



**CITIES AS ARENAS OF POLITICAL INNOVATION
IN THE STRENGTHENING OF DELIBERATIVE AND
PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY**

STAKEHOLDERS' INCLUSION GUIDELINES

**An easy-to-use guide for stakeholder inclusion in
deliberative democracy initiatives**

DECEMBER 2021

EUARENAS investigates the ways in which social movements coupled with local government reform initiatives, manifesting themselves in local-level experiments, create momentum for political change that include more inclusive and participatory forms of governance.



For more information:

euarenas.eu

Grant Agreement	959420
Duration	January 2021 – June 2024 (42 months)
Coordinator	University of Eastern Finland
Contact	Professor James Scott (james.scott@uef.fi)

About the document:

Name:	D7.1 Stakeholder Inclusion Guidelines, v1.0
Authors:	Luna Kappler, Manfredi Valeriani, Christian Iaione Luiss Guido Carli
Collaborators:	PVM, UEF, CRN, UG, SWPS, REGGIO, EUTROPIA, MIAGDANSK, VORU, E35
Publication date:	December 2021



EUARENAS has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement N° 959420.

The document is dedicated to the development of a toolbox for inclusion of stakeholders during case study implementation carried out as part of Case Studies, Piloting and Foresight (WPs 3-5). The toolbox is continuously supplemented by the exchange of information and knowledge during fieldwork.

The contribution is a step-by-step guide that can be adopted by the Project as a source of evidence-based methods and tools to ensure active stakeholders' involvement in EUARENAS experimental initiatives and transferable in other deliberative processes.

The guide is supported by a dedicated podcast "EUARENAS Stakeholder Inclusion Guidelines Series" recorded at LUISS Language Café.



The EUARENAS podcast setting at LUISS Language Café, December 2021

Outline

- 03 Introduction
- 04 Stakeholders' mapping
- 05 The risk of exclusion
- 05 Levels of inclusion/decision-making
- 06 Good practices from the analysis of EUARENAS Case Studies & from Pilot Cities

- 07 Stakeholders' involvement
- 09 Useful techniques
- 17 References

Introduction

Experiences conducted within democratic initiative should be developed starting from characteristics that can also be used to group phases and tools needed to achieve them: diversity, engagement, inclusion, influence.

The geographical context, the scale of the processes, the level of experimentalism, and the type of the stakeholders involved should be analyzed within urban contexts to inform each step of the Pilot Project Cycle.

Stakeholders' inclusion is a precondition to successfully deliver any desired change, broadening its impact on society effective contribution to decision-making and community stewardship on urban commons.



Work Package 7 workshop at EUARENAS meeting in Helsinki, November 2021

Stakeholder mapping

The EUARENAS quintuple helix (social innovators, civil society organizations, schools and universities, businesses, public authorities) and frames (political, social, knowledge and economic frames) can be the starting point of the stakeholder mapping activity.

A comprehensive stakeholder map can follow the categories highlighted by the “Collective Awareness Platform for Sustainability and Social Innovation” (Arniani et al., 2014).

- Political frames include:
 - local policymakers, local governmental bodies, and officials
- Knowledge hubs include:
 - universities, research centers, academic researchers, independent researchers, graduate students, EU projects, any other research-related organization/professional, schools, teachers, educators

- Economic frames include:
 - ICT large companies, non-ICT large companies, ICT-SMEs, cooperatives and social entrepreneurs, consultant and self-employed workers, utilities
- Social frames include:
 - NGO, associations and charities, umbrella organizations, social innovation network/ organizations, common-based organizations and foundations, trade unions and parties, activist and social movements, P2P producers, bloggers or content producers, citizens at large, other civic society organization.
- Media discursive frames are transversal.

The identification of the variety of actors that make up the city and that should be considered to ensure both participation and deliberation effectiveness increase the credibility of the project and its acceptancy in the long-term.

To build social responsibility mapping should be a collective action conducted on field.



Basic Stakeholder mapping chart: quintuple helix and the EUARENAS frames. LUISS LabGov on WP1 Leader (SWPS) frames

Guidelines:

- a. Make a list of relevant disaggregated demographic criteria for each context
- b. Set clear and shared ethical guidelines compliant to GDPR and H2020 ESA
- c. Identify facilitators (and cultural mediators if relevant) that can support this mapping process – if it is the case build capacity to enable people to take this role
- d. Use “mixed-methods” combining various collection methods to gather data such as focus groups, interviews, door-to-door surveys, online questionnaires
- e. Plan to use a transparent feedback method to receive suggestions for further improvements
- f. Adapt the impact indicators to the relevant frames for the mapped stakeholders

The Risk of Exclusion

Wixey, Jones, Lucas, and Aldridge (2005) - based on a comprehensive review of the international accessibility literature - identified seven main types of accessibility-related causes of social exclusion:

- spatial: the location of where people live in relation to the places/services they need to access
- environmental: vulnerable people living in an area are exposed to greater risk
- temporal: people who do not have access to places they need to get to at desired times
- personal: people who do not have access to places because of personal impairment, lack of trust
- financial: people who are unable to access places because the cost to them of doing so is regarded as excessive
- infrastructural: people whose access and/or quality of life and participation is affected by infrastructure
- institutional: stakeholders whose interests are excluded from the ones of certain other groups.

The accessibility issue has perception-related

implications that affect the ability of stakeholders to spontaneously participate in participatory activities or contribute to decision-making processes. The implications are a rising sense of urban insecurity, lack of trust strengthened by reactions to the degradation of the urban environment to the conflict in the use of public spaces (Iaione, 2009). Part of cities become areas of marginalization and exclusion; social exclusion can be the result of deliberate discrimination, exploitation and/ or an attempt to protect privilege. Until a proper strategic vision of change starts questioning about the opportunities related to the enhancement of the specific context or neighborhood from both socio-economic and urban quality's perspectives, there may be little room for improvements.

A social exclusion analysis could be envisioned prior to the starting point of any deliberative democracy initiative as part of the preliminary discovery activity focused on who is being excluded, who is doing the excluding, and why. This study should lead to select specific techniques, for example from the ones presented in this guide, to avoid that exclusion would threaten the effectiveness of deliberative democracy processes arising the risk that the innovations adopted exacerbate existing gaps jeopardizing the socioeconomic stability of a city or local community.

Levels of Inclusion/ Decision-making

Deliberative democracy methods aim at engaging multiple stakeholders in the decision-making process. Different perspectives are represented by groups and/or individuals that need to socially interact, usually face-to-face in reasoned debates (Ozane, 2009).

This approach enriches the political scenario by moving from a situation where leaders decide alone to a strengthening of involvement: from inputs from key stakeholders to consensus building through discussions with subgroups; to voting systems that include all groups on a decision; to delegation of decision-making; to true consensus. In the last case, leaders fully delegate decision-making to a group.

Deliberative approaches expand traditional decision-making to include stakeholders as “makers and shapers” of policy (Cornwall and Gaventa 2000), recognizing their role as city-users and commons managers or owners.

In this scenario “stakeholders are equal participants who are actively involved in reflective and deep deliberation with few constraints placed on their exploration and dialogue” (Holmes and Scoones 2000 in Ozane, 2009). Constructing engagement starts from the identification of the current levels of inclusion and decision-making; the first as the varieties of voices whose perspectives are included in the debate, while the second as the capacity to influence decisions in terms of strategic aims, policies implementation, legal recognition within cities to gain empowering benefits (Shultz, 2007).

Guidelines:

- a. In each area/urban context in which a deliberative initiative begins, promoters/organizers should list exclusion causes related to previous projects and initiatives that interested the same area/urban context
- b. Map excluded stakeholders for each of the causes
- c. Evaluate whether exclusion occurs in all phases of the deliberative process

Good Practices from The Analysis of EUARENAS Case Studies & from The Case Studies

Good practices within EUARENAS have been mapped by the consortium during the third Project Workshop held in Helsinki in November 2021.

Participants answered to a live pool prepared and facilitated by the LUISS team aimed at collecting good practices from Case Studies and Pilot cities, and identifying mechanisms that EUARENAS researchers are using to include “hard-to-reach” populations.

The results are shown below:

1. Which good practices can you list from Case Studies or have been already applied by the cities that will be Pilots?

- Identification of specific facilitating figures: Civil servants - spoke-persons - young people and volunteers as intermediaries
- Communication tools: personalized invitations – traditional one-to-one email – phone invitations
- Co-design methods: neighborhood labs - engaging in public spaces – experimental projects-gamification – surveys – social hackathons
- Economic tools: participatory budget
- Digital tools: smart neighborhood platforms

2. What mechanisms are you putting in place to make sure that the case studies' analysis is including "hard-to-reach" populations?

- direct communication
- verifying tools accessibility level
- open elections also with online voting
- lottery methods based on trustworthy empirical data about community characteristics
- creating profiles of "hard-to-reach" groups and preparing targeted communication or engagement plans
- involving all the quintuple helix in focus groups
- inviting excluded people to community reporting
- talking with group representatives to counterweigh the narratives collected by community reporting
- organizing neighborhood Labs designed to include all the constituencies

Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholders' involvement is concurrent with the mapping activity. It should be considered as early as possible, and it is a continuous action oriented towards meeting the inclusivity target set by the Pilot cities during the implementation of the project.

These specific guidelines are developed to match core characteristics for deliberative democracy initiatives identified in D2.2 Methodology Protocol: diversity, engagement, inclusion, and influence.

Guidelines

• For Diversity

Ensuring diversity means that the deliberative process includes different participants. Representatives involved in the process should resemble in proportions the characteristics of the reference population. Limits to participation should be removed, and incentives should be applied to achieve equal access to the process.

The following steps and hints can support this aim:

- a. Identify place-based diversity barriers
- b. Identify places and spaces that the underrepresented communities consider as gathering areas and landmarks
- c. Organize open events in identified places
- d. Diversify the location of the events (different neighborhoods or different spaces within the same neighborhood)
- e. Let each stakeholders' group manage part of the activities
- f. (If needed) Hold a separate focus group meeting for each underserved and vulnerable group

• For Engagement

The process should allow for active participation, providing participants with the possibility to report needs and proposals. The issues voiced should be addressed, deepened and understood with regards to their long-term implications

The following steps and hints can support this aim:

- a. Adapt the Protocol to the specific context and follow the steps to involve stakeholders from the beginning
- b. Map already applied best practices within each experimentation ground and the

failures in terms of methods and tools

- c. Provide accessible updates about the status of the process using low-level of Technology readiness tools or in presence events or multiple formats supports (e.g., paper-printed info, podcasts, video) considering vision and hearing-impaired accessibility
- d. Communicate and disseminate live results for an informed engagement always considering vulnerable groups
- e. Overcome barriers with practical solutions with the support of facilitators
- f. Set an implementation plan that articulates the Protocol
- g. Consider costs and financial opportunities (e.g., see the economic tools listed in the D2.2 Methodology Protocol)
- h. Make the benefits evident for each of the stakeholders' categories, declaring expected impacts and providing updates about the effective impacts

• For Inclusion

Different perspectives and needs should be treated equally. They should be given attention and possibility to be highlighted and discussed. The deliberation should be based on consensus looking for a common ground of needs and values emerged during the process.

The following steps and hints can support this aim:

- a. Include different perspectives verifying that participants match the demoscopic criteria selected in the stakeholders' mapping phase
- b. Treat different perspectives equally. In the oral form, allocate each stakeholder a limited and well-defined amount of time to intervene. Similarly, in the written form, allocate each stakeholder a limited and well-defined amount of words.
- c. If facilitating a session, consider the need of all groups involved
- d. Build consensus on proposals/ prototypes (at each step) using voting systems and scoring mechanisms (live pools, close-ended questions)

- **For Influence**

The deliberative process should be followed by an actual capacity to influence the policy and decision-making processes. The level of influence may vary depending on a series of different conditions. However, a minimum effect on policy is what distinguishes a democratic deliberative process from other formal and informal ways of aggregation and discussion.

The following steps and hints can support this aim:

- a. Always try to include policymakers into informal and formal discussions together with citizens
- b. If the policymakers' involvement seems to be difficult, identify a facilitator as intermediary figure between stakeholders and policymakers
- c. Consider that the Pilot Project cycle is not linear, but circular; each step can be updated and integrated to strengthen the possibilities to influence and welcome additional inputs
- d. Consider that the Prototyping phase of the Protocol allows the "crash with reality" through which improvements can be made
- e. Identify which changes (legal, tech & digital, infrastructural socio-economic, urban, and behavioral) the city should envision and put in place to welcome multiple stakeholders' contributions
- f. Define and adopt a dataset and a database structured in qualitative-quantitative dimensions and indicators indexed on existing experiences and usable for pilot experimentation (e.g., D8.2 EUARENAS INDEX)
- g. Monitor and boost transparency

Mistakes to avoid

Each process should also keep in mind what mistakes not to make in stakeholder engagement.

Misguided attitudes are generally examples of exclusive behavior when designing an inclusive

environment. These are related to different aspects: the programming of initiatives; communication; physical setting and accessibility-related issues.

- **Programming**

What not to do:

- a. Transferring methods and tools from one context to another without adaptation
- b. Not involving decision-makers at an early stage
- c. Stimulating conflict between citizens and decision-makers (e.g., one-on-one interviews)
- d. Separating some helixes of the quintuple helix in brainstorming activities unless there is a need to reach a specific sensitive target group
- e. Lack of organizers, facilitators, and staff knowledge regarding participants and their specific or special needs
- f. Not employing those with differing abilities
- g. Lack of culturally sensitive program times (agendas should be respectful of the community timing needs)
- h. Lack of accessible equipment

- **Communication**

What not to do:

- a. Not communicating directly with participants about their needs
- b. Not collecting feedback from participants
- c. Using just one form of communication (e.g., one language, one type of print version of written materials, not using materials capable of working with screen readers)
- d. Lack of closed captioning in videos
- e. Not providing adequate opportunities for people from different situations or background to actively participate in debates bringing their voice, share concerns and express their unique needs during planning processes or meetings even anonymously or in a silent way (e.g., with messages)

- **Physical setting and accessibility-related issues**

What not to do:

- a. Choosing setting with structural obstacles like lack of ramps, doorways that cannot accommodate wheelchairs, inadequate facilities in low-income communities
- b. Identifying a place that is not recognizable to the community or divisive
- c. Forgetting about accessibility to the place of the initiatives, not providing adequate sustainable transportation and multiple mobility modes

Useful Techniques

Across these guidelines it is possible to identify useful techniques to organize the activities within each step of the Pilot Project Cycle and strengthen the level of inclusion of specific stakeholders' groups. These techniques derive from multiple sectors and applications not directly related to deliberative democracy but based on multi-actor involvement and design engagement methods related to fieldwork (survey, observation, interviews' methods), citizens' workshops, co-design tools and media analysis.

Techniques have been selected to be compliant with the set of seven principles for universal design defined in 1997 by the Center for Universal Design in North Carolina State University to evaluate existing designs, guide processes and educate both designers and consumers about the characteristics of more usable products and environments so that they can be understood, accessed, and used to the greatest extent possible:

1. Equitable use: design is useful and marketable to people with diverse abilities
2. Flexibility in use: design accommodates a wide range of individual preferences and abilities
3. Simple and intuitive use: design's use is easy to be understood, regardless of the user's status and experience
4. Perceptible information: design communicates necessary information

effectively to the user, regardless of ambient conditions or the users' conditions

5. Tolerance for error: design minimizes hazards and the adverse consequences
6. Low physical effort: design can be used efficiently and comfortably and with a minimum of fatigue.
7. Size and space for approach and use: appropriate size and space is provided for approach, reach, manipulation, and use

In this framework of principles, EUARENAS suggests the use of the following techniques:

Open Dialogue – Listening Circles

Description: Communication that happens without structure or discipline for shared exploration towards understanding or connection between stakeholders. Open dialogue can be held in collaborative listening circles in which each one listens to the other sides to find meaning, re-evaluation and agreement or an open end. Facilitation of an open dialogue includes letting people talk, give behavioral guidelines and gentle reminders to maintain a shared center. Supporting tools are: passing an object to structure intervention rounds; using a recognizable sound to pass the word from one person to another or to fit into speech; to give everyone an equal number of something (e.g., stones, pennies, cards) one of which they put into a bowl whenever they speak. If they run out of them, they can't speak again until everyone else has finished them.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From capacity-building and useful for challenge identification

Best for including: all stakeholders

Example: Kirklees Council – BAME Listening Circles

World Café

Description: World Café allows for small group discussion on topics proposed by facilitators.

Participants can move from table to table to listen to ideas that have been discussed at other tables. This allows a real contamination and sharing of ideas and proposals and promotes the development of creative and innovative ideas. Small group discussions are then brought back to a plenary meeting.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From challenges identification

Best for including: all stakeholders especially citizens

Example: From the Four Directions: People Everywhere Leading the Way, Berkana Institute, 2000

Citizen Deliberative Councils

Description: Citizen Deliberative Councils are usually temporary deliberative democracy methods. They are face-to-face councils of diverse citizens that reflects the variety of their community, region, or state. Members are often selected randomly with additional criteria to ensure diversity. Variations of this general typology are: citizens assemblies and juries, consensus conferences, planning cells

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From the prototyping phase

Best for including: all stakeholders

Example: Ostbelgien Citizens' Council, 2019

Consensus Conference

Description: A public meeting in which ordinary citizens dialogue with and cross examine a range of experts to form a position on topics that interest them

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From the challenges identification phase

Best for including: citizens and Community of Practice experts

Example: Danish citizen technology panel, 2003

Deliberative poll

Description: After an initial, extended survey, a subsample is invited to attend an event, where people can discuss in groups and ask questions to experts. Later, the sample that participated in the event is surveyed again. The final survey provides more mature and responsible guidance to decision-makers and is disseminated to support decision-making (Fishkin, 1988).

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From Piloting

Best for including: sample of citizens and experts

Example: National deliberative poll – Policies Toward the Roma in Bulgaria, Sofia, 2007 - with regards to the areas of housing, education, and crime

Scenario-based deliberation/ Scenario workshop

Description: A planning process in which citizens dialogue with diverse stakeholder over a specific issue to write up different solutions in scenarios to encourage dialogue and develop action plans

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From Piloting

Best for including: citizens, experts, policy-makers and especially local businesses

Example: Danish ecologically sustainable city

Asset-Based Community Development

Description: Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) is an approach that recognizes that awareness of strengths, talents and assets of communities and individuals is more likely to inspire actions for change than an exclusive focus on needs and problems. It is an asset-based technique for community-led initiatives that starts from collecting stories about community successes and identifying capacities of communities' components that contributed to positive outcomes. A core group carries the process forward and maps stakeholders and frames. Relationships are built

among local assets for mutually beneficial problem-solving and information sharing. The initial core group becomes as broad a representative as possible to build a shared community vision and plan. If needed, investments and resources are collected externally to support local development.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From Challenges identification

Best for including: all stakeholders (also decision makers)

Example: Al-Kayat Village, Egypt from 2010

Visioning

Description: Visioning is aimed at building future scenarios for change-making that can inform urban and strategic planning. It allows participants to create images that can help to guide change in cities based on shared possible or desirable futures. Visioning is firstly an individual activity and then an in-group exploration.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: Piloting, prototyping, modeling

Best for including: all stakeholders

Example: Bountiful City (Utah) revitalizes historic Fort District, Local Visioning, 2005

Open Space Technology

Description: Participants build and manage their own agenda of parallel working sessions around a central issue theme of strategic relevance. It can involve small and big groups in more than one day workshops. Discussion outputs are mainly collected and written down in a way that they can inform all participants so that every stakeholder can further implement the discussion

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From Piloting

Best for including: diverse stakeholders

Example: Victoria (British Columbia) Urban Development Agreement Aboriginal engagement strategy, 2005

Parish Mapping

Description: This technique aims at creating a common expression of values, beginning to assert ideas for involvement. It starts with and is sustained by inclusive gestures and encouraging questions. All participants reach the same level of engagement and turn each other into experts. It is focused on self-defined small territories or topics that can be mapped or sketched

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From Challenges identification

Best for including: not expert citizens

Example: West Sussex County Millennium Maps

Planning for Real

Description: Planning for Real is a community development tool. It is a registered trademark of “The Neighborhood Initiatives Foundation” designed for involving a wide range of people in practical processes to determine needs & priorities. It is useful when there is not a strong sense of community to build large-scale models (e.g., three-dimensional models) of the neighborhood from multiple contributions. The making of the model comes from architectural lab-based techniques and brings the sense of collaboration from hands-on activities. Once that the model is ready this can be illustrated and remains like testimony of the decisions taken. The concrete output may not be suitable for all types of decisions to be made, but certainly for the cognitive activity on the sites of the initiatives.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From Challenges identification

Best for including: all stakeholders, especially citizens, decision-makers, and local businesses

Example: Woodthorpe in Charnwood, The Neighbourhood Initiatives Foundation

Techniques for the fieldwork (survey, observation, interviews' methods)

Description: Techniques for the fieldwork come from anthropology studies and research. They include participant observation, which involves participating in the life of the contexts examined to develop an insider's view of the processes as a prerequisite to understanding. Participant observation uses two techniques, covert, and overt observation. The former allows for the collection of unconditioned and spontaneous cues from people unaware that they are the object of analysis. The second supports the "incognito" activity thanks to work phases in which the researcher's intent is explicitly declared. These include free interviews (carried out in informal and unscheduled contexts) and semi-structured and structured interviews (by appointment, with a pre-established theme and outline).

Correspondent step of the Protocol: At different stages of the process, to know better the status-quo and as a self-evaluating mechanism for initiatives

Best for including: all stakeholders and researchers

Example: Commoning.City, LabGov.City

Participatory Learning and Action Approaches

Description: Participatory Learning and Action Approaches aim at investigating issues of concern to communities implementing and evaluating planning and development activities. They involve full participation of people to learn together about needs, opportunities, and corresponding actions. These approaches use methods that range from interviewing techniques to visualization, generally using group work.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From early stages

Best for including: all stakeholders, especially not expert citizens

Example: Anti-Racism & Diversity Strategy (ARDS) County Wicklow, Ireland, 2009

Media analysis (WP5)

Description: Analyzing media content to gather info about context, quotes, key-signals, compositional and contextual level to see how media describe on-going or past initiatives

Correspondent step of the Protocol: At different stages of the process; to know better the status-quo and as a self-evaluating mechanism for initiatives

Best for including: all stakeholders

Example: EUARENAS Work Package 5, PVM

Capacity-building

Description: Strengthening of knowledge and skills through specific training activities aimed at defined types of actors on issues of relevance to the initiative to be undertaken. These are primarily face-to-face activities taught by experts and adaptable to the needs of the target community. The capacity-building is located at the start of the project and prepares the groundwork for a general understanding of the phenomena, issues, possibilities, and tools.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: First step of the Protocol

Best for including: targeted stakeholders' groups and experts

Example: Verso Savio 2030 and Co-Pula, LabGov.City

Storytelling

Description: The technique – according to People's Voice Media definition - is aimed at using lived experience stories to identify and explore signals about the future of deliberative and participatory democracies. In practical terms in studies and experiences about deliberative democracy, storytelling includes: collecting citizen experiences of engagement with democracy; identifying key insights from citizen experiences of their engagement in democracy; using citizen experiences and the insights gathered to inform wider learnings on the future

of democracy, in particular the opportunities and challenges of deliberative and participatory democracies.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From capacity-building and as a self-evaluating mechanism for initiatives

Best for including: all stakeholders, especially citizens

Example: Life in Greater Manchester, People's Voice Media

Community reporting

Description: Community Reporting is a mixed methodology developed to enhance citizen participation in research, policymaking, service development, and decision-making processes. Using People's Voice Media definition, it involves: gathering stories, supporting people to tell and share their own and their peers' authentic stories using digital tools; curating stories, working with people to identify the insights in their stories and package them as short films, reports etc.; mobilizing stories, connecting learnings from the stories to people who can use them to create positive change.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: From capacity-building

Best for including: all stakeholders, especially inexperienced citizens

Example: Youth for Youth in Erasmus+ Ka2

Co-design tools

Description: Co-design tools are part of creativity-based research and techniques. They are useful digital (preferably open source) or physical tools aimed at gathering the views of the various stakeholders involved in the delivery and use of an initiative or service, raising key issues while accelerating the process of identifying solutions.

Correspondent step of the Protocol: All stages

Best for including: all stakeholders

Example: digital for online experience- Mural, Miró, Aha Slides; physical for in presence experience -sticky-notes boards, guided sketching, maps, storyboards, prototypes, mock-ups

EUARENAS – self-evaluation box

This self-evaluation box is the result of a poll conducted during the Helsinki Project Workshop held in November 2021 among EUARENAS researchers and Pilot cities (Gdansk, Voru, Budapest and Reggio Emilia representatives).

Which techniques have provided the best outcomes within Case Studies and why?

- ++++ Asset-Based Community Development
- ++++ Citizen Deliberative Councils
- ++ Workshops
- + Co-creation
- + Techniques of fieldwork
- + Scenario-based deliberation
- + Open Dialogue - Listening Circles
- + Concrete implementation
- + Planning for real

In which techniques are you interest in the most?

- +++ Asset-Based Community Development
- +++ Citizen Deliberative Councils
- ++ Planning for Real
- ++ Open Dialogue - Listening Circles
- + Visioning
- + Participatory Learning and Action Approaches

References:

- Arniani, M., Badii, A., De Liddo, A., Georgi, S., Passani, A., Piccolo, L. S., & Teli, M. (2014). Collective awareness platform for sustainability and social innovation: An introduction. *Book Sprints for ICT Research*.
- Cornwall, A., & Gaventa, J. (2000). From users and choosers to makers and shapers repositioning participation in social policy. *IDS Bulletin, 31*(4), 50-62.
- Fischer, A. M. (2008). Resolving the theoretical ambiguities of social exclusion with reference to polarisation and conflict. *London School of Economics and Political Science. Development Studies Institute. Working Paper Series, 8*, 1-31.
- Fishkin, J. (1988). The Case for a National Caucus: Taking Democracy Seriously. *Atlantic Monthly*, August 1988, pp. 16-18
- Holmes, T., & Scoones, I. (2000). Participatory environmental policy processes: experiences from North and South.
- Iaione, C. (2019). Legal Infrastructure and Urban Networks For Just and Democratic Smart Cities. *Italian Journal of Public Law, 11*(2).
- Jones, P. (2011). Developing and applying interactive visual tools to enhance stakeholder engagement in accessibility planning for mobility disadvantaged groups. *Research in Transportation Business & Management, 2*, 29-41.
- Ozanne, J. L., Corus, C., & Saatcioglu, B. (2009). The philosophy and methods of deliberative democracy: Implications for public policy and marketing. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 28*(1), 29-40.
- Shultz, C. J. (2007). Marketing as constructive engagement. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 26*(2), 293-301.
- Wixey, S., Jones, P., Lucas, K. & Aldridge, M. (2005). 'User Needs Literature Review', Measuring Accessibility as Experienced by Different Socially Disadvantaged Groups. *Social Research in Transport (SORT)*.