



**Improving Interaction between NGOs,
Universities, and Science Shops:
Experiences and Expectations**

TOOL-KIT

SCENARIO WORKSHOP

by
Andrea Gnaiger & Gabriela Schroffenegger

December 2003



A project funded by the European
Commission/DG 12 under the Fifth
RTD Framework Programme

Contract No. HPV1-CT-2001-60039

Table of Contents

Preface: Introduction on the Interacts Project and the Work Packages

I. Introduction

I.1 What is a Scenario Workshop and why to conduct one?

II. Basic Scenario Workshop Tool - BSWT

II.1 The Adaptation of the EASW Methodology and the Rational in Detail

II.1.1 Selection of Participants / The Interest (Role) Groups

II.1.2 Time Frame

II.1.3 Development of Scenarios

II.1.4 Provision of Scenarios and Chairing of Working Groups

II.2 Main Elements to be included in the Basic Tool to conduct a Scenario Workshop

II.2.1 Introductory Session in Plenary

II.2.2 Presentations of the Organiser

II.2.3 Group Session: Development of the Scenario within the four Interest Groups (Role Groups)

II.2.4 Plenary Session: Presentation of the Results of each Interest Group (Role Group).

II.2.5 Plenary Session: Identification of Common Themes derived from the four Scenarios

II.2.6 Group Session: Division of the Participants into four Thematic Groups

II.2.7 Plenary Session: Presentation of the Results of each Thematic Group

II.2.8 Plenary Session: Plenary Discussions of what to do next - drawing up an Action Plan (a Master Plan)

II.2.9 Feedback Round and Farewell

II.2.10 A Follow-up Meeting

II.3 Crucial Steps and important Issues to consider in organising a Scenario Workshop

II.3.1 Selection of Participants

II.3.2 Drop out Rate

II.3.3 Gender Issues

II.3.4 Moderation

III. National Modifications of the Basic Scenario Workshop Tool

III.1 The Innsbruck (Austria) Scenario Workshop

III.1.1 Workshop Programme

III.2 The Kopenhagen (Denmark) Scenario Workshop

III.2.1 The Workshop Programme

III.3 The Sevilla (Spain) Scenario Workshop

III.3.1 The Workshop Programme

IV. Data and Material produced in the Scenario Workshop available for further Analysis

IV.1 Written Results of the Scenario Workshop

IV.2 The Process

IV.3 Feedback

IV.4. Added Value of the Scenario Workshop for the Organizer

Preface: Introduction on the Interacts Project and the Work Packages

Michael Strähle and Sosser Rasmussen

This Scenario Workshop Tool-kit has been developed for the INTERACTS project, which has the overall objective:

To develop policy implications for future co-operation in Science, Technology and Innovation, in particular for the co-operation of small and medium NGOs with universities through intermediaries such as Science Shops.

INTERACTS is a pioneering cross-national study by organisations and institutions from seven different countries – Austria, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Romania, Spain, and the United Kingdom - collaborating across disciplines to identify necessary changes in structures and routines in the RTD system for improving future interaction between NGOs, researchers, and intermediaries like Science Shops. Out of the aggregate results from different countries a broader picture emerges concerning past experiences of the impact of Science Shops, future expectations and policy relevance. In this way, INTERACTS contributes to strengthening the interaction between research institutions and society, and provides a more in-depth understanding of the processes and effects of knowledge production.

INTERACTS is an Accompanying Measure to ISSNET, “Improving Science Shop Networking”, and financed by the European Commission, DG 12.

INTERACTS is made up of five interlinked activities. These National Case Studies Reports constitute the second activity in the INTERACTS project:

1. The State-of-the-Art Report provides an overview of the political and institutional conditions for co-operation between small and medium non-governmental organisations (NGOs), Science Shops, and Universities in Austria, Denmark, Germany, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom.
2. The National Case Studies Reports examine the practical experience and impact of the interaction between NGOs, scientists, and Science Shops.
3. **Scenario Workshops** in each of the partner countries form the next step, allowing discussion of future expectations and perspectives for co-operation between NGO representatives, researchers and policy makers. By giving a voice to a broader range of stakeholders, INTERACTS contributes to the democratisation of science and technology policy.
4. The final report will identify opportunities and obstacles within the R&D environment , thus improving conditions for future co-operation.
5. In a final step, the INTERACTS findings will be disseminated through national and international workshops and conferences.

Further information: <http://members.chello.at/wilawien/interacts/main.html>

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1. What is a Scenario Workshop and why to conduct one?

Work package 5 of the INTERACTS project deals with the future expectations of and the perspectives for cooperation between the four actor groups NGOs, intermediaries, scientists and politicians, concerning the “improvement of the dialogue between science and society”. A workshop bringing together all actor groups was envisaged. The obvious methodological approach to choose was an adaptation of the European Awareness Scenario Workshop method (EASW). This approach is a good tool to support and facilitate active participation of people from across society and across different interest groups.

The EASW methodology was originally developed by the European Commission’s Innovation Programme in 1994 as a way of promoting awareness and planning for sustainability in the urban environment by bringing together participants from different backgrounds – technology experts, policy makers, residents, and employers – to consider future scenarios and to discuss how to overcome barriers to success.

The European Awareness Scenario Workshop Method allows the direct participation of four social groups from civil society. The setting of a EASW Workshop offers the participants a direct opportunity for exchanging and discussing their points of view, doubts, suggestions and wishes regarding a particular topic or problem with experts and decision-makers. Furthermore it is a tool for promoting dialogue, furthering involvement and for managing a constructive discussion between various actor groups.

The Collingridge dilemma also supports this choice of method. It states that: The attentiveness of society for a certain problem or future development reaches its highest point at a time when control or influence of society on this problem is not possible any more.

As a consequence, the timely involvement of the citizens in decision-finding processes, with respect to problems they are concerned with, can increase the chance of timely intervention and control.

To summarize the main aims of the Scenario Workshop:

- It helps raising awareness of future problems in the community.
- It helps developing a common definition of a desirable development.
- It allows discussions with different social groups about obstacles on the way towards a future worth living.
- It allows to identify and discuss the differences and similarities of problems and solutions as perceived by the 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 realized 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.

The central element in the Scenario Workshop approach is dialogue aiming at moderating the participants to develop their own visions related to a specific focus question and their specific area of interest, and through discussions enabling the participants to identify and develop suggestions on options to achieve their vision.

Based on the standardized European Awareness Scenario Workshop methodology “Pax Mediterranea” developed a first adaptation of the methodology explained in detail in the “INSTRUCTIONS BOOKLET” – an INTERACTS Methodology for group discussions and analysis: an adaptation of the EASW and BASIS Public Participation Tool (for full details see booklet)

Bases on this booklet “The FBI Centre” further developed and adapted the methodology to the specific needs of the INTERACTS project partners. This further step was necessary as the majority of the project partners have not been experienced with the EASW methodology and needed a very basic tool, which could easily be adapted to their specific boundary conditions. In addition it proved to be necessary to have a training unit on the EASW methodology which took place at the third internal INTERACTS project meeting in Rinn, (Innsbruck – Austria) prepared and conducted by Gabriela Schroffenegger from “the FBI Centre” and Alain Labatut from “Pax Mediterranea”.

II. BASIC SCENARIO WORKSHOP TOOL - BSWT

II.1. The Adaptation of the EASW Methodology and the Rational in Detail

II.1.1 Selection of Participants / The Interest (Role) Groups

With respect to the key stakeholders in the INTERACTS project it was decided to have the following four role groups to be present at the Scenario Workshop:

1. NGO representatives
2. Politicians/decision makers
3. Universities/researchers
4. Intermediaries

This subdivision is necessary to balance the various interests of the different role groups and to include them on an equal basis. All participating role groups are regarded as experts on an equal basis with knowledge of the problem and solution trails.

II.1.2 Time Frame

An EASW is scheduled to last two days in order to provide enough time to develop the scenarios and plan the activities.

The partners of the INTERACTS project decided to shorten the time frame of the Scenario Workshop to one day by combining and shortening intermediary stages.

The rationale for this decision lay in the realistic assumption that for politicians and university professors a workshop organised by a non-official institution like the Science Shops would not warrant abandoning their day-to-day activities for two whole days. So, in order to prevent getting only second and third ranking representatives to attend, it was decided to contract the time frame.

The second reason for shortening the time was the broadness of the topic. It was clear from the start that even two days would not be enough to discuss the topic exhaustively, rather, the workshop would only serve to discover ideas, compare them and, at the most, agree on first steps to be taken in consultation with each other. The hope was to put into motion a process of dialogue and networking which has to be continued longer term on a regional level.

II.1.3 Development of Scenarios

Within an EASW the role groups develop a best-case (positive) and a worst-case (negative) scenario. For practical reasons, time constraints and also with respect to the general aim of the Scenario Workshop to investigate on the improvement of the relationship between university and society most partners decided to focus only on the best-case scenario. Even in the case a worst-case scenario is developed it is just to contrast the best-case scenario. Experience shows that people more easily develop a worst-case scenario compared to a best-case scenario. It supports developing the best-case scenario.

II.1.4 Provision of Scenarios and Chairing of Working Groups

In the classic version of an EASW, the participating groups are being confronted with given scenarios, in the case of urban planning on a scale of more or less technological development and more or less personal initiative.

The given topic could, of course, also be modified. Most INTERACTS partners, however, did without pre-given scenarios and chairing of working groups. This is due to the perceived high expertise of the invited participants and the small numbers. It was considered too unwieldy and also patronising to chair a working group of city councillors, university professors, high-ranking civil servants etc. The people invited knew best what they wanted to discuss and wanted to do that in an unrestricted manner. There would have been little point for the organisers to construct future scenarios, only to have them rejected and start the working process on a negative note. We wanted to find out about new ideas, new visions and not hamper them with too tight a framework. The project workers of the Science Shops, for

whom INTERACTS is their second project on science transfer via intermediaries, think they know from experience and from their research work with this model in its various forms and development, how the dialogue between science and society via intermediaries can work, but they do not want this knowledge to dominate to such an extent, that other possibilities are not being considered any more. We as workers of the Science Shops are keen to discover ideas hitherto not considered in our work and the best way to do this is not to channel the participants thinking into given scenarios.

II.2. Main Elements to be included in the Basic Scenario Workshop Tool to conduct a Scenario Workshop

A Basic Scenario Workshop is arranged as a combination of group and plenary sessions. In the course of the Scenario Workshop the participants will go through a combination of different activities: brainstorming, development of positive scenarios, group and plenary presentations, development of actions or strategies in order to achieve a certain situation, dialogue and negotiations.

II.2.1 Introductory Session in Plenary

The Scenario Workshop starts with an introductory session in plenary, welcoming the participants and explaining them about the programme of the day.

II.2.2 Presentations of the Organiser

These presentations are explaining the wider settings and the aims of the workshop. There is also room for a short presentation of the organiser organisation and for any material the organiser considers as helpful in the frame of the workshop.

II.2.3 Group Session: Development of the Future Scenario within the four Interest Groups (Role Groups)

The participants develop and discuss within their role group a positive scenario related to the scenario workshop focus question (the prospective question) reflecting their interests and future expectations. To support this process it is helpful to provide the groups with handouts to help develop the scenario, pointing out the main questions to ask and what steps to take. (see Appendix: XXX)

Each role group develops one common future scenario reflecting their interests and future expectations.

A minimum participation of four persons per role group is recommended. The maximum participation per role group should be limited to eight persons to give the individual participants a chance to discuss and bring forwards ones view.

It is recommended to have around one and a half hour of discussion time.

II.2.4 Plenary Session: Presentation of the Results of each Interest Group (Role Group)

The individual scenarios are presented by on spokesperson each and are compared with each other. Thus one can learn to understand the ideas, fears and wishes of the participating role groups and identify common ground and conflicting issues. The discussion stimulates mutual understanding. Individual motives, backgrounds, intentions become visible and decisions are made transparent and comprehensible.

II.2.5 Plenary Session: Identification of common Themes derived from the four Scenarios

In a first step a list of common topics and themes derived from the four scenarios gets drawn up by the participants. In a second step this list gets whittled down to four themes to continue working in the thematic groups.

II.2.6 Group Session: Division of the Participants into four Thematic Groups

Here the participants are divided into four thematic groups, and the aim is to discuss and develop means of actions towards the chosen theme for further discussions. Each thematic group consists of participants of all role groups. Thus the scenarios from the individual groups are present in each thematic group. Each thematic group gets supplied with a handout focusing on the suggested questions and including a coordinate axes schema supporting a structured presentation of the findings. (see Appendix: XXX)

A minimum participation of four persons per thematic group is recommended (one representative of each role group). The maximum participation per thematic group should be limited to eight persons to give the individual participants a chance to discuss and bring forwards ones view.

It is recommended to have around one and a half hour of discussion time.

II.2.7 Plenary Session: Presentation of the Results of each Thematic Group

II.2.8 Plenary Session: Plenary Discussions of what to do next - drawing up an Action Plan (a Master Plan)

This part of the participatory workshop brings us back to reality. Based on the results of the thematic groups a plan is developed for the implementation of the results, i.e. what each participant or participating group can contribute to the realisation of the scenarios. This last step opens up perspectives for concerted action, shows practicable ways for implementation and can go as far as developing a strategic action plan. In some cases an actual action plan is developed pointing out responsibilities of the different actors, and in other cases, the scenario workshop ends with several suggestions to change a given situation, but without pointing out responsibilities.

II.2.9 Feedback Round and Farewell

II.2.10 Follow up Meeting

A Follow-up Meeting some weeks after the Scenario Workshop is recommended with the aim of discussing workshop results and next steps.

II.3. Crucial Steps and important Issues to consider in organising a Scenario Workshop (Based on Experience in the INTERACTS Scenario Workshops)

II.3.1 Selection of Participants

For a successful scenario workshop, the selection of participants is a major factor. Choosing and contacting the participants is a rather time-consuming task. For this task it is a necessity to know the regional structures and to have knowledge about the key players concerning the topic of the workshop. The organisation of the Scenario Workshop in Innsbruck started three months in advance of the workshop with discussions about a potentially ideal list of participants to conduct a successful workshop that would achieve optimum outcomes. As a result, a preliminary list of participants, already grouped into the four role groups (NGO representatives, researchers, policy makers and intermediaries), was drawn up, followed by a first conceptual outline of the workshop

Based on this meeting and further internal discussions on the preparation of the workshop, a revised and extended list of participants was drawn up.

This list consisted of two sections:

List A contained 33 names, already subdivided into the four role groups, who were considered to be key figures with reference to the selected workshop topic “The future of the dialogue between science and society through intermediaries” and rated as priority A; and List B containing 28 names of people considered important in the context of the workshop and rated as priority B.

The aim was to attract as many participants as possible from List A. The definitive list of participants included names from list A and B in equal numbers.

In a next step, special consideration was being given to the information material that in a first shot was to be sent to the key figures from list A.

All potential participants were first contacted personally, either by telephone or in person, and informed about the aims of the workshop and the INTERACTS project. On showing interest they received further information via the internet (letter of invitation, information on the FBI Centre, the INTERACTS project and the methods, press release...).

II.3.2 Drop out Rate

One must be aware that the drop out rate can be rather high (in the case of the Innsbruck workshop it was 20 %). To have the minimum number of participants (16) it is recommended to have the firm agreement to participate of at least 20 people.

II.3.3 Gender Issues

Special attention has to be paid to gender issues in the different phases of the organisation of the workshop and also during the workshop itself.

In the course of the selection process, special efforts have to be made to ensure an equal number of women and men in each group of participants in comparable positions. The way the workshop is run has to take account of the different ways women and men communicate. It will be the task of the moderator to ensure that women and men can participate in the discussions on an equal footing and that no participant, irrespective of “gender”, can dominate the proceedings. The working groups (interest groups and thematic groups) have to be encouraged to choose women and men as spokespersons to present the groups’ result in the plenum in an equal measure.

II.3.4 Moderation

It is recommended to have a moderator who is either familiar with the concept of a Scenario Workshop or is experienced in moderating similar workshops that are characterised by a high level of group dynamics. It is important to have a professional moderator to make sure that the participants feel they are guided correctly through all the processes of the workshop. To conduct a Scenario Workshop with around 20 participants it is sufficient to have one moderator and one co-moderator who in principal is responsible for making sure that the participants are supplied with all materials needed and furthermore for facilitating the group processes when needed.

The most important and also crucial step within the methodological adaptation of the Scenario Workshop is to draw out the topics for the thematic groups based on all individual scenarios. This is in contrast to an EASW workshop where the topics for the thematic groups are already fixed from the beginning. The topics will not emerge during the course of the workshop as it is the case in our adaptation where the topics depend on the participants and the discussion. This makes it very thrilling but it is also a great challenge for the moderator. It is recommended to have enough time for this important step and to prepare a selection of methods supporting the participants to develop or extract the topics. The moderator has to be very flexible and he has to have skills in guiding the participants without being too pushy.

III. NATIONAL MODIFICATIONS OF THE BASIC SCENARIO WORKSHOP TOOL

Based on the Basic Scenario Workshop Tool as described in chapter II national adaptations have been conducted in all INTERACTS partner countries.

The idea behind was a wish to mobilise civil society organisations, university researchers, Science Shops and policy makers to develop the debate at national and international level about potentials and expectations for future co-operation between civil society organisations, researchers and Science Shops.

To get an impression on the wide spectrum of possibilities of application and adaptation of the basic tool the authors selected 3 examples of national Scenario Workshops, which will be explained in more detail in this chapter. The examples selected are the Scenario Workshops in Innsbruck (Austria), Kopenhagen (Denmark) and Sevilla (Spain).

The major elements of adaptation are described at the beginning of each sub-chapter followed by an outline of the workshop programme. It will not be possible to refer to every detail of adaptation. It is recommended for the interested reader to refer to the individual national Scenario Workshop reports to get the full details.

III.1 The Innsbruck (Austria) Scenario Workshop

This example was chosen to illustrate the application of the Basic Scenario Workshop Tool method as described in chapter II.

III.1.1 Workshop Programme

9.00

Welcome

Short introduction on the FBI Centre, the INTERACTS project and the wider setting of ISSNET and SCIPAS (*input1*)

9.05

Introduction on the European Awareness Scenario Workshop method - Reasons (*Collingride Dilemma*) and aims (*input2*)

Presentation and explanation of the workshop process plan

9.15

Short presentation of each participant (3 minutes per person) covering the following aspects:

Who: name, education, position within the organisation

What and how: institution - aims – fields of interest - clients

Why: expectations from the workshop

One spontaneous phrase on the topic "Dialogue between science and society" – which was written down on a poster

10.15

Instruction and explanation of the first task, the development of the scenario (2010), for each role group in the plenum. (*Instruction: teamwork 1 – handout: questions 1 – see below*)

10.30

Development of the scenario by each "Role Group"

Integrated coffee break

11.40

Presentation of the scenario by a representative of each "Role Group" (15 minutes per scenario):

Additions to the presentation of each scenario are allowed for role group members only.

Questions asking for clarification of certain aspects are allowed for all participants regardless the role group they are in.

12.50

Gathering of common aspects for all scenarios and aspects that are specific to individual scenarios.

Selection of the most important 4 aspects

13.00 - 14.00

Buffet

14.00

Recapitulation of the most important 4 topics and drawing up of themes to work on in the "Thematic Groups" (mixed groups)

Instruction and explanation of the second task on how to continue working in the thematic groups (*Instruction: teamwork 2 – handout: questions 2, see below*)

Selection of participants for the thematic groups

14.30

Teamwork "Thematic Groups"

Integrated coffee break

15.40

Presentation of the thematic group results by a representative of each thematic group (15 minutes per thematic group):

Additions to the presentation of each scenario are allowed for role group members only.

Questions asking for clarification of certain aspects are allowed for all participants regardless the role group they are in.

16.20

Feasibility assessment of the suggestions by all participants (*Instruction 3*)

List of activities drawn up from the most popular suggestions

16.30

Development of a “Master plan” - optional discussion on first steps that can be taken to get closer to the intended scenario, common wishes, requirements... This can take place either in the plenum or by using cards (personal declaration of intention).

Comparing the results or as a second option comparison of the personal declarations of intention with the statements on the “dialogue between science and society” from the beginning of the workshop.

16.45

Feedback and farewell

- *(Instruction: teamwork 1 – handout: questions 1)*

Handout 1: Each role group (politicians, scientists, NGOs, intermediaries) was supplied with a handout to help develop the scenario, pointing out the main questions to ask and what steps to take.

Questions:

What are the main steps taken to reach the scenario?

What are the main factors contributing to it?

In which areas have things happened which furthered the scenario?

- *(Instruction: teamwork 2 – handout: questions 2)*

Handout 2: Each thematic group was supplied with a handout focusing on the suggested questions and including a coordinate axes schema supporting a structured presentation of the findings.

Questions:

Which activities could promote the topic? – Keeping in mind the scenario.

Who can do it? Who can assist?

Which decisions have to be made?

Which obstacles can be expected?

Coordinate axes (4) for answering the questions:

Present state: goes into more details of the topic

Targeted state: activities, changes

Who can, should participate: who else has to be involved?

Obstacles to be expected:

III.2 The Copenhagen (Denmark) Scenario Workshop

There are three major elements that differentiate this workshop from the Basic Scenario Workshop Tool. These elements of adaptation are: the number of interest groups, the development of a negative (worst-case scenario) and additional information material for the participants called “inspiration material”.

- The number of interest groups

The Danish organizer team decided to operate with five Interest groups, instead with four as described in the Basic Scenario Workshop Tool. The interest groups were: Science Shops, university researchers, civil society organisations, university policy makers and students. The rationale behind the decision to split up the interest group researchers into university researchers and students was the assumption that those groups would have different views and visions, which during the course of the workshop turned out to be the case.

- The development of a negative scenario (worst-case scenario)

Each interest group developed a positive and a negative scenario addressing the focus question of the Scenario Workshop. The negative scenario was produced to contrast the positive scenario. There was made no further use of this scenario in the course of the workshop.

- The “inspiration material”

The Danish organizer team decided to enrich the presentation session of the organizers by material called “inspiration material”.

This material contained information about the national and international status for Science Shops, about the Danish university policy, and the tendencies within the Danish university policy. It further illustrated experiences with Science Shops and similar initiatives for the participants in order to be inspired and get an understanding of which influence and effect Science Shop projects can have on the involved actors and on societal development.

III.2.1 The Workshop Programme

Interacts Scenario Workshop Programme	
3. June 2002, from 8:45 am to 5 pm	
8:45 am	Arrival Breakfast, coffee and tea
9:00 am	Introduction Welcome – presentation of workshop moderators and the Interacts research project (5 minutes) Presentation of the workshop programme and structure (10 minutes) Presentation of the participants (25 minutes) Presentation of the present situation (the so called zero scenario) (10 minutes)
9:50 am	Break
10:10 am	Group session 1 Development and discussions of scenarios (one positive and one negative scenario) in Interest groups (procedure and time table explained in handouts to each Interest group)
11:30	Plenary session 1

am	<p>Presentation of the Interest groups scenarios (6 minutes pr Interest group, in total 30 minutes)</p> <p>Discussions of the scenarios and elements in the scenarios (35 minutes)</p> <p>Identification of four themes (15 minutes)</p> <p>Development of Theme groups (10 minutes)</p>
1 pm	Lunch
2 pm	<p>Group session 2</p> <p>Discussions in Theme groups</p> <p>Each group discusses solutions and actions needed in regards to the theme they are working with (procedure and time table explained in handouts to each Theme group)</p>
3:20 pm	Break
3:30 pm	<p>Plenary session 2</p> <p>Presentation and explanations of the Theme groups discussions and solutions (10 minutes pr Theme group, in total 40 minutes)</p> <p>Discussions of strategies to how the co-operation between civil society and universities can be strengthened, and how the Science Shops can contribute in this process (40 minutes)</p> <p>Round off (10 minutes)</p>
5 pm	Informal drinks

III.3 The Sevilla (Spain) Scenario Workshop

The major elements that differentiate this Scenario Workshop from the Basic Scenario Workshop Tool are a SWOT analysis and the development of multiple strategic visions by each interest group (instead of one vision per group)

- The SWOT analysis

The SWOT-Analysis works out the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the present system of the science and society relationship in Spain that can limit or foster the development of Science Shops in Spain.

- The Development of multiple visions per interest group (role group)

In the Spanish Scenario Workshop the individual interest groups developed up to four strategic visions (instead of just one) in relation to the prospective question. In addition the individual interest groups were instructed not only to focus on positive aspects but as well as on handicaps and challenges.

III.3.1 The Workshop Programme

Will be inserted.

IV. Data and Material produced in the Scenario Workshop available for further Analysis of the Scenario Workshop

IV.1 Written Results of the Scenario Workshop

To analyse the Scenario Workshop the following raw data respective raw material are available.

- 1.1. The flipcharts or posters of the four scenarios produced by the individual interest groups.
- 1.2. The commonly selected themes (to continue in the thematic groups) showing the discussions the participants are interested in.
- 1.3. The flip charts or posters from the thematic groups.
- 1.4. Finally a master plan including activities and responsibilities for the future. This master plan is not a necessity but an option depending on the willingness and possibilities of the participants.

IV.2 The Process

The protocol and the impression the moderator gains in the course of the workshop are showing the process of the scenario development, the drawing up of the themes and the planning of further steps. The participants points of view and the dynamics of the discussions are documented.

It can be seen how the different point of views get closer to each other and to what extend and under which conditions the development of common themes and common activities is possible. The process of generating themes based on the individual scenarios and the inherent logic of the interest groups and the thematic groups gets documented.

IV.3 Feedback

At the end of the workshop there is a feedback round of the participants reflecting their impressions, feelings and perception. This way a first glance on the immediate effect of the workshop on the participants is possible. An evaluation of the planned activities (as described in the master plan) 6 to 12 month after the workshop can also contribute to the analysis of

the Scenario Workshop. This second step evaluation may be organized as a feed back workshop or an informal meeting.

IV.4. Added Value of the Scenario Workshop for the Organizer

Apart from disseminating the Scenario Workshop results the Scenario Workshop contributes to the attempt to build up a network of similar initiatives, key players and politicians in the region. Furthermore a Scenario Workshop is a good opportunity to get into contact with potential partners and to get to know their points of view and interests. The organizer (the Science Shop) can present himself as a competent partner for networking and mediating. Based on the results and experiences gained the landscape of knowledge production and knowledge application can be better understood and can be documented.