do when you are too involved yourself. The participants recommend that this activity is repeated, e.g. once or twice a year.
- However, process documentation needs to be defined as a specific task and deliverable, with clear responsibilities. In the past it was not always clear what was expected. By having a clear definition of the task, there is also time and resources available for this work.
- At the same time, it is recognised that it was a huge task, requiring lots of resources. Maybe in a next round, it can be done in a simpler way, also considering that now a broader pool of people has obtained experience in process documentation. The specific modality of doing this needs to be defined.

The work package leader was asked to further elaborate this task in next year’s description of work, including a clear time frame, responsibilities, and definition of the task.

## 12.7. Way forward

During the workshop, cities identified ways of strengthening learning alliance processes. This was done around the different areas mentioned above, but also learning from practical activities developed in other cities. Cities were therefore asked to bring these together in a short plan for strengthening their LAs, and present these for feed-back from their peers. The summary sheets of their work can be found in Annex 4. They will feed into the next round of planning which needs to be completed by 20 Jan. This will be done through the city storylines, and these plans will then run from February up to the end of the project. Cities are asked to be very specific for their activities, as there may be a need to move money around to those cities and activities where most impact can be achieved.

Out of the city plans, a number of issues emerged to be addressed at global level across cities.

- **Recommendations from city assessments.** All city assessments contained a number of city-specific recommendations. These need to be fed back to the learning alliance members, and then need to be addressed in the following round of planning (see above).
- **Final products.** A number of final products were defined. These included the following:
  - o Book with LA experiences from the cities. This would then contain both papers from each of the cities, as well as a generic analysis and a theoretical background. The city assessment papers, or the next version of them, can serve as basis.
  - o Guidelines or training package. This would build upon the Briefing Notes, bundle them and turn them into a guideline document.
- **Training.** Participants felt that from now on, no additional training would be needed. Rather, there would be an added value in organising another learning and sharing event, like the one held here. However, there may be need on specific technical issues of relevance to learning alliances, such as the online City Water training. These are expected to be addressed in other work packages.

- **Global learning alliance.** This idea builds upon the previous point. The idea arose to organise a global forum on learning alliance experiences, where the current group would come together, alongside a selected number of learning alliance members from the different cities. This would then link into the book mentioned above. E.g. it would be a forum where papers are presented that will later go into the book. The suggestion is to hold it early 2010, so as to have adequate time to process the results from such a forum
- **5<sup>th</sup> World Water Forum.** Although SWITCH is involved in a session on learning alliances, it is felt late to get involved in the political process of the WWF5. If mayors or other politicians from SWITCH cities attend the WWF5, it would be good to invite them to the session. But it would now be too opportunistic to quickly prepare something for that event.



## Session 13.      Annex 1: list of participants

Name	Country	Organization
Sônia Knauer	Brazil	PBH
Silmara Mechado	Brazil	PBH
Rosilene Nunes Santos	Brazil	University of São Paulo
Daniel Toledo	Brazil	PBH
Diana Paola Bernal	Colombia	Univalle
Alberto Galvis	Colombia	Univalle
Monica Sáenz	Colombia	UNAL
Khaled AbuZeid	Egypt	CEDARE
Barbara Anton	Germany	ICLEI
Heike Langenbach	Germany	Hafen City University
Ralph Philip	Germany	ICLEI
Wilhelm Schulte	Germany	City of Hamburg
Esi Awuah	Ghana	KNUST
Kohbira Awuah	Ghana	Cornell University
Bertha Darteh	Ghana	KNUST
Elina Mayoli	Greece	NTUA
John Butterworth	Netherlands	IRC
Carol Howe	Netherlands	UNESCO-IHE
Solomon Seyoum	Netherlands	UNESCO-IHE
Stef Smits	Netherlands	IRC
Iwona Wagner	Poland	UL
Alison Duffy	Scotland	UAD
Javier Celma	Spain	Ayuntamiento de Zaragoza
Marc Soutter	Switzerland	EPFL
Rae Mackay	UK	Uni Birmingham
Jennifer Chlebek	UK	ARUP
Colin Green	UK	FHRC

## Session 14. Annex 2: Final agenda of the training workshop

Wednesday 26 November	
1330-1430	<p>Session 1: Introduction</p> <p>Introduction of participants, logistics, objectives of training workshop, expectations (Stef Smits)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Successful learning alliances for research and impact</i> (John Butterworth)</li> </ul>
	Session 2: Sharing experiences with learning alliance methodologies
1430-1700	<p>Session 2a: Sharing of learning alliance experiences from SWITCH cities in Latin America including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Learning Alliances for Integrated Water Management in the city of Cali, Colombia</i> (Diana Paola Bernal)</li> <li>• <i>Learning alliances in Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Water is everybody's business</i> (Sonia Knauer)</li> </ul>

Thursday 27 November	
0900-1230	<p>Session 2b: Sharing of learning alliance experiences from other SWITCH cities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Influencing urban water management through learning alliances: a mid-term reflection on an experiment in Łódź, Poland</i> (Iwona Wagner)</li> <li>• <i>A mid-term review of switch in Birmingham, its learning alliance and engaging research to address the challenges of integrated water management</i> (Jennifer Chlebek)</li> <li>• <i>Bringing a fragmented sector together: Documentation of the Learning Alliance Process in Accra, Ghana</i> (Bertha Darteh)</li> <li>• <i>Summary of findings from the city assessments</i> (John Butterworth)</li> <li>• Discussion</li> </ul>
1400-1730	<p>Session 3: Reaching the poor and their representatives within learning alliance processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Exercise on power and negotiations between stakeholders: engaging Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs) to address pollution in Bogotá, Colombia</i> (Monica Sáenz)</li> <li>• <i>An introduction to social inclusion</i> (John Butterworth)</li> <li>• <i>Social inclusion in learning alliances</i> (Stef Smits)</li> <li>• Addressing social inclusion in your own city and learning alliance process</li> </ul>

Friday 28 November	
0845-1230	<p>Session 4: Influencing decision support and planning in SWITCH cities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Review of visioning and scenario-based planning by SWITCH learning alliances</i> (John Butterworth)</li> <li>• <i>An overview of the City Water model</i> (Marc Soutter)</li> <li>• <i>Practical session: using the City Water economics module</i> (Elina Mayoli)</li> <li>• <i>A reality check from three Latin American cities: why understanding governance is important for joint planning?</i> (Stef Smits)</li> </ul>

	Smits) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion: use of the City Water tool for joint planning by learning alliances</li> </ul>
1400-1500	Session 5: Linking demonstrations and learning alliances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>An introduction to principles of action research</i> (Stef Smits)</li> <li>• Discussion</li> </ul>
1500-1730	Session 6: Innovative communication, training and learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a) City websites to communicate with learning alliance members</i> (Barbara Anton and Ralph Philip)</li> <li>• <i>b) Experiences with E-training: a review of the SWITCH stormwater online course</i> (Alison Duffy and Barbara Anton)</li> </ul>

Saturday 29 November	
0900-1000	Session 7: Documenting change and impacts for learning (process documentation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An introduction to process documentation and progress in SWITCH to date (John Butterworth)</li> <li>• Discussion: Improving SWITCH process documentation</li> </ul>
1030-1230	Session 8: Concluding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group work: strengthening learning alliances processes for uptake of research (Stef Smits)</li> <li>• SWITCH learning alliances planning: introduction of process (Carol Howe)</li> <li>• Next steps and evaluation (Stef Smits)</li> </ul>

## Session 15. Annex 3: Final announcement

### SWITCH Training workshop: 'Advancing Learning Alliances to increase research impact'

*26-29 November 2008 in Belo Horizonte, Brazil*

#### Final announcement

#### Background

The Sustainable Water Management Improves Tomorrows Cities Health (SWITCH) project is a research partnership funded by the EC undertaking innovation in the area of *integrated urban water management (IUWM)*. In a range of cities<sup>12</sup>, learning alliances (a form of multi-stakeholder platform) have been established by the project (see [www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances) for more information). Rather than solely focusing on new research, the project is supporting city learning alliances to put *research into use* across different aspects of the urban water cycle to help improve integration and *scaling-up* impacts.

In December 2007, SWITCH cities came together in Accra, Ghana to share their experiences in establishing learning alliances. This workshop, almost one year later, aims to build on the Accra workshop and to share experiences in advancing the city learning alliances since then. Given the location of the workshop in Latin America, particular attention will be given to the experiences in Spanish and Portuguese-speaking SWITCH cities (Belo Horizonte, Lima, Zaragoza and Cali), and by having some workgroups in Spanish. Other experts and practitioners from the Latin American region involved in multi-stakeholder processes and improving water governance are also invited to contribute and participate.

#### Objectives of training workshop

The objectives of the training workshop on 'Learning Alliances' are:

- To advance and consolidate the establishment of learning alliances in SWITCH and other similar projects and programmes through sharing experiences and lessons learned.
- To address some specific issues that we know are important (and perhaps problematic) through introduction of tools and experiences: 1) social inclusion in learning alliance processes, and 2) high quality documentation of learning alliance processes and good communication, 3) joint planning based on visioning, scenario-based planning and use of models, and 4) engaging stakeholders in action research around demonstrations.

#### Who should attend?

The workshop is aimed at both SWITCH and external participants. SWITCH participants will include city learning alliance facilitators and other participants interested in aspects of making learning alliance approaches work, such as city coordinators, researchers, programme managers in the cities and members of the management team. Other participants involved in research and development projects and programmes that follow learning alliance or similar multi-stakeholder approaches from Latin America and elsewhere are also warmly invited. In total, there will be space for 25 participants.

---

<sup>12</sup> Accra, Alexandria, Beijing, Belo Horizonte, Birmingham, Cali, Chongqing, Hamburg, Lima, Lodz, Tel Aviv and Zaragoza.

## Summary of training programme and methodology

The first part of the workshop will focus on the experiences of the participants with the effectiveness of learning alliances and multi-stakeholder processes in research, both within SWITCH cities and in other projects and programmes. Most participants will have gained valuable experience in dealing with the day-to-day realities and challenges of bringing stakeholders together in one or more platforms, maintaining dialogues and initiating collaboration between these stakeholders. Participants will be invited to prepare presentations and other inputs. The second part of the workshop will focus more in-depth on some key and difficult aspects of learning alliance processes. Advanced methods and tools for social inclusion and documentation of learning processes will be introduced and discussed. The workshop will end with a session in which the participants will work on their own city Learning Alliance plan to include lessons learnt from the workshop.

## Workshop methodology

The IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre and SWITCH learning alliance facilitators will prepare the workshop programme and co-organise sessions. The workshop will combine short (expert) presentations from key resource persons combined with discussion, exercises and group work based upon the participants own experiences and other examples. These interactive sessions will be based on adult-learning principles. Participants will be asked to prepare specific inputs (presentations and other contributions) for the workshop. The lead facilitators will engage with participants about that. In addition, participants will be asked to co-facilitate certain aspects and group work, so they can practice and improve their own facilitation skills during the workshop.

The main language of the workshop will be English, but the workshop will be accessible to Spanish and Portuguese speakers and a multi-lingual facilitator will provide limited translation. Some parallel workgroup sessions will be held in Spanish/ Portuguese with participants from the Latin America region.

## Workshop arrangements

The workshop will be hosted in Ouro Preto in Minas Gerais which is close (about 1 hour drive) to Belo Horizonte, Brazil from Wednesday 26 to Saturday 29 November 2008. Participants should arrive in Belo Horizonte on Tuesday 25 November or before 1000 on Wednesday 26 November. Participants may wish to stay in Belo Horizonte for the annual SWITCH scientific conference to be held from 30 November to 4 December 2008.

The workshop venue, the hotel 'Estalagem das Minas Gerais', is located in a park and is 5 km outside Ouro Preto. The full contact details are: Estalagem das Minas Gerais, Rod. dos Inconfidentes Km 87 – Tripuí, Tel: +55.31.3551-2122, Fax: +55.31.3551-2709

Participants will need to cover their own travel and subsistence costs (accommodation/ meals) from their own SWITCH or other project budget. For SWITCH participants, an allocation of money specifically for these training events has been made within SWITCH city budgets and should be used for this purpose. Non-SWITCH participants will need to cover their own travel and subsistence costs.

All participants in the training course will need to pay a fee at the workshop in cash - we estimate about 200 euros - that covers airport transfers, venue costs, refreshments and lunches but NOT accommodation or other meals or costs. These costs will be shared equally across the participants. A receipt and copy invoice will be provided.

Participants will all stay in the same hotels and the booking and transfer arrangements will be made as soon as your travel details have been supplied (date, time and flight number of arrival and departure) following the procedures for registration for the event (see registration form). Participants are responsible for organising visas, and ensuring they make proper insurance and medical arrangements.

### Registration and further information

Participants should have already registered using the combined form for the learning alliance training workshop and the following week's SWITCH scientific meeting.

See [www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances](http://www.switchurbanwater.eu/learningalliances) for more details on the training workshop under capacity building. To register and for more information about the content of the programme, please contact John Butterworth ([butterworth@irc.nl](mailto:butterworth@irc.nl)).

## Session 16.      Annex 4: city plans

### Accra

- Improve coordination with other stakeholder platforms
- Work on demonstration (PURC) – meeting with stakeholders - social inclusion policies
- Development of city strategic plan (RIDA)
- Working groups
- City water training
- Policy makers forum
- Assistant for Bertha

### Alexandria

- Allocate money for full time facilitator for rest of project
- Formalize structure within the local authority as a Formal IUWM Advisory Committee
- Finalize approval of rest-of-project proposal on IUWM plan and demo activity/project
- Enhance communication with LA members
- Organize a global LA Conference to have larger involvement of LA members in meetings with other cities to learn from each other, either with:
  - High-level officials' sessions
  - Juniors' sessions
- Training of LA members on City Water
- Translate briefing notes, and website to Arabic
- Support to develop city-wide City Water application
- Support for City Water Training
- Financial Support for Translation to Arabic
- Financial support for LA facilitation for the rest of the project
- Faster response from management on proposed plans for demo and IUWM plan studies
- Support to focused studies to be able to compare feasibility of interventions for the IUWM plan

### Belo Horizonte

- Reinforce partnerships with institutional stakeholders (regular meetings, establishing clear roles)
- Reinforce UFMGs role in LA to increase neutrality
- Invest in documentation – critical analysis
- Invest in stronger relationship with local press to increase visibility and attract new institutional stakeholders
- Involve other departments of UFMG (architecture, urban planning, etc)
- Have a deeper training or assistance about the use of City Water tools
- Additional budget for information and advertising press material
- Improving quality of communications of the project, particularly with COMFORCAS

### Birmingham

#### LA meetings

- Reflections on institutional mapping (Dec/Jan)
- Scenario planning and strategy meeting
- City Water overview/introduction (Feb)

- Young SWITCH-liaise with Adam Bates about visit to demo (Dec/Jan)
- Virus transfer and hyporheic zone meeting (Late summer 2009)
- Profiling raising nationally, articles

#### Demonstrations

- Publishing of outputs in a journal/SUDS magazine (2009)
- Increasing roof numbers
- Expansion of knowledge into other SWITCH cities (website, SWITCHed on newsletter)

#### Research outputs

- Publishing of outputs in a journal (late 2009)
- Presentations to the LA on research activities (late summer, 0.5 days per project)
- Feedback from EA during the project presentations
- Strengthen links with LA
  - Liaising with researchers more
  - Attend research meetings

#### Process documentation

- Undertake it in 2009, more self reflection, extension of previous
- Some semi-external person to facilitate it (e.g. Alistair, Alison, plus facilitator or coordinator)
- Distribute final city review and get feedback (Dec 2008)
- Feedback to go into next document

#### City Water

- Initiation meeting (Feb 2009)
- Demonstration later in 2009
- Distribute PhD thesis
- And executive summary
- Upload to city website
- Presentations to the LA on research activities (late summer)

#### Training

- City Water events in Feb 2009
- May 2009 Phil or Jenny attends
- Young SWITCH visiting green roofs (liaise with Adam Bates)
- Find out what global training is on so we can budget appropriately

#### Membership of LA

- Encourage other organisations/members
  - Send those who don't attend information to encourage future attendance
  - Links with CIWEM
- Young SWITCH launch
- Clear meeting purposes and forward plan

#### Dissemination and website

- Updating of research information
- Encourage researchers to "own" bits of the website or send more information regularly
- Journal publications/articles/SWITCHed on (2009)
- Reflection from other groups we work on, e.g. Climate Change Forum, Expo, etc
- Newsletter for LA but need funding for time
  - Support from researchers required
- Need training as "extra time" and not part of 1 day per week

#### Calli

#### Social inclusion



- Identified key new groups for involved in LAs
- Strengthen groups with less participation
- Maintain participation and motivation of stakeholders
- Develop methodologies for involved other groups and work at city level

#### Use of decision support system

- To evaluate the possibility of training and use of City Water Model
- Online training of City Water
- Use of other models

#### Governance

- Get more relation among the governance and LAs
- To formulate a proposal of governance for Cali, it is necessary get the funds for develop this topic

#### Linking demonstration and LAs

- To start with demo activities proposed jointly with some stakeholders
- Concrete some ideas with some stakeholder for others demos

#### Innovative communication training and LAs

- Consider the suggestions for update the website
- Stimulate stakeholders for use of website
- Use of diffusion strategies for others groups

#### Process documentation

- Internal analysis of the documentation process and review criteria for good process documentation
- Involved stakeholders in process documentation
- Report each 6 months

#### Others

- Improve the following to visioning planning (scenarios)
- Define responsibilities among stakeholders in visioning planning
- Training for facilitator group
- Training for stakeholders (conflicts management and others)
- Workshop in AGUA 2009 about Paradigm Shift in IWRM
- Workshop in AGUA 2009 about Natural Methods in IWRM
- Academic research (thesis)
- Development of papers

#### Lodz

- Set up working groups within LA (e.g., bioenergy and WWTP, illegal discharges to rivers, up-scaling river restoration, stormwater, health etc.) – end 2008
  - BMPs modeling – link with the WP2.1., 2.2.
- Study on improving social inclusion in the river restoration project: report – end 2009
  - Budget for the external expert
- Identifying training needs of the LA
- Training: Executive Seminar on Strategic City Planning (ICLEI, Tel Aviv);
  - Talks with ICLEI
  - Link with Tel Aviv

- Short Strategy Document for Water Management (end of 2009);
  - Backstopping support from SWITCH for the next steps of the water strategy building.
  - Budget for experts, modelers/.models, data document writing
- City Water;
  - Working contact with Rae and Marc (others?)
  - Data – specify needs
  - Data – specify and find budget
  - Training on City Water for the LA
- Strengthen the activities on higher level in the City Office and nationally;
- Involvement of community to LA – housing associations? More?
  - student?
- Strengthening the links with other SWITCH cities
  - Budget for workshop, travel, .....?
- Writing a proposal for supporting the LA activities: Human resources EC funds
- Process documentation – film (end 2009), paper (when?);
  - Budget for film
  - Support for process documentation (?) – involve LA members
- Improve the website
  - Support – budget;
- Support for the LA process;
  - Continue funding for the LA facilitator
  - Funding for the LA facilitator support
- others
  - Finish the Stakeholder analysis;
  - Finish the model for the WWTP/bioenergy DSS
  - SWITCH vision in the Water Masterplan and Strategic Planning
  - City Plan – 20th of January!!!!
- Regular:
  - report about research to the LA and City Council