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Introduction

• PERARES (WP3): Dialogue and co-construction between Science and Civil Society

• Offering stakeholders them a proven participatory method

→ Basic Scenario Workshops

• Based on European Awareness Scenario Workshop (EAWS, Europ. C., 1994) "Explore new possible actions and social experiments for the promotion of a social environment favouring innovation in Europe"

• Adapted by "the FBI Centre" (Austria) for INTERACTS project (FP5, 2001-2003) "Improving Interaction between NGOs, Universities, and Science Shops: Experiences and Expectations"

• Customized by "the FBI Centre" for TRAMS project (FP6, 2004-2007) "Training and Mentoring of Science Shops"
Why conducting a Scenario Workshop?

• Summary of the main aims (*FBI Centre, 2003*)

  • It helps to **raise awareness of future problems** in the community.

  • It helps to **develop a common definition** of a desirable factor.

  • It allows discussions between **different social groups** regarding obstacles in the way towards a future worth living.

  • It allows to **identify and discuss the differences and similarities of problems and solutions** as perceived by different groups of participants.

  • On the one hand a Scenario Workshop helps to **develop and generate utopian ideas**. On the other hand it allows to **plan first steps that can be realised in the near future** or even to develop an action plan for the implementation of solution trails.

  • It supports attempts to **work out solutions together**.

  • An **optimal result** would be the **agreement** of all participants on a desirable development with respect to the workshop topic.
Scenario Workshop organisation steps

- The Focus Question
- Selection of participants and distribution in Interest Groups
- Contextualisation
- The Scenario Workshop
- Further developments
The Focus Question

- It should be established with "relevant" stakeholders

- It should be a long term question (e.g. occurring in 10 years)
  - To foster the expression of a vision
  - To be able to look beyond the current difficulties and obstacles

- It shouldn't be
  - Too precise.  ⟷  Creativity might be hindered
  - Too broad.  ⟷  Convergence could be more difficult to achieve
Participants (selection)

- The most crucial phase!

- Typical stakeholders to gather must have/be
  - Important levers for change
  - Eager to dialogue with "not so obvious partners"
  - Eager to co-construct a vision and work on participatory projects
  - Equal level of knowledge on the Focus Question
  - Equal capacities to debate and to defend his/her positions and visions

- Really Time-consuming!
Participants (distribution 1/2)

• **Small number of groups and participants** (e.g. 4 groups of 4 to 8 persons)

• **Interest (role) Groups should gather homogeneous stakeholders:**
  
  • With similar backgrounds or kind of responsibilities
  
  • With supposed similar visions
  
  • And who don't come to impose their visions or interest group's visions

• **But…**

  • Professional occupation DOESN'T MEAN homogeneity!
"Health Promotion and Education" Scenario Workshop

- 3 main kinds of participants initially distributed according to their occupation
  - Sociologists, philosophers, anthropologists...
  - Doctors, nurses, therapists...
  - Social workers, coaches, NGOs...

- Difficulties to assign a single group for some of them

Solution proposed: INTEREST rather than OCCUPATION

- Each participant was proposed to chose his interest group amongst:
Contextualisation (1/2)

- Participant booklet that contains:
  - The Focus Question
  - The overall objective
  - The programme of the day(s)
  - Contacts and basic biographical information about the participants
• **Preliminary meetings or seminars**

  • Useful when the participants need a presentation of the context, the overall project and perspectives
  
  • Useful when you need the participants to have a first session of dialogue and exchange of views
  
  • Useful when your network of contacts is not yet build
  
  • Useful when you want to organize different thematic workshops with different profiles of participants. For instance, to present the methodology and the global project (WP3, PERARES)
## The Scenario Workshop (typical programme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plenary Session</th>
<th><strong>Introduction</strong> and presentation of the programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong> of the <strong>participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong> for the <strong>Utopian Scenarios</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Session</td>
<td>Development by each <strong>Interest Group</strong> of an <strong>Utopian Scenario</strong> related to the focus question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td>Presentation of the <strong>results</strong> by each Interest Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAK (lunch or night)**

| Plenary Session          | **Identification of common themes** from the Utopians Scenarios  
**Selection of themes** (from the previous list) for the following Group Session |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Session</td>
<td>Development by each <strong>mixed group</strong> of a <strong>pragmatic scenario</strong> related to the focus question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td>Presentation of the <strong>results</strong> by each Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td><strong>Strategic discussion</strong> to define the <strong>priorities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td>Drawing up of an <strong>Action Plan</strong> (first steps only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Session</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong> of the Scenario Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Scenario Workshop (presentations)

• Common issues

  • Really time consuming: 3 min x 20 participants ➔ 60 min lost!
  
  • Impossible de memorise 20 biographies in a row
  
  • Rather boring…

• Possible remediation actions

  • Ask for biographical details for the participant booklet (send it before the SW)
  
  • Ask specific questions related to the topic (e.g. experiences, motivations, expectations, etc.) and add the answers in the participant booklet
  
  • Use a speed-dating technique or another fast mutual presentation technique
The Scenario Workshop (utopian sessions 1/5)

- One paperboard sheet to describe a common vision
  - Common duration: 1h30
  - No formatting guidelines to avoid hindering the creativity
  - It should include:
    - The **common long-term vision**
    - The **main steps** and **transition phases** required to achieve it
    - Factors, context, passed experiences that **further this scenario**
  - Don't set aside a minority view! Mention it somewhere in the poster
### The Scenario Workshop (utopian sessions 2/5)

- Some differences between EASW and the SW method we used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European Awareness Scenario Workshop (EASW)</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
<th>Basic Scenario Workshop (BSW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The SW last 2 days</td>
<td>Really difficult to gather relevant stakeholders during 2 days</td>
<td>Shortened to only 1 day or ideally 2 consecutive evenings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participants are confronted to provided scenarios | • Requires a **very good knowledge** of the topic  
• Prevent the **expression of the participants own views** | The participants design their own scenario |
| The participants are asked to develop a **best-case** and a **worst-case** scenario | The participants often focus on the worst-case and have great difficulties to adopt an utopian posture | The worst-case scenario is restricted to a short notice at the end of the utopian group session, only if there is time |
The Scenario Workshop (utopian sessions 3/5)

- Difficulties to expect...
  - Lack of time to answer all the questions
  - Inability to adopt an utopian posture
  - Speaking time unbalanced

- ... and how to circumvent them

  - Each group must comprise a facilitator, with sufficient knowledge of the topic, who will:
    - monitor the session
    - remind that they have to forget any constraint in expressing their visions
    - and ensure the involvement of each participant
The Scenario Workshop (utopian sessions 4/5)

Example of results

"classical" one
Example of results

"not that classical" one
The Scenario Workshop (common themes 1/2)

• 1st option (common one): 1-day Scenario Workshop
  
  • Common themes identified together

  ➔ Main Advantage: participants can keep their vision in mind

  ➔ Main Drawback: lack of hindsight

• 2nd option (ours): 2-evenings Scenario Workshop

  • brief overview of the results to start the 2nd evening

  • List of keywords drawn up by the organizers

  • Addition or merging proposed to participants ➔ More relevant Finale list
The Scenario Workshop (common themes 2/2)

- Common keywords (converging ideas from the utopian scenarios)
- Vote with labels (2-3/person)
- Informal moment
• Interest Groups are split into thematic groups (1 theme ➔ 1 group)

Ex: SW in Grenoble, France (June 2007)
The Scenario Workshop (pragmatic sessions 2/4)

• One structured paperboard sheet to describe a targeted state
  
  • Common duration: 1h30
  
  • The members of the Interest group should agree on who will work on what theme
  
  • Strict formatting guidelines (see next slide)
  
  • It should contain precise and realistic proposals!
  
  • It's very often an exercise the participants know well
  
• But, sometimes…
  
  • choose only one theme when you have proficiencies in several can be frustrating ➔ The message to deliver is that everyone should rely on other participants' capacities to deal with the subject
**The Scenario Workshop** (pragmatic sessions 3/4)

- The structure of the presentation (FBI Centre for INTERACTS, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT STATE</th>
<th>TARGETED STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• More details of the topic</td>
<td>• Details out of utopian scenarios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>OBSTACLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • To promote the targeted state  
  • Who can/should do that?  
  • Which decisions have to be made?  
  • What else is required, helpful? | • What is expected?  
  • Who will be against it? |
## Example of results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>État Actuel</th>
<th>État Souhaité</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Connaissance comme propriété privée/intellectuelle</em></td>
<td><em>Connaissance libre, universelle, suffisante, libre d'usage</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Peu d'accès de partage</em></td>
<td><em>Accessibilité</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Problèmes de sécurisation et éthiques non assurées démocratiquement</em></td>
<td><em>Transparence sans limite</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Avancée de concurrence</em></td>
<td><em>Équilibre des savoirs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Non reconnaissance de certaines connaissances (savoir-faire, savoir technique, culture culturelle)</em></td>
<td><em>Éveil et éducation à la connaissance</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Problème de codification (entretien scientifique)</em></td>
<td><em>Avancement partagé et interaction au service de TOUS</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Activités

- **La Révolution**
  - Temps de partage festifs, locaux pour la construction et la réactivation des savoirs de chacun.
  - Université, réseau, population.
  - Création d’épisodes d’éducation populaire (savoir-savoir, partie de l’opposition).
  - Ateliers, réunions d’échange de savoirs d’experts.
  - Développement de supports multimédias : vidéo, audio, images, textes, etchés, etc.
  - **UNE ENCYCLOPÉDIE PUBLIQUE**

### Obstacles

- **Cadre économique, politique, social, culturel et scientifique**
  - Le savoir comme propriété économique et politique (sectorisé).
  - Économiser / Protéger au sein de la compétitivité.
  - Structures d’enseignement (Agro, AmR, CNRS).
  - Modèle mécanistique de la diffusion de la connaissance.
  - Manque d’implication des citoyens.
  - La difficulté de perception ; MOYEN ou FIN ?
The Scenario Workshop (Finale Discussions)

- Discussion of the proposals out of the pragmatic scenarios
- Additional information about upcoming events, opportunities, etc. that could help
- Strategic discussion to define workable priorities
- Discussion to find ways to circumvent related obstacles
- Agreement on the very first steps of the action-plan or on an upcoming meeting to draw-up the action plan
The Scenario Workshop (towards an action plan)

- What?
- Who?
- When?
- Who else?
- What else?

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quoi</th>
<th>Qui</th>
<th>Quand</th>
<th>Quoi d'autre qui d'actie?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liste BDS-APA</td>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>25/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSERT BDSF</td>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>25/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envoi Tedeu PCA</td>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>25/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1er JET Chart</td>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>6/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR AS</td>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>31/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coord fichier</td>
<td>Stéphanie</td>
<td>31/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts E</td>
<td>François</td>
<td>31/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthèse Chartie</td>
<td>François</td>
<td>31/05</td>
<td>TOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orga 1er réu</td>
<td>ERLA</td>
<td>30/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réu BDS-BMO Avignon</td>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>SEPT-OCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liste Subv. Drapez projet</td>
<td>François, Stéphanie</td>
<td>31/05</td>
<td>FSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Scenario Workshop (evaluation)

- **Method**
  - Time frame
  - Pertinence to ensure fruitful dialogue
  - Pertinence to ensure co-construction

- **Contents**
  - Coherence with initial objectives
  - Capacity to deliver results and action plan
Further Possible Developments

• More detailed evaluation questionnaire sent shortly after the SW
  • To prospect the different levels of commitment to the project
  • To prospect the different levels of commitment to the network
  • To propose an action-plan built with the suggestions from this questionnaire
  • And to get new ideas to better organize future Scenario Workshops!

• Specific meeting to draw-up the action plan:
  • Allow a more detailed action plan
  • Probable ensure a better commitment of the participants
Conclusion

• **A methodology useful and efficient:**
  
  • To foster dialogue, participation, exchange of views and co-construction
  
  • To help building network
  
  • Adapted to "Science and Society" issues
  
  • Can be refined depending on the topic, the kind of participants, the question, etc.
  
  • Allow to get quick results

• **But…**
  
  • The success strongly depends on the commitment of the participants
  
  • A regular follow-up may be needed!