

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 690452



URBAN-WASTE – 690452 – D2.2

URBAN WASTE

# Urban strategies for Waste Management in Tourist Cities

## D3.4 URBAN-WASTE Mobilization and Mutual Learning Plan

<b>Grant Agreement No:</b>	WASTE-6b-2015 690452	<b>Project Acronym:</b>	URBAN-WASTE
<b>Project Title:</b>	Urban Strategies for Waste Management in Tourist Cities		
<b>Funding scheme:</b>	Horizon 2020: Eco-Innovative Strategies: “Waste: a resource to recycle, reuse and recover raw materials”		
<b>Project Coordinator:</b>	Government of Canary Islands		
<b>Start date of the project:</b>	01/06/2016	<b>Duration of the project:</b>	36 months
<b>Contractual delivery date:</b>	31/12/2016		
<b>Actual delivery date:</b>	27/02/2017		
<b>Contributing WP:</b>	WP3		
<b>Dissemination level:</b>	Public		
<b>Authors:</b>	Claudia De Luca, Michelle Perello		
<b>Contributors:</b>	Jean Benoît Bel, Orsola Bolognani, Marie Kazeroni, Erneszt Kovács, Aurore, Medieu,		

### Abstract

The URBANWASTE Mobilisation and Mutual Learning orients and defines the actions to empower stakeholders and citizens towards the development and the implementation of the eco-innovative and gender-sensitive waste management strategies and to promote those towards decision makers and relevant stakeholders. The MMLP guides the consultation process and structure the way feedback is provided: this results in a new concept of participatory and science-based decision making and planning for waste management. The MMLP defines specific actions to be performed and propose instruments to be used to ensure stakeholders engagement, facilitate an inclusive and constructive dialogue and ensure processing of the feedbacks. The MMLP have been built around the concept of the Communities of Practice (CoPs), tested under the BRIDGE project20. CoPs are usually a spontaneous phenomenon among people who share common interests and passion who meet to learn from each other. CoPs will be built in each URBANWASTE pilot case and will have 4 well-defined and compulsory meetings opportunities proposed by the local municipalities in different forms



(big events, workshops, round tables, working groups). The role of municipalities, supported by the task leader and the guidelines provided in the MMLP, will be to provide inputs for discussion – such as the results of the urban metabolism and behavioural analysis, the presentation of best practices – and to guide those towards the development of eco-innovative strategies and selected measures. The MMLP also identifies specific roles within the staff of the cities (CoP coordinator) and set a defined timeline to implement the actions. The calendar and the topics of the mutual learning events have also been included within this deliverable.

### Contributors

NAME	COMPANY	CONTRIBUTIONS INCLUDE
Claudia De Luca	CE	All
Michelle Perello	CE	All
Jean Benoît Bel	ACR+	3.2; 5
Erneszt Kovács	ACR+	3.2; 5
Marie Kazeroni	ORDIF	3.3
Aurore Medieu	ORDIF	3.3
Orsola Bolognani	AMBIENTE ITALIA	3.3



## List of abbreviations

CE	Consulta Europa
GA	Gender Auditor
WP	Work Package
D	Deliverable
CoP	Communities of Practice
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
EU	The European Union
EC	European Commission
EASME	European Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises
MMLP	Mobilization and Mutual Learning Plan



## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	5
2. Stakeholder participation and participatory approaches.....	5
2.1 Knowledge brokerage and information gathering .....	8
2.2 Social learning .....	9
2.3 Communities of Practices (CoPs) .....	9
3. URBAN-WASTE mobilization approach.....	10
3.1 Stakeholders' identification .....	11
3.2 CoPs activities .....	11
3.2 CoP e-platform .....	12
3.3 Schedule of URBAN-WASTE CoP activities.....	12
First activity: public event to gather additional stakeholders and involve them in CoP.	12
Second activity: CoP workshops to collect input for the waste prevention and management strategies .....	14
Third activity: CoP workshop to select waste prevention and management strategies.	15
Fourth activity: presentation of the strategies and public signature of URBANWASTE Public-Private Partnerships.....	17
3.4 Other activities.....	18
4. Monitoring System of CoP activities.....	18
5. Staff exchanges and mutual learning meetings.....	19
Bibliography .....	22



# 1. Introduction

The Urban-Waste Mobilization and Mutual Learning Plan (MMLP) provides pilot partners with general recommendations and concrete indications on steps to be taken to mobilize stakeholders and get their input for the formulation of waste prevention and management strategies.

Stakeholders involvement is fundamental for the development of several political strategies not only to collect input or feedback but also to ensure the needed consensus which in turn would facilitate the implementation of the strategies. This is even truer in the waste management field, which requires specific efforts to build consensus and prevent conflicts. Different actors have in face stakes in waste management and need to be consulted but also empowered for the formulation of the strategies as direct beneficiaries and implementers.

In URBAN-WASTE the stakeholders involvement will be organized around Communities of Practices (CoPs) which will be created in each pilot case. Pilot partners in URBAN-WASTE will have the responsibility to favour the creation of CoPs, promote or co-organize activities and drawing conclusions for the formulation of waste strategies.

The Plan aims at presenting the theoretical framework adopted for the mobilization activities and at providing concrete guidelines and a shared methodology for pilot partners.

The URBAN-WASTE approach to mobilize stakeholders is based on issues which have been highlighted as key success factors by previous European projects:

- FOODLINKS – Using knowledge networks to promote sustainable foods which developed and experimented with Knowledge Brokerage activities as new ways of linking research to policy-making in the field of sustainable food consumption and production.
- BRIDGE – Sustainable urban planning decision support accounting for urban metabolism (project involved five case study cities over Europe. Two CiP gatherings were organized in each city )and two umbrella CoP meetings were organized to provide an opportunity for mutual learning between participants of the five case study cities.
- SEA FOR SOCIETY - engages stakeholders, citizens and youth in an open and participatory dialogue to share knowledge, forge partnerships and empower actors on societal issues related to Ocean. In doing so, the project aims to develop and enrich the concept of "Blue Society", preparing at the same time mechanisms for cooperation.

## 2. Stakeholder participation and participatory approaches

Policy-makers have registered and communicated an increasing need to seek citizens' inputs in decisions that affect the public, particularly in the environmental arena (Glicken et al, 1999). Environmental problems are complex and might evolve and change rapidly: decision-making needs thus to be able to answer with the same rapidness and needs to embrace a diversity of knowledges and values, which can be brought only by a variety of stakeholders.



In the simplest terms stakeholders can be defined as individuals or groups who affect or are affected by a policy. Stakeholder participation can thus be defined as a process where individuals, groups and organisations are invited and choose to take an active role in making decisions that affect them (Wandersman, 1981; Wilcox, 2003; Rowe et al., 2004). Stakeholder participation differs thus from broader public participation, since stakeholders are only those who can affect or be affected by a decision.

Stakeholder participation in policy decision-making have several benefits:

- quality and durability of decisions is greater (e.g. Fischer, 2000; Beierle, 2002; Reed et al., 2008). Information from stakeholders brought into the deliberation contributes to avoid unintended consequences of decisions, such as environmental ones, and more adherence of those to existing contexts. More solutions to solving problems might be formulated.
- social consensus is more easily reached. Stakeholders engagement increases public understanding of the issues and consequences of different choices and reveals both conflicts and agreements among different stakeholder groups. At the same time, open and inclusive stakeholder engagement, including representatives of different viewpoints, can sometimes resolve differences and build trust in the policy making process and therefore help secure public acceptance of decisions (e.g., Kleivink, et al, 2012).
- the process of decision-making and final decisions becomes more transparent and legitimate.

Good policy development needs to include all stakeholders, disrespectfully of their degree of power and influence. More influential stakeholders or “key” stakeholders (Freeman, 1999) are usually powerful, knowledgeable and resourceful. Powerless stakeholders can exercise less influence but are also affected by the policy, and sometimes in a dramatic way (Bryson, 2004). Some interested stakeholders have in fact the power to affect the policy content, while others are relatively powerless but nevertheless are affected, sometimes in dramatic ways (Brugha & Varvasovszky, 2000).

Stakeholders can thus be any type of organizations and individuals which can affect or be affected by a policy. In stakeholder engagement processes, organizations are represented by one or more individuals and can include:

- public authorities, which are not responsible for the policy but are affect by it,
- research organizations,
- formal and non-formal education establishments,
- companies and social enterprises,
- business support organizations and business associations,
- no-profit organizations, including associations, foundations, NGOs,
- civil society organizations.

Physical persons can be represented by a) an organization, such as an association or not, b) informal groups (groups of families, of neighbours, ...) or c) can be consulted and engaged individually.



Different typologies of stakeholder participation exist and have been applied in history. The diversity in the typologies lie mainly in the different degree of involvement and in the way knowledge flows from and among decision-makers, researchers and stakeholders. A participatory approach is thus an approach in which everyone who has a stake in the intervention has a voice, either in person or by representation, and the right to contribute to a decision-making process. In this sense, a participatory approach does not include simple communication where stakeholders receive an information or provide information and knowledge to well-defined questions. For a decision-making process to be participatory, stakeholders need to be consulted early in the process and with an open and iterative approach, which allows them to provide inputs and suggestions for the decisions to be taken and feedback on reformulation of decisions by policy-makers. The table below, taken from FAO, describes well the differences among typologies of participation.

Passive Participation	People participate by being told what is going to happen or has already happened. It is a unilateral announcement by an administration or project management without any listening to people's responses.
Participation in information giving	The information being shared belongs only to external professionals. People participate by answering questions posed by extractive researchers using questionnaire surveys or such similar approaches. People do not have the opportunity to influence proceedings, as the findings of the research are neither shared nor checked for accuracy.
Participation by consultation	People participate by being consulted, and external agents listen to views. These external agents define both problems and solutions, and may modify these in the light of people's responses. Such a consultative process does not concede any share in decision making, and professionals are under no obligation to take on board people's views.
Functional participation	People participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives related to the project, which can involve the development or promotion of externally initiated social organisation. Such involvement tends not to be at early stages of project cycles or planning, but rather after major decisions have already been made. These institutions tend to be dependent on external initiators and facilitators, but may become self-dependent.
Interactive participation	People participate in joint analysis, which leads to action plans and the formation of new local institutions or the strengthening of existing ones. It tends to involve interdisciplinary methodologies that seek multiple objectives and make use of systematic and structured learning processes. These groups take control/ownership over local decisions, and so people have a stake in maintaining structures or practices.

PARTICIPATORY APPROACH



## 2.1 Knowledge brokerage and information gathering

To face the complexity of societal challenges, including environmental problems, policy making needs to be knowledge-based. Traditionally, researchers were considered the knowledge holders and the term "knowledge transfer" has been increasingly used to describe the process of generating knowledge based on user needs, disseminating it, building capacity for its uptake by decision-makers, and finally tracking its application in specific contexts. The concept of Knowledge Brokerage usually refers to knowledge transfer from researchers to policy makers and viceversa, but does not take into consideration other stakeholders such as businesses, civil society organizations and citizens.

The role of science in policy and decision-making has been in fact an issue of intensive debate over the past decade, and the concept of Knowledge Brokerage has been developing in this context (Sheate & Partidario, 2010). In this sense Knowledge brokerage has been identified as a promising strategy (e.g. Slob et al. 2007, van Kammern et al. 2006, CHSRF 2003), for the promotion of interaction among of researchers and policy makers and for developing a mutual understanding of goals and cultures of participating actors.

"Knowledge brokering is one of the human forces behind knowledge transfer. It's a dynamic activity that goes well beyond the standard notion of transfer as a collection of activities that helps move information from a source to a recipient. Brokering focuses on identifying and bringing together people interested in an issue, people who can help each other develop evidence-based solutions. It helps build relationships and networks for sharing existing research and ideas and stimulating new work." (CHSRF 2003).

More recent participatory approaches (Court et al., 2006), have highlighted the role of other stakeholders such as businesses and civil society organizations as holders of a knowledge which represents an important input to policy-makers. URBAN-WASTE adopts this more inclusive approach, also in line with the promotion of the multi-actor approach promoted in H20201.

The quality of Knowledge Brokerage depends on the type and quality of relationships between engaged actors. Trust and confidence represent a prerequisite for effective knowledge brokering (Armstrong et al. 2006, Dobbins et al. 2009). To build trust, the engagement process must be as open and transparent as possible. Also interactions among stakeholders and policy makers must be frequent to reinforce high trust relationships.

Another key element to make Knowledge Brokerage process effective is to organize customized engagement activities: the activities organized to engage with stakeholders and get inputs to policy-making must be customized to the specific policy-making context (van Kammen et al. 2006). The knowledge transfer then need to be multilateral or at least bilateral (from the policy makers to the stakeholders and vice versa). To gather input and knowledge from a diverse type of actors, different interactive activities must be envisaged: some of the activities might address different type of stakeholders in combination with tailored activities addressing a specific group. Appropriate communication styles and tools should be chosen per the different types of stakeholders/actors engaged. The shared language should correspondent to different types of knowledge involved to avoid misunderstandings. For activities engaging actors from different language areas, it is important to implement measures (e.g. use of specific tools, provision of translation services, language support, conscious facilitation) to avoid language barriers.

---

<sup>1</sup> The multi-actor approach is an innovative concept which was introduced in Horizon 2020 for the first time in 2014 for agriculture and forestry projects.



Online tools to be used for Knowledge Brokerage activities need to be carefully chosen and designed in line with the actors' capabilities of using such tools. Especially in the beginning, certain actors may be quite reluctant in engaging in online interaction; prior physical meetings and face-to-face interactions might facilitate the use of online tools afterwards.

## 2.2 Social learning

One of the benefits of stakeholder participation is social learning. Social learning occurs when stakeholders learn from each other through the development of new relationships, building on existing relationships and transforming adversarial relationships. The object of learning is not only related with knowledges or experiences but also with trustworthiness and the appreciation of the legitimacy of each other's views.

Social learning has been considered among the more pragmatic benefits from participation for several reasons. Social learning might transform adversarial relationships and build new ways for participants to collaborate (Stringer et al., 2006). This in turn, if the stakeholders involved are a big group, provides long-terms support to the implementation of the decisions formulated and ultimately a reduction of implementation costs.

Social learning theorists suggest that communities provide a foundation for sharing knowledge. Social constructivists for instance understand learning as an individual's responsibility and the community is the mean by which people learn. Communities provide in fact a safe environment for individuals to engage in learning through observation and interaction with experts and through discussion with colleagues.

## 2.3 Communities of Practices (CoPs)

In order to achieve the double goals of gathering input for the formulation of waste prevention and management strategies and of creating the basis for a successful and efficient implementation of those strategies in 11 different cities, URBAN-WASTE has chosen to adopt the concept of Communities of Practice as group of stakeholders to interact with. The concept of Communities of Practice (CoP) was originally developed by Lave & Wenger (1991), who suggested that learning takes place in social relationships rather than through the simple acquisition of knowledge. CiP are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interaction and on an on-going basis (Wenger 1998; Wenger et al. 2002). They are considered a spontaneous, natural phenomenon among people of a similar trade who occasionally meet to learn from each other, and are characterized by three key dimensions: mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire. In addition, there are four critical elements that make up a CoP (Wenger 1998; Wenger et al. 2002):

- **Domain:** a CoP has an identity defined by a shared domain of interest. Membership implies a commitment to the domain and, therefore, a shared competence that distinguishes members from other people.
- **Community:** in pursuing their interest in the domain, members engage in joint activities and discussions, help each other, and share information. They build relationships that enable them to learn from each other. Having the same job or the same title does not make a CoP unless members interact and learn together.
- **Practice:** Members of a CoP are practitioners. They develop a shared repertoire of resources: experiences, stories, tools, ways of addressing recurring problems – in short, a shared practice. This takes time and sustained interaction.



A well- developed CoP, that appropriately functions in all four dimensions provides an environment that facilitates learning and knowledge development. A CoP is different from a set of people participating in a stakeholder workshop (that as no continuity) or a social network (that has open boundaries and does not necessarily aim at learning). CoP are also seen as distinct from other types of groups such as working groups, in that they spring from the members' interest and passion, are self-organising, voluntary and have fluid goals around learning.

CoP fit within an alternative way of thinking about knowledge production that is often referred to as knowledge co-creation (Regeer & Bunders 2009) or transdisciplinary research (Klein et al. 2001). A crucial difference between transdisciplinary research and other forms of research is that the knowledge of local stakeholders/practitioners is considered beneficial for the development of sustainable solutions to real world problems. Transdisciplinary research is a response to address complex and politically relevant issues, which often cross the borders of sectors and disciplines (Regeer & Bunders 2009; Pohl & Hadorn 2008). Over the years, transdisciplinary approaches have gained importance as a problem-solving approach for fields in which social, technical and economic developments interact with elements of value and culture, including sustainable development, health care and housing (Klein et al. 2001). It has been recognised that CoPs can be helpful in facilitating collaboration between researchers and practitioners. The CoP becomes thus a learning space where participants could bridge the gap between science and practice (Hearn & White 2009). Informal communications between individuals interested in a given domain become the means for sharing information, improving practice and generating new knowledge and skills (Li et al. 2009).

### 3. URBAN-WASTE mobilization approach

This Mobilization and Mutual Learning Plan is based on the experience of the BRIDGE and SEA FOR SOCIETY projects in the CoP application which have been presented above as good practices.

The overall mobilization and mutual learning of URBAN-WASTE will pass through the creation and maintenance of CoPs on waste prevention and management. Although CoP should emerge as a spontaneous phenomenon, in URBAN-WASTE CoP creation will be triggered by pilot partners. In this sense, pilot partners will identify and invite to join the CoPs representatives of stakeholders and will guide them through a participatory process for the formulation of input and feedbacks to waste prevention and management strategies. In URBAN-WASTE, end- users of the urban policies – in this case citizens, businesses and even tourists will all be considered experts able to contribute along with researchers and policy makers at the development of new strategies and policies.

One CoP per pilot area will be established for a total of 11 Communities of Practices.

Interaction and knowledge brokerage within each CoP will occur online through the online platform and offline through ad hoc meetings which will be scheduled and organized by the municipalities in collaboration with the members of the CoP.

Meetings will aim at facilitate CoP members with information and receive input and feedback on the following issues:

- the current situation in waste prevention and management in the pilot area,
- specific challenges of the pilot area



- existing technological and non-technological solutions, practices
- potential prevention and management strategies.

The role of the pilot partner will be thus:

- To schedule and organize the meetings of the CoPs
- Provide and present information
- Trigger a debate and exchange within the CoP
- Collect information and knowledge and transfer it to URBAN-WASTE partners (mainly Consulta Europa, ORDIF, Ambiente Italia).

### 3.1 Stakeholders' identification

Stakeholder identification has partially already been performed and a database of stakeholders (Deliverable 3.1) has been created by each pilot partner including representatives of:

- The tourism value chain: representatives from restaurants, bar, hotels and other tourist establishment have been included. Those representatives might have different functions including managerial ones or more specific such as environmental managers, social corporate responsibility managers, etc.
- Waste management authorities and companies, including both public and private organizations. The activities foreseen in the Plan will serve also to identify additional stakeholders to be invited as members of the CoPs.

### 3.2 CoPs activities

Pilot partners will be asked where possible to couple the CoP meetings with other public events to capitalize on the audience attending the public events and raise awareness and interest in the CoPs.

This task deals on one side with the organization of activities proposed spontaneously from the stakeholders involved in the CoP. Local municipalities will support the emergence of those activities providing venues and other services free of charge for the organization of those and will attend the events organized to collect feedbacks. On the other side, the municipalities, supported by the task leader and the guidelines provided in the Plan, will organize dedicated activities and events to guide the mutual learning towards the production of inputs for the eco-innovative and gender-sensitive strategies.

Each CoP will have to convene in at least four physical meetings from Month 10 (March 2017) to Month 36 (May 2019). Meetings might take different formats according to their scope and the type of stakeholders involved. Dedicated meetings can be foreseen for specific groups of stakeholders. Activities might include:

- round table/panels presentations/ workshops to discuss waste prevention and management challenges, objectives, strategies
- laboratories with male and female adult and children based on role game about the sustainable use of resources and the importance of recycling
- 'green/info days/nights' organized in the city with the collaboration of municipalities and the multidisciplinary team.



- focus group or interactive games with tourists (activities in the most touristic places- beaches, monuments) to get feedback and input to the strategies

## 3.2 CoP e-platform

A joint e-platform will be set up at project level to facilitate the exchange of information among members of a same CoP and of different CoPs. The platform will be thus composed of different “rooms”, each one dedicated to a specific CoP.

Each Cop “room” will be composed of:

- a forum where CoP members will be able to discuss on specific topics proposed by them or by the CoP coordinator. The forum will allow members to share picture and video.
- a section dedicated to “Events and news” will be foreseen to inform CoP members of activities related to the CoP itself or related to waste prevention and management.

The “European room” will be dedicated to foster exchange of information between members of a same CoP. This room will be composed only the forum section.

## 3.3 Schedule of URBAN-WASTE CoP activities

Pilot partners will have to organize at least four physical meetings/events to engage different stakeholders, build their trust and thus facilitate knowledge brokerage offline and online. One CoP’s coordinator will be identified in each pilot before the beginning of the MMLP and will be responsible for the smooth running of the activities and for the communication with WPs leaders.

For each meeting, the Plan define objectives, means and concrete operational steps to be taken by each pilot partners. Deadline for each step are also indicated.

### First activity: public event to gather additional stakeholders and involve them in CoP

<p><b>Objective of the activity</b></p>	<p>Gather additional stakeholders and members of the CoPs</p> <p>Present URBAN-WASTE</p> <p>Inform about EU targets for waste prevention and management</p> <p>Present specific challenges/objectives of the pilot area</p>
<p><b>Type of event and logistical details</b></p>	<p>Public event/fair open air or in big venue</p> <p>One day duration (from 9 to 17)</p> <p>The event should gather and host stands of other relevant organizations (e.g.: hotels with special environmental policies and practices, waste management companies, civil society organizations, environmental NGOs, environmental consultancies). The pilot partner should provide physical space such as exhibition stands where those organizations can exhibit. Exhibitors should provide gadgets and organize animation activities. Stands could be made available for free or upon a fee.</p>



	<p>Standard programme: 1) one session to present EU Waste Directive, URBAN-WASTE project and CoP approach 2) one workshops with participation of different stakeholders on waste challenges and solutions of the pilot area with specific focus on tourism 3) one free activity with children/families (competition on sorting, quizzes, etc)</p> <p>In different areas of the venues, several informative documents must be available for participants describing what CoPs are, what are duties and advantages of members of CoP. Registration forms should be made available for participants.</p>
<b>Expected number of attendants</b>	150
<b>Expected results</b>	Final list of potential members of CoP including around 50 participants (list to be compiled with representatives of organizations invited to attend the event and other participants attending the event collected through a dedicated registration list )
<b>Suggestions</b>	The event might be organized in conjunction with another event related with tourism, waste management or environmental management. Leisure activities in conjunction ( concerts, role games, etc.) can be considered to attract more people.
<b>Date of the event</b>	June-July 2017 during a weekend day preferably (CE proposes to organize the first event on June 5 <sup>th</sup> , in conjunction with the Environment Day).
<b>List of activities</b>	<p>Identify potential events to partner with (by end of February 2017)</p> <p>Identify the venue (by end of March 2017)</p> <p>Identify and invite panellists and exhibitors (by end of March 2017)</p> <p>Identify sponsors (by end of April 2017)</p> <p>Draft programme (by end of April 2017)</p> <p>Dissemination and marketing of the event (printing leaflet, posters-see Dissemination Strategy)</p>
<b>Estimated budget and eligible costs</b>	<p>8.000€ (Venue should be made available through in-kind contribution). Eligible costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Printing of posters/leaflets- communication materials</li> <li>- Gadgets</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sub-contracting for animation services (children activities, etc) and interviews</li> </ul>
<b>Partnerships and sponsorships</b>	<p>Hotels (free access to spa or one night to be raffled during the event)</p> <p>Restaurants (free small catering/snacks, or free lunch/dinner to be raffled)</p> <p>Non-profit associations/NGOs (organize animation activities, provide environmental friendly gadgets)</p> <p>Artists (free performances and/or are exhibitions)</p> <p>Universities (presentation of research projects, demonstration of research activities)</p>
<b>Monitoring indicators</b>	<p>Number of participants (if possible or indicative)</p> <p>Number of partnerships and sponsorships</p> <p>Interviews to at least 10 attendants (gender balanced)</p> <p>Number of expression of interests for CoPs members (detailed by gender)</p>

### Second activity: CoP workshops to collect input for the waste prevention and management strategies

<b>Objective of the activity</b>	To collect input and proposals for waste prevention and management strategies to feed Task 4.1
<b>Type of event and logistical details</b>	<p>Workshop</p> <p>Duration: Half a day</p> <p>Single event gathering representatives of different kind of organizations (research organizations, waste management company, representatives of tourism industry, environmental no-profit organizations and NGOs, environmental consultancies, civil society organizations). <b>This workshop must be presented as the first session of a longer discussion which will finalize during the following workshop.</b> The pilot partner should provide physical space for the organization of the event and organize the agenda</p> <p>Standard programme: 1) discussion on waste management needs from the perspective of local authorities, tourism industry, civil society organizations 2) presentation of data from WP2 (urban metabolic analysis and survey) 3) presentation of good practices on</p>



	waste management 4) debate for the proposal of waste prevention and management strategies
<b>Expected number of attendants</b>	50
<b>Expected results</b>	Report of the workshops List of proposed measures
<b>Suggestions</b>	A facilitator is needed to foster the debate and one recorder to collect all suggestions Foresee a catering (coffee break)
<b>Date of the event</b>	September-October 2017
<b>List of activities</b>	Identify the venue (by end of July 2017) Identify and invite speakers (by end of June 2017) Draft programme (by end of July 2017) Sending out invitation and reminders to members of CoP (end of July and mid-September)
<b>Estimated budget and eligible costs</b>	1.500€ (Venue should be made available through in-kind contribution by public authorities or hotels) Eligible costs: Catering Facilitator
<b>Partnerships and sponsorships</b>	Restaurants (free small catering/snacks) Non-profit associations/NGOs, Universities (provide facilitator)
<b>Monitoring indicators</b>	Number of participants Number of measures proposed

### Third activity: CoP workshop to select waste prevention and management strategies

<b>Objective of the activity</b>	To present a list of waste prevention and management measures and select at least 2-3 to be implemented in each pilot the framework of URBAN-WASTE.
<b>Type of event and logistical details</b>	Workshop



	<p>Duration: one day</p> <p>One single event gathering representatives of different kind of organizations (research organizations, waste management company, representatives of tourism industry, environmental non-profit organizations and NGOs, environmental consultancies, civil society organizations). <b>Possibly the same participants of the previous workshop should attend.</b> The pilot partner should provide physical space for the organization of the event and organize the agenda</p> <p>Standard programme: 1) presentation of the measures proposed by the public authorities and of related indicators 2) presentation of the Waste app and food track devices to be installed 4) Debate to select 2-3 measures and discuss about implementation steps (including partnerships to be established)</p>
<b>Expected attendants</b>	50
<b>Expected results</b>	<p>Report of the workshop</p> <p>List of proposed measures</p>
<b>Suggestions</b>	<p>A facilitator is needed to foster the debate and one recorder to collect all suggestions</p> <p>Foresee a catering (coffee and lunch break)</p>
<b>Date of the event</b>	Mid October- Mid November 2017
<b>List of activities</b>	<p>Identify the venue (by end of September 2017)</p> <p>Identify and invite speakers (by end of September 2017)</p> <p>Draft programme (by end of September 2017)</p> <p>Sending out invitation and reminders to members of CoP (end of September- first half of October)</p>
<b>Estimated budget and eligible costs</b>	<p>2.000€ (Venue should be made available through in-kind contribution)</p> <p>Eligible costs:</p> <p>Catering</p> <p>Facilitator</p>
<b>Partnerships and sponsorships</b>	<p>Restaurants (free small catering/snacks)</p> <p>Non-profit associations/NGOs, Universities (provide facilitator)</p>



<b>Monitoring indicators</b>	Number of participants Number of measures proposed
------------------------------	---

#### Fourth activity: presentation of the strategies and public signature of URBANWASTE Public-Private Partnerships

<b>Objective of the activity</b>	Present to a wider public the measures selected Sign publicly public-private partnerships Public launch of the implementation of URBANWASTE strategies
<b>Type of event and logistical details</b>	Conference/ceremony Half day duration The event should gather all CoP members + representatives of other public authorities Standard programme: 1) Presentation of the strategies 2) Public signature of the partnerships 3) symbolic activity to launch implementation of strategies
<b>Expected number of attendants</b>	50-100
<b>Expected results</b>	Report of the event Public-private partnerships signed
<b>Suggestions</b>	The event should be organized in a symbolic venue (historical building of the municipality) and <b>being promoted in press to ensure visibility</b> of organizations signing the public-private partnerships
<b>Date of the event</b>	January-February 2018
<b>List of activities</b>	Agreeing on the organizations for public-private partnerships (by beginning of November 2017) Developing the public-private partnerships programme (by November 2017) Select and book the venue (by November 2017) Draft programme (by end of November 2017) Dissemination and marketing of the event (since October 2017)



<b>Estimated budget and eligible costs</b>	2.000€ (Venue should be made available through in-kind contribution)  Eligible costs: Catering Communication activities
<b>Partnerships and sponsorships</b>	-
<b>Monitoring indicators</b>	Number of participants  Number of partnerships signed

### 3.4 Other activities

Pilot partners are invited to consider the organizations of other relatively small activities to disseminate information on the URBAN-WASTE measures selected and present those to a wider group of stakeholders. Those activities might include:

- Focus groups with CoP during the implementation of the strategies to collect qualitative information for monitoring and assessment
- Activities for children and families organized in conjunction with museums, schools, etc
- Reuse, repair, recycle workshops
- Art exhibitions
- Other type of activities.

At the same time, specific activities for the monitoring and evaluation of the strategies will be organized under WP6 including a communication campaign and several trainings tailored to different target groups. Those activities are not part of the mobilization plan but will involve members of the CoPs among others.

## 4. Monitoring System of CoP activities

Monitoring activities will aim at assessing the efficacy and efficiency of the CoPs.

Monitoring will include assessment of quantitative aspects and quality aspects. Quantitative assessment deals with the number of events organized and the number of stakeholders engaged at each step of the Mobilization Plan. The table below reports the minimum number of indicators which will be monitored for offline and online mobilization activities.



Indicator	Unit of measure
Events organized	Number
Participants involved	Number (per gender)
Members of CoPs	Number (per gender)
Public-private partnerships signed	Number
Organizations involved in the public-private partnerships	Number
Users registered in the CoP local (and European) "room" of the e-platform	Number
Online interactions	Number of discussions initiated (per week) Number of posts (per week)

The monitoring activities consider also qualitative aspects and aims at assessing the efficiency of CoPs in terms of:

- Collecting concrete inputs for the formulation of strategies
- Ensuring representativeness of different actors in the CoPs

For the qualitative evaluations, interviews with members of CoPs will be carried out. A template of questionnaire will be developed by CE.

## 5. Staff exchanges and mutual learning meetings

The objectives of the staff exchange will be to learn more in detail about waste policies, strategies or measures implemented in another city which are suitable for replication elsewhere. 2-3 representatives from the industry will also join those staff exchanged in order to learn about innovative technologies or on specific challenges faced by the municipalities which could be solved by existing to new technologies.



PLACES	TOPIC	DATE
Florence	<p><b>Gender mainstreaming in Waste Management</b></p> <p>How to include and consider gender in all the aspects of waste management</p>	M6 – December 2016
Santander	<p><b>ICT solution for awareness raising</b></p> <p>How to include data and reward form the cities in the WasteApp and how to use it</p>	M9 – March 2017
Copenhagen	<p><b>EU Waste Directive: good practices</b></p> <p>Considering the EU Waste Directive and the new circular economy package, best practices of implementation will be presented to the pilot cases. Best practices could be selected among the pilot themselves and should focus on actions interrelated with tourism activities</p>	M12 - June 2017
Nicosia	<p><b>Urban planning: participatory processes and collectively-based decision making</b></p> <p>Public participation and stakeholder involvement are key aspects of a sustainable and inclusive urban planning. A training on how to include these actors in the development and the implementation of the waste prevention and management strategies will be provided to the pilots</p>	M15 - September 2017
Nice	<p><b>Food waste: how to face it?</b></p> <p>Food waste in an increasing issue and it is even more relevant in tourist cities. The URBANWASTE food track will help the pilots in solving this issue and during this mutual learning the pilots will be trained on how to implement this solution. Relevant best practices coming from pilots and/or other relevant example from tourist cities will be considered</p>	M18 – December 2017
Ponta Delgada	<p><b>Waste management practices and measures</b></p> <p>According to the waste management strategies developed within URBANWASTE a mutual learning and exchange of best practices among the pilots will take place. The WasteApp will also be presented in this occasion.</p>	M21 – March 2018
Kavala	<p><b>Waste prevention practices and measures</b></p> <p>According to the waste prevention strategies developed within URBANWASTE a mutual learning and exchange of best practices among the pilots will take place. Best</p>	M24 – June 2018



	practices from cities/organization that are dealing with the same issues coming from tourism will also be invited to share their knowledge.	
<b>Syracuse</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Littering</b></p> <p>Littering can be considered as an important issue in several pilots. Best practices in its management will be investigated and presented</p>	<b>M27 – September 2018</b>
<b>Lisbon</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Implementation of the eco-innovative waste management measures: barriers and good practices</b></p> <p>Good practices and barriers to overcome encountered during the implementation phase, will be deeply analysed and discussed in this mutual learning</p>	<b>M30 – December 2018</b>
<b>Dubrovnik</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Monitoring the results</b></p> <p>First results of the implementation phase will be discussed and analysed.</p>	<b>M33 – March 2019</b>
<b>Brussels</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Impact assessment</b></p> <p>The last mutual learning will be the occasion for the pilots to share the results and the impacts of the implemented actions</p>	<b>M36 – June 2019</b>



## Bibliography

Armstrong R., Water E., Roberts H., Oliver S., Popay J., The role and theoretical evolution of knowledge translation and exchange in public health, 2006, Journal of Public Health Advance Access

Brugha R., Varvasovszky Z., Stakeholder analysis: a review, Health Policy and Planning, 2000, 15(3), pp. 239-246

Bryson J.M., What to do when stakeholders matter. Stakeholder Identification and Analysis Techniques, Public Management Review, 2004, Vol. 6. Issue 1, pp. 21-53

Chrysoulakis N., Anselmo de Castro E., Moors E.J., Understanding Urban Metabolism: A tool for urban planning, 2014, Routledge

CHSRF – Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, Knowledge Brokering in Canada's Health system, 2003, Preliminary Report

Court J., Mendizabal E., Osborne D., Young J., Policy Engagement: How civil society can be more effective, 2006, ODI, London

Dobbins M., Robeson P., Ciliska D., Hanna S., Cameron R., O'Mara L., A description of a knowledge broker role implemented as part of a randomized controlled trial evaluating three knowledge translation strategies, 2009, Implement Science, 4:23

Freeman E. R., Harrison S. J., Stakeholders, social responsibility and performance: empirical evidence and theoretical perspectives, , Academy of Management Journal, 1999, Vol. 42, No. 5, pp. 479-485

Glicken J., Effective public involvement in public decisions, Science Communication, 1999, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 298-327

Hearn S., White N., Communities of Practice: linking knowledge, policy and practice, 2009, <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publicatinos-opinion-files/1732.pdf>

Klein J.T., Grossenbacher-Mansuy W., Haberli R., Bill A., Scholz R.W & Melti M., Transdisciplinarity: joint problem solving among science, technology and society – an effective way for managing complexity, 2001, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel

Kleivink B., Janssen M., Tan Y.H., A Stakeholder Analysis of Business-to-Government Information Sharing: the Governance of a Public-Private Platform. International Journal of Electronic Government Research, 2012, 8(4)

Lave J., Wenger E., Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation, 1991, Cambridge University Press

Li L.C., Grimshaw J.M., Nielsen C., Judd M., Coyte P.C., Graham I.D., Use of Communities of Practice in business and health care sectors: a systematic review, 2009, Implementation Science, 4 (27)

Pohl C., Hadorn G.H., Methodological challenges of transdisciplinary research, 2008, Natures Sciences Sociétés 16, EDP Sciences, pp. 111-121

Reed M.S., Dougill A.J., Baker T., Participatory indicator development: what can ecologists and local communities learn from each other?, Ecological Applications, 2012, 18, pp. 1253-1269

Reeger B.J., Bunders J.F.G., Knowledge co-creation: Interaction between science and society. A transdisciplinary approach to complex societal issues, 2009, RMNO, The Netherlands



Sheate W.R., Partidario, Strategic approaches and assessment techniques—Potential for knowledge brokerage towards sustainability, *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 30, 2010, pp. 278–288

Slob A.F.L., Rijnveld M., Chapman A.S., Strosser P., Challenges of linking scientific knowledge to river basin management policy: AquaTerra as a case study, *Environmental Pollution*, 2007, Volume 148, Issue 3, pp. 867–874

Stringer L.C., Dougill A.J., Fraser E., Hubacek K., Prell C., Reed M. S., Unpacking “Participation” in the Adaptive Management of Social– ecological Systems: a Critical Review, 2006, *Ecology and Society* 11(2): 39

Van Kammen J., De Savigny D., Sewankambo N., Using knowledge brokering to promote evidence based policy-making: The need for support structures, 2006, *Bull World Health Organ*, 84, pp. 608– 612

Weiss C., The many meanings of research utilization, *Public Administration Review*, 1979; 39, pp. 429-31

Wenger E., *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, 1998, Cambridge University Press

Wenger E., McDermott R. A., Snyder W., *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge*, 2002, Harvard business School Press., Boston

Wenger E., *Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems: The Career of a Concept*, 2010, *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice*, Blackmore, Springer London, pp. 179-198

Wilcox D., The guide to effective participation, <http://partnerships.org.uk/guide/>