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Message from the IAP2 Federation

It gives us great pleasure to present the winners of the 2013 IAP2 International Core Values Awards.

This year for the first time the IAP2 Federation Board supported a new model of Core Values Awards, one where each Affiliate runs their own awards program, with winners of these being considered for Core Values Awards internationally. Put simply, the International Core Values Awards would be ‘the best of the best’ in three International Award categories: Project of the Year, Organization of the Year and Research Project of the Year.

IAP2 Federation Affiliates in Australasia, Southern Africa and the United States ran programs this year with winners being announced in Johannesburg, South Africa, Adelaide, South Australia, and Salt Lake City, Utah. For IAP2 members in Affiliates that did not run an awards program this year, the IAP2 Federation held the Member-at-Large awards to offer an opportunity for members around the world to submit their work. The winners in this group have been judged along with winning entries submitted by Affiliates for the international honors.

We are pleased to announce two entries in the Member-at-Large awards program are recognized for their excellence in the Project of the Year category.

Highly Commended is awarded to the City of Calgary/Calgary Transit for their entry titled “RouteAhead: The 30-year strategic plan for Calgary Transit” submitted by IAP2 Canada member Tracy McCabe.

The Winner of Project of the Year in the Member at Large group is awarded to Intelligent Futures, for their entry titled “Our Wascana” submitted by IAP2 Canada member John Lewis.

Please join us congratulating both organizations on their work to further the practice of P2.

The Project of the Year entries recognized by our national Affiliates are:

- IAP2 Southern Africa: Sonja Pithey Consulting submitted the winning Project of the Year for the City of Cape Town S78(3) Waste Review Stakeholder Engagement process.

- IAP2 Australasia: City of Marion, South Australia was recognized as the Project of the Year for Making Marion – A Community Plan towards 2040 submitted by Patrice Pearson.
• IAP2 USA recognized Healthy Democracy for their Project of the Year entry, “The Citizens’ Initiative Review” submitted by Tyrone Reitman and the City of West Hollywood, Social Services Division for their entry titled “City of West Hollywood 2013 Community Study: Engaging, Listening, Learning”.

All of these entries were judged according to a set of criteria with an emphasis on IAP2’s Core Values by an international panel of judges convened by Leanne Hartill, IAP2 Federation Director, Australasia, including: Rodolfo Lewanski, University of Bologna, Italy (2012 Award Winner), Patricia Munro, World Café Europe, Germany and Fiona Cavanagh, Centre for Public Involvement, Canada.

On behalf of IAP2, we extend our sincere appreciation to the jury members for their time and dedication to participating in this important global initiative.

On behalf of the IAP2 Federation, it is our distinct pleasure to present the winner of the 2013 IAP2 International Core Values Award Project of the Year - Healthy Democracy for their Project of the Year entry, “The Citizens’ Initiative Review” submitted by Tyrone Reitman.

Congratulations to Healthy Democracy and all the winners for their excellence in their work in the practice of public participation worldwide.

Thank you to the all applicants. A special mention of sincere thanks to the team behind the scenes as well in particular the stalwart publication volunteer Pat Crawford from USA and team at IAP2 HQ especially, Ellen Ernst.
IAP2 Federation Core Value Awards 2013

Nomi Muthialu, Presiding Member
Iris Almeida-Côté, Executive Director

International Association for Public Participation, IAP2 - International Federation:
www.iap2.org

Introduction

Each year the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) seeks nominations for the Core Values Award to recognize excellence and innovation in the field of public participation.

Winning projects demonstrate the use of innovative techniques, provide solutions to problems that face the field of public participation, involve the public in new areas and show how public participation has affected decisions. While “winners” are selected each year, all of the entries present a wealth of information about the state of public participation worldwide and showcase excellence in practice.

The IAP2 Research Committee determined that it was important to share these stories with our membership in the form of a State of the Practice Report. This is the sixth edition of the report. Previous editions of the State of the Practice Report are available at www.iap2.org. The descriptions submitted for these awards are a valuable tool for learning about others’ experiences. We can learn from their stories to inform our own practice. The projects presented here are exemplars of good practice: they support IAP2’s core values, and exhibit creative ways to engage the public. The public is engaged in a variety of methods and media; from panels, focus groups, community meetings, pop-up workshops, and online discussion forums to digital social networking sites. They range from local to national levels and involved anywhere from 48 to several thousand participants. They cross topical areas such as health care, transportation, education, community visioning, sustainable development, policy making, and re-visioning democracy. They all result in benefits for the agencies, stakeholders, communities and citizens.

The studies provide useful examples of creative techniques, management or governance structures for participatory processes, methods to engage diverse groups or agencies, and reflections on lessons learned. The Core Value submissions also can be
used for promoting or “making the case” for participatory approaches. Initially, the projects were judged against the IAP2 core values award criteria. Each submission is peer-reviewed by members of the Core Values Award Committee for inclusion into the State of the Practice Report.

The report is organized for easy access:

- The first section is a summary of the Core Values applications in table form to help identify which projects may be of interest to you. These summaries have been prepared by the State of the Practice report authors.
- The second section contains the full submissions as written by the person or agency applying for the Core Values Award.
- The final section is the showcase of 2013 Australasian Core Values Awards.

The International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) uses the Core Values Awards to recognize excellence and innovation in public participation practice around the world. These awards are made annually. Winning entries and finalists are selected by a panel of judges who are experienced public participation practitioners in their own right. The seven Core Values are used as the basis for the evaluation of the entries.
International Judging Panel Members

Each year an international judging panel is formed to assess the applications and this year the Judging Panel was led by **Leanne Hartill**, IAP2 International Federation board member. Leanne is a Social Worker with around 30 years of experience in both state and local government agencies in Australia. She is currently the Manager of Neighbourhood Development for over 40 community facilities at the City of Melville in Perth Western Australia. She was joined by a panel from academia, media and practitioners in the field.

**Patricia Munro**

is heads the consulting company *zephyrus – Bringing people and ideas together* which works with its clients to foster more effective communication in organizations through the use of feedback loops and evaluation. Patricia’s know-how as a facilitator and graphic recorder has been used for strategic planning meetings, presentations, speeches and conferences throughout Europe. She is a founding boardmember of World Café and a co-author of a book on the use of evaluation “Wegweiser Evaluation” (oekom publishing 2009).

**Fiona Cavanagh**

is a is the Executive Director of the Centre for Public Involvement (CPI), an organization founded through a partnership between the University of Alberta (Faculty of Extension) and the City of Edmonton to advance the scholarship and practice of civic engagement. Prior to her work at the Centre, she was the Program Manager of Public Engagement for Change for Children, an Alberta non-profit working in international development. Fiona also served two terms as the Chair of the Board of the Alberta Council for International Cooperation (ACGC) and provided leadership for non-profits working in partnership with international communities to address global poverty. Fiona is currently serving as co-chair for the 2014 North America IAP2 (International Association of Public Participation) Conference.
Rodolfo Lewanski
is an associate professor at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Bologna where he teaches courses in environmental policy, policy analysis, urban policies and public administration. His research interests are in the field of road safety policies, environmental policy, sustainable development, environmental conflicts, and deliberative democracy and public engagement. Since October 2008 as “Participation Authority” he is responsible for implementing law no. 69/07 of the Tuscany Region. An English version of the law is available at www.consiglio.regione.toscana.it/partecipazione/documenti/l_r69_2007_English.pdf.
Core Values Awards Program Criteria

Project of the Year Award

The **Project of the Year** award recognizes excellence in the tools, techniques and efforts in public participation within a finite framework.

**The Problem and Challenge**
Describe the problem and challenge faced and how the question or decision statement for public participation was developed.

**The Role of Public Participation**
Briefly describe the role of public participation in addressing the problem or challenge.

**Public Participation Methods**
Describe the methods used to implement public participation.

**Uniqueness of the Project**
Describe what makes this project special. Some questions to consider in this section include:
- What was the decision statement and how were the public involved in framing the statement?
- In what way(s) did public participation improve the decision?
- How did public participation contribute to the resolution of the problem?
- Describe the innovative participation techniques that were used?
- How did the project advance the practice of public participation?
- What evaluative and monitoring techniques were used throughout the project to provide evidence of public participation?

**Project Results**
- Describe the project's effectiveness in achieving results. Provide a brief summary of the project evaluation.

**Alignment with IAP2 Core Values**
- Describe how the IAP2 core values are reflected in the project outcomes. Specifically:
  - How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?
  - How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public's contributions?
  - How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?
  - How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?
  - How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?
  - How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?
  - How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?
IAP2 Core Values

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.

2. Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will influence the decision.

3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers.

4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.

5. Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.

6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.

7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Citizen’s Initiative Review (CIR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Healthy Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Oregon (events in Portland and Salem drawing participants statewide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>How can we strengthen ballot measures as a tool for public participation in government by giving voters the unbiased information they need to make informed decisions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Invitations were sent to 10,000 randomly selected registered voters. Panelists were selected from those who agreed to participate, and were chosen to match the state’s demographics (age, gender, ethnicity, geographic location, educational attainment, voter participation, party affiliation). Twenty-four panelists participated in each of two reviews in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Healthy Democracy brought together two groups of randomly selected, demographically balanced citizens to study ballot measures in advance of the 2012 general election. The citizen panels heard from activists in favor and against the measures, called upon neutral policy experts, and deliberated with the help of trained facilitators. Each group wrote a “Citizens’ Statement” summarizing facts about the ballot measure in question and arguments for and against the measure. Results were published in the statewide voters’ guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Results were read by voters around the state in the statewide voters’ guide and impacted significant governance decisions decided by ballot measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>July-November, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>Forty-eight panelists directly engaged. Independent research found that over half of all Oregonians read a Citizens’ Initiative Review Statement in the statewide voters’ guide, and two-thirds – over 627,000 Oregonians — found it useful when voting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.healthydemocracy.org">www.healthydemocracy.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

Oregon pioneered the ballot initiative system in 1902 to give citizens a stronger voice in their government and a way to participate in making the laws they are governed by. The initiative and referendum allowed citizens to bypass the legislature and create laws directly at the ballot box.

After 111 years, the system is going strong but showing some signs of strain. The number of measures on ballots has increased, and so has the amount of money campaigns spend working for and against them. Ballot measure campaigns spent close to a billion dollars in 2012, as voters decided 188 questions on 39 statewide ballots (when local measures are added, the count rises above 5,000). And while legislators have access to public hearings about bills they consider, the initiative process often asks citizens to make even more impactful decisions (for instance, constitutional amendments) with little information other than what campaigns provide.

So while polls show that voters like the initiative system, they’re frustrated by a lack of quality information about measures. A supermajority of voters in several states report casting ballots on measures with which they are unfamiliar, and three in four voters say they often find the measures too complicated and confusing to understand.

The initiative and referendum were initially known as the Oregon system, named after the state where the reforms started, and the system has been frequently used there. From 2000 to 2010, in Oregon alone voters’ choices involved $50 billion in state revenue decisions, alongside social issues such as gay marriage, campaign reform, land use, and criminal justice.

In 2007, a group of Oregonians and experts in the field of deliberative democracy came together to search for a way to improve the initiative process in the state that started it all. They asked: How can we strengthen ballot measures as a tool for public participation in government by giving voters the unbiased information they need to make informed decisions?

The Role of Public Participation

Healthy Democracy determined that the best way to provide citizens with the quality unbiased information they are seeking is to engage a representative sample of voters and give them the tools and time necessary to make an informed decision.

We call our solution the Citizens’ Initiative Review, or the CIR.

During the CIR, a randomly selected and demographically balanced panel — a microcosm of the public — is brought together and given the time and resources to fairly evaluate a ballot measure. The panel hears directly from campaigns for and against the measure in question and calls on policy experts during the multi-day public review.

At the conclusion of each review, panelists draft a “Citizens’ Statement” highlighting the most important findings about the measure. Each statement is published in the voters’ pamphlet as a new and easily accessible resource for voters to use at election time.

We ran a pilot of the CIR in 2010, and urged the Oregon legislature to pass it into law in 2011, making the Citizens’ Initiative Review a permanent part of Oregon elections. After the 2012 reviews, newspapers and organizations around the state applauded the process. The Portland
Tribune wrote: “Oregon voters should have the opportunity for this type of balanced analysis of every ballot measure. Voters won’t always agree with recommendations of these panels — that’s not the point. The purpose is to help voters make the most informed decisions possible.”

Public Participation Methods

Several months in advance of the review, the statewide Citizens’ Initiative Review Commission (an independent board created by the legislature to oversee the process) meets to select measures for CIR panels to address. In selecting a measure to be reviewed by a citizen panel, the commission considers criteria including the fiscal impact of a measure and whether it amends the Oregon Constitution.

Initial invitations are mailed to 10,000 Oregonians selected at random from the list of registered voters, and those who agree participate are placed in a pool. For each review, 24 panelists are selected to match the demographics of Oregon’s population with regards to party affiliation, voting frequency, age, gender, ethnicity, educational attainment, and geographic location.

The panelists meet for five days to review a ballot measure (they are compensated for their time and travel expenses). Trained moderators guide the panelists through the process of gathering initial information about the measure, selecting neutral policy experts to interview, and questioning advocates for and against the measure. The panelists deliberate and have the opportunity to ask further questions. As Maggie Koerth-Baker writes in the New York Times Magazine, “The panelists know they’re expected to base their opinions on hard evidence, and this expectation becomes part of their temporary identity. Under those conditions…facts suddenly matter.”

At the end of the five day period, the panelists develop a list of facts about the ballot measure and develop arguments in favor and in opposition. These are shared with the public via the statewide Voters’ Guide.

Uniqueness of the Project

The Citizens’ Initiative Review is a first-in-the-nation program that uses public participation to provide unbiased information to voters at election time. As State Representative Vicki Berger wrote, “This is a chance to see democracy as it should be. Instead of sound bites, there are real people grappling with complex issues.”

In 2012, two panels convened. The first looked at a measure to make a change to the state’s corporate taxation structure (Measure 85). The second considered a measure that would have allowed non-tribal casinos in Oregon (Measure 82). Trained moderators ensured that the measures were presented in an unbiased way and created space for all panelists to define the key issues raised by each measure and speak and listen to each other’s feedback.

Panelists understand that the Citizens’ Statements they write will be viewed and trusted by hundreds of thousands of voters, and they take their responsibility to the public seriously. In turn, voters trust the CIR because they know that the information they read comes not from activists, but from citizens like themselves who have had an opportunity to thoroughly research the ballot measure in question.
The project opens up a new avenue for representative public participation and deliberation in democracy. There is significant interest in expanding the process to cover local measures and to bring the process to additional states, and we plan to provide information free of charge to organizations and localities looking to implement this process.

**Project Results**

The Citizens' Initiative Review is a highly successful program. In 2012, for the first time over half of Oregon voters were aware of and used the CIR when voting. Media have praised the CIR for offering “the most objective analyses of the issues we’ll be voting on” (La Grande Observer). Elected leaders from both parties complimented the process for offering voters a chance to provide quality information to their fellow citizens.

Panelists consistently express satisfaction with the deliberative quality of the events. One wrote in an evaluation:

> Participating in the Citizens' Initiative Review has been a unique and enriching experience for me. This opportunity to work side by side with fellow voters has affirmed my belief in the value of public participation in the democratic process. Over and over throughout the week we saw how putting many heads together helped us to come up with responses that were more thoughtful than any one individual could have generated. I hope this initiative review process eventually becomes the standard for voter-developed ballot measures.

An independent research team funded by the Kettering Foundation studied the reviews in 2010 and 2012. A summary of their 2012 assessment follows.

*Summary Evaluation of the 2012 Oregon Citizens’ Initiative Review*

Katherine R. Knobloch and John Gastil, March 13, 2013

Our team of researchers studied the legislatively-authorized 2012 Citizens’ Initiative Review (HB 2634, adopted in 2011). Our purpose was to determine the quality of deliberation that took place during the review process itself as well as the utility of the resultant Citizens’ Statements published in the statewide Voters’ Pamphlet. By both of these metrics, the 2012 Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) received high marks.

Our research method included direct observation of the CIR panels, surveys of the panelists, assessment of the Citizens’ Statements, and analysis of large statewide surveys. Based on this research, our primary findings are as follows.

1. The two CIR panels convened in August 2012 engaged in high-quality deliberation.

   - The 2012 Citizens’ Initiative Review (CIR) appeared to be a highly deliberative process, both from our perspective as observers and from the point of view of the participants themselves. Overall, its quality was comparable to the 2010 CIR panels.

---

1 This is a summary of the report by the same authors, “Evaluation Report on the 2012 Citizens’ Initiative Reviews for the Oregon CIR Commission” (2013). The full report is available online at http://www.la1.psu.edu/cas/jgastil/CIR/ReportToCIRCommission2012.pdf
The 2012 CIR Citizens’ Statements maintained the high level of factual accuracy first achieved in 2010. As found in the 2010 report, the 2012 panelists drafted Statements that contained no obvious factual errors or misleading sentences.

2. Were the CIR Citizens’ Statements helpful for Oregonians when they voted?

- Statewide surveys of Oregon voters found that 51% of likely voters were aware of the CIR by the end of the 2012 election. This amounts to a 9% increase from the peak of 42% awareness among likely voters in 2010. At least two-thirds of CIR Statement readers in 2012 found the panelists’ insights helpful in making their voting decisions, also a significant increase compared to 2010.

- An online experimental survey was conducted for one of the measures reviewed by the CIR process (Measure 85), with the results showing substantial knowledge gains for those exposed to the CIR Statement.

Organizing Group Alignment with IAP2 Core Values

The CIR puts citizens in control of developing the information their fellow voters will use to decide how to vote on complicated policy issues that have a major impact on their state, and citizen empowerment is infused in every aspect of our program. Four panelists — two from 2010 CIRs and two from 2012 — sit on the seven member Citizens’ Initiative Review Commission, which oversees the process. By using a random selection process and demographically balancing the panels, we ensure that each group is a cross-section of the state’s population, which allows traditionally disenfranchised groups have an equal say. We also compensate participants fairly for their time and travel expenses, which means that the process is inclusive for people who normally cannot take time away from working and other responsibilities to participate in civic events.

Our moderators have honed their techniques over several iterations of the CIR and other Citizens Juries, and surveys collected by the independent research team demonstrate high participant satisfaction (44 of 48 panelists ranked their satisfaction as “high” or “very high,” with four “neutral”). Panelists also consistently reported that they had sufficient opportunities to express their views each day and that the other participants treated them with respect. Panelists are given control of the process – they determine which neutral experts to call upon and what questions to ask of proponents and opponents. They work together to develop key findings and arguments in favor and against the measure in question.

Panelists directly see the results of their work in the statewide Voters’ Guide, which is widely used in Oregon. In 2012, researchers found that over half of voters read a CIR statement, and two-thirds, or over 627,000 Oregonians, found it useful when casting their ballots. In the end, voters agreed with both panels’ assessments and supported the corporate tax change while rejecting non-tribal casinos.

After each cycle of reviews, Healthy Democracy uses feedback from panelists and recommendations from the independent research team to develop and implement improvements to the process.
Citizens’ Initiative Review: How It Works

1. Measure
For each measure on the ballot, a panel of 24 randomly selected and demographically diverse voters is assembled.

2. Pros & Cons
Over the five-day review, the panel hears directly from campaigns for and against the measure and calls upon policy experts.

3. Oregon Voters’ Statement
The panel drafts a Citizens’ Statement highlighting the most important findings. The statement is published as a prominent page in the Oregon voters’ pamphlet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>ourWascana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Intelligent Futures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>Understanding the community’s hopes for the next 50 years of Wascana Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Sounding Boards, participation in community events, targeted workshops, social media, roaming displays, postcard circulation, media releases, project website, e-newsletters, photo contest, text service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>ourWascana was focused on three main results: a high level of responses to the visioning questions; a high level of knowledge about the process and the future of Wascana Centre, and; a high level of integration of the feedback into the vision for the future. On all three fronts, the desired results were achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>High level of responses</em> - over 3,300 individuals responded to the questions during the 10 weeks of active engagement. This is one of the largest engagement processes ever done in Regina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>High level of knowledge about the process</em> - coverage in the local media and social media channels was very extensive and successful. One example: the ourWascana Twitter feed (615 followers) has more followers than Wascana Centre Authority itself (497 followers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>High level of integration of feedback</em> - The entirety of the Vision package was derived from themes that emerged from public feedback on the current state and future of Wascana Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>City-wide within Regina; Province-wide within Saskatchewan (Wascana Centre is home to the provincial legislature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>10 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>Over 3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Link</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ourwascana.ca">www.ourwascana.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge

Wascana Centre has been an important part of the Saskatchewan landscape for generations. It’s a meeting place for people from across the province, a place where they come to celebrate, learn, relax and explore. In addition to being one of the largest urban parks in North America, Wascana Centre is also home to the Provincial Legislature, the University of Regina, the Royal Saskatchewan Museum, the McKenzie Art Gallery, the Saskatchewan Science Centre, the Connexus Performing Arts Centre and dozens of other important public uses, including a vast array of recreational opportunities.

The Wascana Centre Authority is comprised of three partners – the Province of Saskatchewan, the City of Regina and The University of Regina. Under their direction, Wascana Centre Authority has managed the operations of Wascana Centre since 1962. Today, it has evolved to include a variety of programs, services and recreational opportunities that draw more than 5 million visitors each year.

In 2011, the Wascana Centre Comprehensive Review Project – the Vision for the Next 50 Years and Beyond was initiated to examine many aspects of Wascana Centre, including its governance, mandate and vision. Launched by the Board of Directors for the Wascana Centre Authority, its focus was to support the long-term sustainability of Wascana Centre. In order to plan for the future of this vital community resource, a central element to the Comprehensive Review was to have a conversation with the community in order to understand current strengths and challenges, along with hopes for the future.
The Role of Public Participation

The Wascana Centre Authority Board felt very strongly about the need for an objective, neutral conversation with the community in order to clearly understand how the views Wascana Centre today and what they saw for the future of this community treasure. With this in mind, Intelligent Futures was retained to design the conversation with the community. From the outset, the views of the public were going to be the central input into the development of a 50-year vision for Wascana Centre.

The process was designed to gain insights into the current realities of Wascana Centre - both positive and negative - and to find out what ideas the community had for the future. To that end, there were three key questions that were asked:
- What do you love about Wascana Centre?
- What changes would you like to see in Wascana Centre?
- What are your hopes and dreams for Wascana Centre in the next 50 years?

Throughout the process, the Strategic Planning Committee of the Wascana Centre Authority Board listened to the responses and honoured the community views. The end result was a Vision package that was reflective of the community conversation and sets the direction for Wascana Centre over the coming decades.

Public Participation Methods

Throughout the engagement process, the goal was to provide convenient and appropriate opportunities for community members to share their perspectives on Wascana Centre. Whenever possible, the process focused on providing a highly visible and interactive presence with opportunities for engagement at convenient gathering places within the community. The process reached exceptional levels of engagement and provided a tremendous array of insights for the process. Participation methods included:

- ourWascana website
- ourWascana Twitter account
- ourWascana Facebook page
- Sounding Boards—feedback boards placed at 8 locations throughout Wascana Centre
- Targeted stakeholder workshops – six workshops with more than 80 participants representing a variety of community organizations and institutions
- Wascana Centre Authority staff workshops
- Attendance at major community events
- Postcards for mail-in
- Indoor display and feedback stations located at various locations in Regina
- Face-to-face workshops and meetings with a variety of stakeholders in the community, including school children, Provincial Cabinet Ministers and the physically disabled
- A province-wide letter to the editor campaign
- Media releases (local and provincial)
- Public service announcements
- E-newsletters
- Media conference launch
- ourWascana photo contest
- Tailored email messages to major organizations in the city of Regina
- ourWascana bus ads (focused on text responses)
- Wascana neighbors postcard drop

This diversity of approaches to engagement reflects a key principle of engagement for the process: create multiple entry points into the conversation.
Uniqueness of the Project

There are four elements of ourWascana that make it unique: place-based engagement, use of graphic design as a key engagement and communication strategy, the creation of multiple entry points into the conversation and the intentional integration of learning into the process.

*Place-based engagement:* Our ‘place-based engagement’ approach moves beyond traditional centralized engagement models by utilizing creative and thought-provoking on-site temporary installations to solicit citizen feedback. The rationale behind this approach is that people who would not normally attend an open house or fill out a web survey will provide valuable input when provided the appropriate channel in a place they know and trust.

By taking the engagement into Wascana Centre itself through our Sounding Boards, we simultaneously met the users in that very place to get them thinking about the location in a real and tangible way, rather than in a formal, detached and academic manner. After all, the intent of engagement processes was to develop ideas for this very specific and special place. What better way to connect with the community than *in that actual place?*

*Integration of graphic design:* We have found that the integration of graphic design is an excellent way to portray information and generate interest. ourWascana used graphic design to share information about Wascana Centre, generate interest and report back on what was heard during the process (see page 8 for examples). Using graphic design sends a very clear message that this process wasn’t your average, stale engagement process. It relayed a message of freshness and thoughtfulness in attracting the attention of the community.

*Multiple entry points into the conversation:* Rather than use the typical “open house” format, our team was intentional about building a wide variety of entry points into the conversation about the future of Wascana Centre. Starting with the place-based approach identified above, the ourWascana project actively sought to remove barriers to contributing to the conversation. As a result, a wide variety of ideas and views were gathered through numerous channels to inform Wascana Centre Authority’s planning for the next 50 years of Wascana Centre.

*Intentional integration of learning into the process:* Wascana Centre has such a rich and diverse history and current reality, that we wanted to integrate learning into the process in as many ways as possible. This benefitted the ourWascana process in the short term, but also creates more knowledge and ownership about the place in the long term. Information about Wascana Centre was shared during our #50thingsaboutWascana Twitter campaign, creating a historical timeline in the park using stencils and spray chalk and through our infographics and postcards. Information on community views on Wascana Centre were shared with the community through the design and placement of our Sounding Boards, through our “What we heard” infographics and through our #50thingsweheard Twitter campaign. This substantially increased the transparency of
the project overall. All of these tactics served to make the knowledge and conversation about Wascana Centre more robust, today and in the future.

These innovations were all built upon a foundation of a rigorous approach to engagement that included extensive stakeholder mapping, constant monitoring and adaptation throughout the process and ongoing commitment to use the feedback to build the 50-year Vision for Wascana Centre. Taken together, this demonstrates how the ourWascana project combines creativity, innovation and rigor to progress the practice of public participation.

**Project Results**

ourWascana was focused on three main results: a high level of responses to the visioning questions; a high level of knowledge about the process and the future of Wascana Centre, and; a high level of integration of the feedback into the vision for the future. On all three fronts, the desired results were achieved:

*High level of responses* - over 3,300 individuals responded to the questions during the 10 weeks of active engagement. This is one of the largest engagement processes ever done in Regina.

*High level of knowledge about the process* - coverage in the local media and social media channels was very extensive and successful. One example: the ourWascana Twitter feed (615 followers) has more followers than Wascana Centre Authority itself (497 followers).

*High level of integration of feedback* - The entirety of the Vision package was derived from themes that emerged from public feedback on the current state and future of Wascana Centre.

**Alignment with IAP2 Core Values**

*How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?*

By delivering a range of engagement approaches in place, users of Wascana Centre were at the heart of the project. Our place-based approach built upon the knowledge of these users to identify what is currently great about Wascana Centre and how it can be improved in the future.

Prior to project launch, an extensive stakeholder identification process determined the preferred methods of engagement and communication. These methods were applied (and adjusted) throughout the process to ensure maximum participation levels.

*How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions?*

The new Vision for Wascana Centre was fundamentally shaped by the input from the public. The key themes and elements of the Vision are a direct result of citizen input.

The development of the Vision would not have been possible without the enthusiastic participation of the community. This participation fostered a sense of ownership in the Vision, and Wascana Centre itself, among community members.

*How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?*
Throughout the engagement process, participants were encouraged to think about what Wascana Centre would look like in 50 years, and not to focus solely on current issues. The focus was on actions that would contribute to a sustainable future. This long-term lens helped encourage participants to reflect on issues and approaches that would maintain and grow all the positive elements of Wascana Centre for generations to come.

By tailoring engagement and communications strategies to specific citizen groups (i.e., university students, long-term care centre residents, students, area home owners, First Nations people, etc.) it was possible to generate a broad range of perspectives and ideas that were then reflected in the Vision.

How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?

A detailed stakeholder analysis and tailored communication strategy helped to ensure that those most affected by the Wascana Centre project (those who lived in the area, and those who visited the Park most often) had many opportunities for engagement. From flyer drops in affected communities to on-site meetings with Stakeholder groups and targeted email communications, the process was focused on engaging those most invested in (and impacted by) Wascana Centre.

How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?

Throughout the process, strategies were often adjusted and developed based on audience feedback (primarily received through email, the website, direct conversations and social media) and participation levels. An active dialogue and conversation was maintained throughout the process that ensured consistent and valuable feedback.

Several convenient channels of communication (email, web based, telephone, text) were in place, and the extensive social media presence provided additional avenues for feedback. The location of portable displays within the community was frequently determined by suggestions from citizens on convenient, accessible and visible areas.

How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?

Citizens were consistently encouraged to focus on three key questions about their hopes, dreams and concerns for Wascana Centre. This provided a framework for focused discussions, resulting in targeted and thoughtful input into the Vision development.

How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?

Throughout the process, citizens were informed about the levels of participation, as well as the feedback that was being generated. Specific participants were profiled in features in website communications and e-newsletters to inspire and demonstrate the real difference one individual could make in shaping the future.

Citizen feedback was incorporated into a variety of communication mechanisms, including “what we heard” infographics, a #50thingsweheard Twitter campaign and project e-newsletters to demonstrate the type of input being received, and to recognize the value citizens were adding to the process.
As part of a major review process for Wascana Centre Authority's 50th birthday in 2012, citizens were asked to share their hopes and dreams for Wascana. The ourWascana project was a conversation with the community to set the vision for the next 50 years of Wascana Centre. Wascana Centre has been an important part of the Saskatchewan landscape for the past 50 years. It's a meeting place for people from across the province, a place where they come to celebrate, learn, relax and explore. From weddings to family picnics, and government debates to nature hikes, Wascana Centre means many things to many people.

This infographic highlights the ourWascana conversation that happened in 2012. Thank you to everyone who participated!

**DISPLAYS & SOUNDING BOARDS – 58%**
- Community festivals; ourWascana postcards; letters to the editor

**COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS – 18%**
- ourWascana website; Twitter; Facebook; texts

**DIGITAL ENGAGEMENT – 11%**
- Community stakeholders; Wascana Centre Authority

**STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS – 9%**
- Displays & Sounding Boards

**OTHER – 4%**
- Monitoring (and sharing) information on the process itself allowed for a more responsive process, while demonstrating transparency.

**Sounding Boards installed within Wascana Centre provided 24/7 opportunities for community input.**

**Providing a sense of history within Wascana Centre to put the visioning process in a temporal context.**

**Wascana at a glance**
- Sharing diverse information about Wascana Centre to increase interest and ownership in the ourWascana process.

**Sharing what was heard with the community in visually engaging ways.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>RouteAhead: A 30 year strategic plan for Calgary Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>City of Calgary / Calgary Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Calgary, Alberta, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>The development of a 30 year strategic plan for Calgary Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>Twitter, Twitter Town Hall, Customer-to-Customer World Cafe, Public Engagement bus, surveys, web content, blog, online commenting, online budget allocation tool, crowdsourced mobile engagement using drawings and written input, stakeholder meetings, attendance at arts events, attendance at community events, staff and citizen engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>The input received from stakeholders drove the development of the 30-year strategic plan for the future of transit in Calgary. The RouteAhead strategic plan is driving the future of Calgary Transit along with other projects such as transit networking decisions, urban transit corridors, customer experience programs and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>Regional. Calgary Transit is a public transportation organization that is used by customers from inside Calgary and from neighbouring regions and municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>12 months (project was 12 months in length)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>4,000+ face-to-face engagements; over 1000+ online submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.routeahead.ca">www.routeahead.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Problem and Challenge

In 2011, Calgary’s City Council directed that Calgary Transit develop a 30-year strategic plan. Early in 2012, the 30-year plan was named “RouteAhead” and a six-person project team was established to develop and deliver the plan. The team included a public participation practitioner employed by The City’s Engagement Resource Unit.

RouteAhead is a precedent-setting project for Calgary Transit and The City of Calgary. In addition to meeting very aggressive timelines, the project team had to meet or exceed the public’s expectations about engagement. While The City of Calgary has a lengthy history of public engagement, under the direction of Mayor Nenshi and the current Council, public expectations around consultation have soared.

The Role of Public Participation

Acknowledging that transit customers are expert in public transit, public input was used to create and refine the 30-year vision for the future of public transit in Calgary. Using stakeholder input, RouteAhead developed core principles that reflect the customer experience, inform network planning and financing decisions. The project team met face-to-face with over 4,000 citizens and received online input from over 1,000 more.

Public Participation Methods

Customer-to-Customer Transit (World) Cafe

- Members of the public, the Calgary Transit Customer Advisory Group and elected officials met and discussed their ideas about the future of public transit in Calgary.

RouteAhead engagement bus

- RouteAhead refurbished a 12-metre, accessible bus and put it into service with the goal of going to the people.
- Modernized, comfortable and colourful, the bus was branded with the slogan “It’s your transit. Tell us where you want to go”.
- The bus was used on regular Calgary Transit routes as a mobile venue for talking with customers during a transit ride; was at community and Transit employee events.
- It was featured at the Calgary International Children’s Festival and Sled Island, a popular indie music festival.
- Using colourful plastic stickers and post-it notes, children and adults were encouraged to draw or write down their input. As the bus interior was covered with stickers and post-it notes, it became a crowd-sourced mosaic of public opinion.
- As input was received, several of the actual stickers were reproduced as large decals and mounted on the exterior of the bus. Garnering attention wherever it went, the bus became the centrepiece of the engagement strategy.
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Pop-in and Participate sessions for City of Calgary staff

- Project staff hosted these sessions, seeking the input of City staff with a professional interest in the future of transit (e.g., planning and development experts, sustainability practitioners, mobility experts, transportation engineers and others).

Public lectures

- Calgary Transit partnered with TransitCamp, a local transit advocacy group, to present two public lectures featuring Jarrett Walker, a well-known public transit consultant.
- The focus of the lectures was how decisions made by communities, local leaders and transit administration affect the success of public transit.

Stakeholder meetings

- One-on-one and group stakeholder meetings were held with a variety of internal and external stakeholder groups.

Twitter stream and Twitter Town Hall

- This social media tool provided an input and commenting forum for stakeholders. The Town Hall event allowed for a live question & answer based discussion.

Online budget tool

- The budget tool (“It’s Your Transit. You Decide.”) asked citizens to choose how to spend Transit’s operating and capital budgets. Over 1,000 submissions were received.

Blog and online commenting tool

- Blog postings provided readers with information about transit, the work of the project team and topics of interest to transit customers; an online commenting tool was available for use.

Uniqueness of the Project

Public participation improved the decision by providing Calgary Transit with a vision for what customers want over the course of the next 30 years and what they think the priorities for public transit in Calgary should be.

Public participation contributed to the resolution of the problem by ensuring that City and Calgary Transit authorities were not working in isolation. In developing a 30-year strategic plan, the problem can only be solved by involving those people impacted by the plan. Not including the public in the decision-making would have created a deeply flawed plan that left the public out of the public transit equation.

While the project embraced a multitude of participation techniques, the most innovative was the development of the RouteAhead engagement bus. A modern and comfortable bus that took the RouteAhead project to the people.
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Too often the field of public participation is criticized as being at one or another end of a continuum, the continuum ranging from lacking in substance (“fluffy”) to the loss of civility as people scream at one another about a contentious subject. The engagement process for RouteAhead embraced joy and playfulness while also offering deep discussion, analysis and debate. The project showed that public participation can in fact work for all, if designed in a way that is responsive to the various learning and input styles of diverse stakeholders.

The RouteAhead engagement process was a precedent-setting project for The City of Calgary. It drew from only internal resources, met aggressive timelines and changed the way that Calgary Transit conducts engagement. The project has received accolades from the public, Calgary Transit customers, City Council, transit organizations and Calgarians. People are keen to hear the lessons of RouteAhead and embrace their own robust yet remarkable and fun engagement process.

**Project Results**

RouteAhead provides strategic direction for transit in Calgary for the next 30 years and will be used to develop future business plans and budgets for Calgary Transit. The plan addresses:

- The customer experience and how to improve it, considering all aspects of the customer journey – understanding, accessing, waiting, paying, riding and connecting.
- The network including a new customer service-oriented rapid transit capital plan.
- The funding required to achieve the above.

The input from citizens and employees was used to create the strategies and directions presented in the plan. Based on stakeholder input and the goals of the Calgary Transportation Plan, RouteAhead developed core principles that inform the visions, directions and strategies in the RouteAhead plan. These core principles reflect the customer experience, network planning and financing transit.

**Alignment with IAP2 Core Values**

**How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?**

We did this through a process that built on existing knowledge and relationships and wove that with curiosity and a willingness to expand our list of stakeholders.

We started with robust stakeholder identification and needs assessment. We then asked our stakeholders and ourselves whom else we should talk with. We took steps to build relationships with potential riders and future riders.

By the conclusion of the project, we had met face-to-face with over 4000 people. We had received input online from over 1000 more.
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Some of the folks we talked with included:

Accessibility Advisory Group
Elected officials including Mayor Naheed Nenshi
Calgary Transit and City of Calgary employees
Current, former and future customers (including children!)
Hotel operators
Professional sports organizations
Shopping mall visitors and customers
Staff and students of post-secondary institutions

Representatives from neighbouring towns and municipal districts
Representatives from other governments (provincial and local)
Representatives from special event venues
Residents of Calgary
School boards
Taxi and Limousine Advisory Committee
Transit Camp (a transit advocacy group)

How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public's contributions?

The raw input was sorted into themes, which drove areas of further study. The input was used to conduct an alignment check with other future visioning work of The City, including the Calgary Transportation Plan and imagineCalgary, a 100-year vision for Calgary. The input was used in the development of the strategic plan. The priorities contained within the strategic plan are a reflection of public input.

How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?

Throughout the engagement process, the input from stakeholders was captured and documented in a spreadsheet. Participants received updates through a variety of channels (email, blog posts, web content, tweets, bus decaling, videos, photos of input and events) that took into account content and stakeholder needs. Content was created that was responsive to stakeholder needs. For instance, at one phase of the project the web provided the ‘story so far’ based on how much time a reader had. Whether they just wanted the high points, more detail or all of the information on hand, there was a link provided.

Participants were given multiple ways to take part in the process, including in-person or on the web. Paper surveys were provided. Email submissions were welcomed. Online commenting and social media input was sought. Face-to-face discussions at community and stakeholder meetings occurred. The customer-to-customer transit cafe event created conversations between customers, with Calgary Transit and City of Calgary staff there in a supporting role.

How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?

The project team chose to take a welcoming and expansive view of stakeholders, identifying not only those stakeholders well known to them (such as customers and vendors), but including
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those who may like to learn more about public transit and those Transit would like to build a relationship with. This included people who reside outside of the geographic boundaries of Calgary as well as children and young adults.

The development and use of the RouteAhead engagement bus ensured that affected citizens could be involved. Rather than asking people to come to a Calgary Transit or City of Calgary site, the bus went into communities and provided a comfortable venue at which citizens could share their views. The bus travelled across this large city, was available for rides in all quadrants on multiple transit routes, was present at free events and events that attracted various age groups.

**How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?**

The information provided was made suitable for a variety of information consumers. Whether a participant was 5 or 85, we presented information and asked questions in a way that worked for them. We were online and in-person. Whether someone had 5 minutes or 50 minutes, there was an information package available to them about the project and what we were hearing. Whether they were a visual, auditory, or tactile learner, we supported their participation through a variety of approaches.

We talked, we provided handouts, we developed online content, we sent information out via email, we created videos. With markers and coloured stickers, we captured people’s attention, passion, imagination and input.

**How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem?**

With over 4000 conversations and thousands and thousand pieces of input, we had a big story to tell. We made it very simple by breaking it down into three categories. Process. People. Product.

The process was the engagement process. We told people what we were doing and why and how they could be part of it (the process). We kept people at the forefront, telling them what they, the people, had said and the impact it was having. The product – the strategic plan – is the result of their input.

To make the information more accessible, we provided it in a variety of ways, always keeping in mind the needs of our stakeholders. We developed a spreadsheet of the raw input; we sorted the input by themes; we posted photos of the crowdsourced, colourful engagement bus and the thousands of input stickers; we created a video that told the story of the input. We distributed a citizen friendly report that laid out the story of the input and the decisions. We developed a comprehensive report of the input and the resulting decisions. By using this layered approach to analysis and reporting, we ensured that each conversation, each interaction, was informed and driven by the ones before it. In this way, stakeholder after stakeholder gave us our plan for each step of the engagement process.
Title: City of Cape Town S78 Waste Review

Organization: City of Cape Town, Solid Waste Management Department
Location: Cape Town, South Africa (Population of 3.5 million)

Key Question/Problem: How to engage with all sectors and stakeholders in the City of Cape Town, including organised labour and alienated hostile civic groups, during a legal review of the City’s waste management practices. The highly sensitive review was being undertaken in terms of S78(3) of the Municipal System’s Act and could result in outsourcing of existing waste management practices and operations – often found to be a very controversial topic for City staff, organised labour and vested interest groups, especially in labour intensive operations such as the Solid Waste Management Department.

Sample Methods: Comprehensive, in depth stakeholder analysis and strategic developing of representative stakeholder clusters, followed by development of customised communication and outreach tools per stakeholder cluster. Stakeholder clusters include: Grassroots communities (including trolley collectors), General Public at large, Focus Groups, City Staff Sub Committee, Councillors and officials and Organised Labour. Customised tools included trolley collectors survey, use of local Councillors with loudhailers, community outreach capacity building sessions, community Newspapers, SMS and web-based I&AP Registration facility, Independent Project Website, eNewsletters, Radio interviews, Info flyers, Depot Posters and capacity development sessions, Newspaper adds, Focus group workshops, Councillor workshops, City Staff training sessions, presentations to City Portfolio committees, draw-card public meetings with anonymous “post-it” suggestions boards and “parking lots” to park issues outs project scope and direct them to relevant officials.

Results: Key inputs from marginalised groups and waste related sectors of the City made a significant contribution towards the final S78(3) document, which was adopted by the City of Cape Town Council as a blue-print for the restructuring of future Waste Management functions. Many of these recommendations are direct inputs from marginalised communities, alienated sectors and hostile civic groups, whose opinions are seldom sought in large scale change orientated processes, such as these. Many of the findings highlight the plea for local, community based economic opportunities in waste management. The process also brought many entrepreneurial opportunities and enterprise development related linkages, such as community based Waste Cooperatives, into the public arena, and turned a once hostile civic group into one of the biggest supporters. The tools and techniques developed for this project ranged from team members walking the streets of Cape Town, to find the trolley collectors to more sophisticated websites and e-based input. The comprehensive range of techniques ensured buy-in, information sharing and the capturing of feedback from representative clusters of stakeholders, affected by a potential change in operations.

Impact Level: City-wide
Time Frame: 12 months
People Engaged: Approx 15 000 direct engagement, not counting community papers
The Problem and Challenge
Describe the problem and challenge faced and how the question or decision statement for public participation was developed

The Section 78(3) Waste Review stakeholder engagement process had to overcome the following challenges:

- How to communicate and translate a highly technical, legal process and change orientated process and its potential impact to operations, to all sectors in the City of Cape Town
- How to regain the trust and buy-in from organised labour and hostile civic groups who were in the process of taking legal action against the very same department that this project stemmed from
- How to involve I&Ap's groups that have already become alienated aggressors with no trust in the client's ability to engage significantly with communities
- How to engage and involve all the key stakeholder groups involved with and affected by potential changes in waste management operations, and how to target those key I &AP's without knowing the outcomes of the study upfront.
- How to overcome participation fatigue in the City of Cape Town, as at any given time there is a plethora of calls for inputs to studies proposals
- How to identify and target I&AP’s – who will be affected significantly by changes
- How to communicate across disciplines, cultures, languages and prejudice
- How to ensure that the PP team and the PP process remains trustworthy, professional and transparent to both client and public
- How to ensure that staff's fears and concerns in the organisation are addressed and a consistent message is communicated internally and externally in a Municipal environment that has experienced significant organisational and political restructuring

The Question and decision statement for this project was developed based on the potential impact of the project in the various stakeholder clusters, identified for this project. For each stakeholder cluster (trolley collectors, communities, commerce, staff, labour, public etc), we asked ourselves: a) “What exactly do you need to know about his project?” b) What impact could this project potentially have on you and what is your opinion on this? c) How can we make it easy for you to follow the project and make sure your input is captured?

The Role of Public Participation
Briefly describe the role of public participation in addressing the problem or challenge.

"The single biggest problem in communication is the illusion that it has taken place."
George Bernard Shaw

Public Participation was a legal requirement in terms of the Municipal Systems Act (MSA 32 of 2000), for the project under consideration. The MSA sets out the core
principles, mechanisms and processes which are necessary to enable municipalities to move towards improved service delivery and social and economic upliftment.

Public participation is more than information sharing, amongst two parties. Participation implies that the public must become a part of a project and influence the decision. Many PP processes and practitioners fail to achieve meaningful participation and many are content that a small newspaper add in the sport section of the newspaper provides sufficient information for stakeholders to get involved with decisions that may affect them.

Public participation should ultimately ensure that all projects, processes or decisions with a potential significant impact are conducted in a transparent, consultative manner, in consultation with interested and affected parties. Public participation seeks to provide information about project to I&AP’s and in return influence the decision and ensure sustainability of decisions and projects. A PP process should always involve customised tools and techniques to meet a representative cross sections of the public interest groups. Public participation should be conducted by a party that is not associated with the project or process and should seek to provide a balanced and representative output and input of information. The collective input from a participation process should ultimately ensure an informed and improved outcome of a project/process.

The some of the whole is greater than its parts!
Describe the methods used to implement public participation.

The following table provides an overview of the Tools and Activities developed for this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Engagement Tool and Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Community/Public              | **Tool:** Community Newspaper adds, Website, eNewsletters, SMS registration facility, Radio broadcast, Info flyers, loudhailer announcements of meetings  
|                               | **Activity:** Web based feedback, Public participations meetings and input sessions (8), one-on-one engagement, trolley collector survey |
| Focus Groups (Waste Industry, commerce and Industry, Academia, NGO’s etc) | **Tool:** Website, eNewsletters, SMS registration facility, Newspaper adds, Radio broadcast, Use of Associations (IWM),  
|                               | **Activity:** Web based feedback, Focus Workshops (2), Sector specific engagement             |
| City of Cape Town Staff      | **Tool:** Info flyers, Website, Line functions Emails, Depot Posters  
|                               | **Activity:** Managers Workshops (3), Staff sub-committee (ongoing)                           |
| City of Cape Town Council/Other Departments | **Tool:** Email, Portfolio Committee Items, Website, flyers, Internal Communication mediums (Contact etc)  
|                               | **Activity:** Councillor meetings, Presentation to Portfolio Committee, Sub-Council community notification of meetings, Public meetings |
| Organised Labour              | **Tool:** Written notification, Info pack, Website, flyers  
|                               | **Activity:** Tabled communication, Information session/Workshop                              |

Customised communication tools were developed to deal with the individual stakeholder cluster groups:

Methods and Tools for this S78(3) project includes:

- Grassroots community outreach meetings and capacity building workshop
- Trolley collectors survey
- Public Meetings
- Focus group workshop
- Posters and flyers
- City staff training session
- City Staff Sub Committee
- Organised labour workshops
- Website
- eNewsletters
- Use of sector specific Institute

Uniqueness of the Project

Describe what makes this project special. Some questions to consider in this section include:

The decision statement was developed in consultation with the City of Cape Town and a representative stakeholder engagement team, Councillors and grassroots practitioners. Public notifications were posted in the local papers and the public were requested to provide input to the proposed plan of engagement. The public participation process added enormous value to the final decision as the inputs and opinions of marginalised communities were translated into the final recommendation. Public participation in this project has managed to set new benchmarks for community involvement in large projects, and it has potentially improved the
Council’s credibility. The use of fresh and innovative e-based technology such as a Website, eNewsletters and sms facilities brought the communication within this project into current modes of information sharing. Community and public meetings also introduces opportunities to capture input anonymously via a “post-it” system and issues that were raised in these meetings that fell out of scope were captured and relayed to the relevant line departments. The PP team offered ensured a that meetings were professionally run and recorded, whilst creating a safe space for creative input to the project. Meetings were informative and included “green catering” and an innovative peanut holder which doubles as the project information flyer. An off-beat presentation and demonstration of current waste minimisation technologies and gadgets ensured that participants could go home and start their own recycling initiatives.

The final test for the PP process was to determine whether the public input influenced the final outcome. The City of Cape Town has adopted a plan to move forward with alternative service delivery investigations and has most recently appointed initiated the implementation phase of this project. The key concerns and suggestions from PP process are all embedded in the future plan. In this case the PP practice was advanced in this project through the use of a broad range of complimentary tools and techniques with a constant re-assurance and demonstration that the public input will influence the project – and it did!

Project Results
Describe the project’s effectiveness in achieving results. Provide a brief summary of the project evaluation.

The project did achieve the desired results. The inputs and opinions were captured and are reflected in the final S78(3) report, which was adopted by Council.

The City officials were initially reluctant to embark on such a comprehensive PP as it sits outside the comfort zones of a call for inputs via a newspaper advertisement.

City officials eventually also bought into the process when they realised how the inputs and opinions of public will add value to the final outcome.

Alignment with IAP2 Core Values
Describe how the IAP2 core values are reflected in the project outcomes. Specifically:
- How did the project ensure that those most affected by the decision or problem were involved?

Extensive stakeholder analysis and stakeholder clustering ensured that key all representative stakeholders were consulted. Local Councillors and representative bodies were also encouraged to take the message to their communities, thereby ensuring buy-in from and early stage from the politicians. The PP process ‘went to the people’ as opposed to the people coming to project. Community outreach meetings were held after hours in (often dangerous) venues with translators and multi-media display to translate the complex issues into and basic terms. How was the outcome of the project influenced by the public’s contributions? The outcomes of the project have had a significant impact on the project. Most of the public were in favour of moving forward into an implementation phase and that the City should investigate alternative service delivery mechanisms. The City is currently in the process of appointing a service provider to implement this phase with due consideration of all the issues and concerns raised during the PP process.
• How did the project promote sustainable decisions and ensure that the needs and interests of all participants were communicated?

The decisions made are currently moving into implementation. Sustainability is ensured through buy-in from both parties.

• How did the project seek out and facilitate the involvement of those most affected?

Through outreach and capacity development the PP process ensured that marginalised communities provide input. There are huge economic opportunities in waste beneficiation and the PP process ensured that these opportunities were communicated across the board and not just to large the Corporate Companies that dominate this field.

• How did the project seek input from participants on how they wished to participate?

The proposed project programme and plan was tabled for public scrutiny and input. The little feedback that the PP team received was a good indication that our plan had manages to address most of the shortcomings identified in other PP projects.

• How did the information provided to participants support or contribute to meaningful participation?

Information was translated in accordance with the language and technical expertise of the receiving audience. Public and community meetings included basic flyers, which doubled as a snack container, and during focus workshops with industry specialists technical information was used to convey the message.

• How did the communication of the project results ensure that participants knew how their input affected the decision or addressed the problem

All the findings and input to the stakeholder engagement process was freely available to download from the website or collect from the project office. Once passed at Council, the final document containing the input could also be collected at Council in accordance with PAIA.

NOTE: THE SECOND PHASE TENDER HAS JUST BEEN AWARDED AND IT APPEARS AS IF WE WILL BE GIVEN ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY TO FURTHER ADVANCE PP IN THE CITY AND SET NEW BENCHMARKS FOR PP OVERALL!

Wastereview: Community Outreach meeting in Khayelitsha
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Wastereview: Stakeholder Project Plan:

Wastereview: Website
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Making Marion – A Community Plan Towards 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>City of Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>City of Mario, South Australia, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Question/Problem</strong></td>
<td>How to strengthen the community utilizing the community voice and community leaders to deliver a vision to South Australia in accordance with the Local Government Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Methods</strong></td>
<td>All 85,300 residents were welcomed to attend. All input provided by residents in community workshops was placed onto cards. These thoughts and ideas were put into groups of themes and priorities. Community leaders presented the groupings to the community to ensure all thoughts were still included in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>The City of Marion will focus on Broad Horizons and a Broad Future. The community input led the City to focus on community wellbeing, cultural vitality, a dynamic economy, and a healthy environment. The community’s 2040 Vision will be welcoming and respectful to all residents and visitors, protect the natural world, plan for and create safe streets, and connect districts and neighborhoods through multi-modal transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Level</strong></td>
<td>City-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>September-October, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Engaged</strong></td>
<td>779 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Link</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.healthydemocracy.org">www.healthydemocracy.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project objectives and role of the public

Once every four years, councils in South Australia are required under the Local Government Act to review their strategic plan. This comprehensive review sought to provide a vision and ‘high level’ strategic directions for the City of Marion for the next 30 years. The revised Plan is known as the City of Marion’s Community Plan. The delivery of the 30-year Community Plan 2012-2040 will provide a clear line of sight for the organisation and our communities through the development and implementation of a suite of plans. This is represented as:

- Council Plan (10 years) that outlines Council’s strategic directions and contribution to the Community Plan including recommendations for Council’s Development Plan, Asset Management Plans, and Long Term Financial Plan
- Service Plans (4 years) to mobilise and prioritise Council resources
- Annual Business Plan & Budget (1 year)
- Individual position descriptions for Council staff

The six week engagement occurred between September 10 and October 19, 2012.

The City of Marion’s Elected Members wanted to create a 30-year blueprint for the city and, in doing so, involve the community in the biggest and most innovative engagement in Marion’s history. The aim was to strengthen council’s connections to its community and ensure that each of the 85,300 residents had the opportunity to participate in the engagement. The role of the public was to participate in the development of:

- A vision for Marion 30+ years
- A plan developed by, and for, the community (community feedback collated by Elected Members)
- Strengthened partnership with us and each stakeholder group

Why we used this particular process

Engagements for infrastructure projects generally attract strong interest in Marion but the ‘bigger picture’ consultations are often not as successful. About 0.89 per cent or 779 of Marion’s 85,300 residents participated in the review of council’s strategic plan in 2008. The City of Marion and its Elected Members were determined that the 2012 strategic plan review would be fundamentally different.

The Strategic Directions Committee (a group comprising our Elected Members and four independent members with specialist strategic, business, planning and environmental knowledge) participated in a workshop held in April 2012 to discuss and identify the benefits, desired outcomes, and ideas for the approach to community engagement using the core values of the IAP2 framework. The Strategic Directions committee agreed we wanted to:

- Be clear on the purpose of engagement, what the community can influence, and what is council’s role?
- Listen to the voices of a wide cross-section of the community.
- Provide authentic opportunities to engage with genuine intent.
- Engage early and often using appropriate methods and at appropriate times and places.
- Engage in creative ways, based on a sense of place and/or specific interest.
- Create opportunity for open, honest, sensitive, respectful and clear dialogue.
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- Be deliberative and interactive and support continual growth of knowledge.
- Communicate how the community has made a difference.
- Remember the community knows best – an informed community are our experts.

This process promoted sustainable decision making by considering the needs of all participants, including the decision makers and set the expectation that public contribution will influence the decision.

Describe how decision making was different/improved compared with ‘normal’ processes and what role public participation had in that change

A ‘normal’ engagement process for a review of our strategic plan would have been to research and identify future trends and internally draft a strategic plan. We would then engage the community at an inform/consult level to receive feedback about how we developed the plan. The new direction involved moving from the ‘consult’ level of participation to ‘involve and collaborate’; working directly with the community to understand their aspirations and to seek their guidance and direct input in developing these aspirations into a plan - by the community, for the community.

One of the first tasks was to ensure the community and stakeholders had information they needed to fully take part in the engagement. We also provided a multitude of opportunities for people to choose how they participated. A ‘Making Marion’ brand was developed. The tools we used are discussed in detail in the table on page 5 on about the process and its link with IAP2 values.

Community group led engagement

We invited key community groups to ‘run their own workshop’ with their networks. A Mayor’s message was sent to them to help set the scene and explain why the City of Marion was seeking input from their group. We supplied resources including a guideline and toolkit to help people record their ideas down. We encouraged people to refer to the postcards and discussion papers to prompt ideas and thinking.

Evidence of how public contributions influenced the decisions made
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The above image was a strong engagement tool to communicate how participants input affected the decision and was used during the engagement process. The 2012 campaign resulted in about 10,755 people directly involved – or 12.6 per cent of the population – with the overall initiative being indirectly exposed to more than 100,000 people who live, work and play in Marion.

The ‘normal’ process to develop a strategic plan for Council is for staff to undertake community engagement, analyse the feedback, and present a draft plan that outlines strategic directions to Council for endorsement. This approach inevitably means that the community’s ‘voice’ is ‘filtered’ with the risk that strategic directions do not accurately reflect their aspirations.

To ensure the community’s ‘unfiltered voice’ was heard a radically different approach was undertaken for the development of Council’s 30-Year Community Plan. In essence, this involved printing each piece of feedback on to A4 cards which were then sorted in a staged process by Elected and Independent Members. This enabled the feedback to be reviewed and subsequently grouped so that it, as accurately as possible, represented the community’s long-term strategic directions. The process involved a 1.5 day facilitated workshop held on 2-3 November 2012. The innovations of this approach were:

- every single response from the community was seen and thoroughly sorted directly by the decision makers resulting in a total of 15 strategic directions identified based on the actual feedback
- The community’s long-term aspirations were highlighted and will set a clear foundation for the development of other plans in the Strategic Management Framework
- This built trust between Council and its community
- The process lead to an outcome that more closely reflects community aspirations.

We have recently completed Stage 5 of the engagement process and have recently concluded engagement of the draft Community Plan asking the community ‘did we hear right?’ and showing how community input has been considered in the Plan. Engagement opportunities for the draft plan were as follows:

- Online discussion forum for communities to share conversations with Council and each other on the vision reflected in the draft Community Plan
- Direct emails/letters inviting participants previously engaged in Making Marion
- Direct email to registered participants of the Making Marion engagement site
- Messenger advertisements and Social media updates

Feedback received, on the whole was positive, and included suggestions about particular areas of focus and clarification of terminology used in the draft Community Plan. The feedback received has been reviewed and incorporated into a table alongside each of the 15 strategic directions and makes suggested changes to the draft Community Plan for Council’s consideration, prior to endorsement of a final Community Plan. The Plan was adopted by Council on 23 April, a copy of which is attached to this award application.
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Evidence of satisfaction levels
During our face to face workshops we asked communities to tell us how satisfied they were with the process. A ‘bullseye’ tool was used to allow people to easily identify what they thought of the process.

Commentary we received during our online engagement included

“I’ve been a 'Marion' resident for 15+ years and I congratulate Marion Council on their vision and action. The ‘Making Marion’ proposal is a good one, albeit scant in detail, but it's good to be able to see the areas of main focus which will help sustain this area in the next 20-30 years.

I think Marion Council could well become leaders in Australia with this community plan. I look forward to watching the plan unfold as I grow old..... “

“Overall all very pleased with the efforts of the Marion council and draft community plan’

How these innovative practices may advance the field of public participation

Community Governance ambitions for City of Marion

The City of Marion’s approach for the development of its Community Plan was an early step towards empowering its community. Council is actively exploring the concept of ‘community governance’ from a systems perspective whilst also identifying timely opportunities in the interim to pilot a community-centred approach to its work. There is a desire by Elected Members to continuously improve our governance where the community is at the centre of decision-making that affects their lives. Conversations in Council around questions such as, ‘What would community governance look like for the City of Marion?’ and ‘How can effective community governance be achieved?’ are currently being explored by staff and Elected Members via meetings and workshops. This is a journey that is being undertaken in partnership by Council and its community.

Marion is working towards a community governance approach by obtaining on-going community input on key issues. This community plan process seeks to embed a philosophy of place-shaping and associated place-based management to embrace notions of community governance.

City of Marion – 2013 Core Values Awards
## The process and how we expressed the IAP2 values in each stage

The level of engagement is identified for each tool in accordance with the International Association of Public Participation (IAP2) spectrum of public participation. The IAP2 spectrum provides a flexible supporting tool to assist in the planning of an engagement project or activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAP2 Spectrum and Core Value</th>
<th>Public Participation objective and technique</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform</td>
<td><strong>IAP2 Core Value #6</strong> About <strong>4000, six page A4 discussion papers</strong> were produced based around the City of Marion’s existing strategic themes of a Dynamic Economy, Cultural Vitality, Community Wellbeing and Healthy Environment. Each paper outlined recent trends in this area and identified future challenges and opportunities. These papers were distributed at face-to-face meetings, community workshops and at shopping centres and libraries.</td>
<td>All stakeholders that are interested in deeper level of information</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td><strong>IAP2 Core Value #1</strong> About <strong>46,000 folded postcards</strong> to every home and business in the city. Each postcard featured four tear-off sheets inviting people to answer a series of questions on the strategic themes. Finally, participants were asked: <em>What is the one big thing you would like to see in your neighbourhood?</em> The aim of the images is to trigger a reaction from recipients and to promote other engagement opportunities. Links to online discussion forums were included so people could choose how they wanted to participate.</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform</td>
<td><strong>IAP2 Core Value #2</strong> The <em>Messenger</em> newspaper adverts contained similar text to the postcards and promoted the various ways in which people can join in the conversation and how their input would be considered. 9 articles appeared across the six week engagement period including a 4 page spread of the discussion themes.</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult</td>
<td><strong>IAP2 Core Value #4</strong> A pack of postcards were placed at participating businesses and centres across the City with some having a return postcard box so people could complete the postcards at the store, café, library, sports club etc.</td>
<td>Sports groups, community groups, cafes, restaurants, shopping centres and hubs, libraries, community centres, churches, schools</td>
<td>Included in postcard returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAP2 Spectrum and Core Value</td>
<td>Public Participation objective and technique</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve IAP2 Core Value #3</td>
<td>A whole-staff breakfast was held to gather input from the 350 staff of the City of Marion</td>
<td>Staff at the City of Marion</td>
<td>280 attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult IAP2 Core Value #4</td>
<td>The City of Marion Facebook page was used to highlight key ideas and thoughts from the community and signposting to website to join online discussion forums or attend an event. Posts appeared in people’s newsfeeds a total of 2759 times. The City of Marion Twitter feed was used to send out updates using a campaign hashtag to enable people to easily link to the specific engagement activity. We harnessed local networks and existing Elected Member networks (for example asking them to retweet and inviting people online to join into the face to face activities using the hashtag #makingmarion)</td>
<td>Facebook friends of City of Marion, Followers of @CityofMarion</td>
<td>We had a total increase of 102 new followers of City of Marion page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve IAP2 Core Value #2</td>
<td>Three community workshops were held in the northern, central and southern areas. We conducted visioning exercises with the community to ask them directly for their aspirations and discussed how their input would be considered and that their thoughts and ideas would be directly provided to the decision makers.</td>
<td>Residents, businesses, community representative and anyone with an interest in the City of Marion</td>
<td>77 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve IAP2 Core Value #4</td>
<td>The Business breakfast was successful and included a presentation from Tom Phillips, an opportunity for networking plus facilitated discussion in a similar format to the community workshops</td>
<td>Local business – small, medium and large</td>
<td>29 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve IAP2 Core Value #4</td>
<td>Run in a format similar to the community workshops, the expert workshops focused on State Government agencies, regional Councils, non-Government agencies (social and environment)</td>
<td>NGOs, state Government, neighbouring Councils</td>
<td>23 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAP2 Spectrum and Core Value</td>
<td>Public Participation objective and technique</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve IAP2 Core Value #6</td>
<td>Staff visited community groups and conducted <em>face-to-face interviews</em> as part of the engagement process. Triangles asking people to think of ‘one big thing’ and Postcards were distributed at these meetings and the generic community/stakeholder forums were promoted. Using the Triangles we offered appropriate techniques for specific interest groups and communities</td>
<td>ESL Employment group ESL Neighbourhood Centre Group Leadership Team at Baptist Church</td>
<td>58 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Involve IAP2 Core Value #3    | Key group of indigenous communities were engaged with as part of the Community plan engagement.  
  - Mitchell Park Aboriginal Health Unit  
  - Aboriginal Education, Clovelly Park PS (for engagement with children and teenagers)  
  - Kaurna Yerta (Native Title)  
  - Kaurna National Cultural Heritage Board  
  - Board member of Aboriginal Elders Council of SA  
  Phone calls to key groups and forwarding of postcards - some thoughts from that process have been recorded by about 3 of the groups and a few individuals as well as Facebook posts collected up. Links to Making Marion campaign were ‘shared’ through the Living Kaurna Cultural Centre Facebook page | Representatives of the Kaurna community | 3 inputs from representative groups 22 comments received from indigenous representatives |
| Involve IAP2 Core Value #4    | A number of easy to access and interactive *online techniques* were offered through our Engagement HQ website, which was rebranded Making Marion:  
  - Moderated discussion forum  
  - Photos montages to prompt visioning (using current and future images)  
  - Video from Mayor  
  - Key documents (discussion papers, postcards etc)  
  We had a total of 3,481 site visits | All stakeholders directed through Facebook, workshops 199 registered users of the site | 42 comments on discussion forum 717 document downloads |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IAP2 Spectrum and Core Value</th>
<th>Public Participation objective and technique</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involve</strong> IAP2 Core Value #5</td>
<td>We asked schools how they would like us to engage with them. Subsequently, we held a workshop held during lunch breaks with Round Square group at Westminster school and Student Representative group at Ascot Park Primary. We asked students to think about what they would like for their future using a tree of ideas. Using the tree of ideas we offered appropriate techniques for specific interest groups and communities</td>
<td>Group of SRC years 3-8 and Round Square group years 9-12 representative groups from different interests at the school</td>
<td>12 + 1 teacher, 18 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inform</strong> IAP2 Core Value #4</td>
<td>Presentation at school assembly promoting the postcards, workshops and online discussion forum</td>
<td>Hamilton Secondary years 8-12</td>
<td>350 students + teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involve</strong> IAP2 Core Value #6</td>
<td>Workshop held at Youth Advisory Committee meeting asking them to think about what they would like for their future using a tree of ideas. Using the tree of ideas we offered appropriate techniques for specific interest groups and communities</td>
<td>Youth representative group of young people advising the Elected Members on youth issues</td>
<td>12 attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inform</strong> IAP2 Core Value #5</td>
<td>We asked schools how they would like us to engage with them subsequently, we provided them with text about the Making Marion campaign printing in their school newsletters during the campaign</td>
<td>Teachers, students, parent and friends of the school</td>
<td>40 agreed to publish text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involve</strong> IAP2 Core Value #1</td>
<td>We leveraged off existing staff engagements involving other teams. We met with key teams across the organisation to provide postcards, discussion papers and invites to community workshops. Staff were able to promote the engagement as they were meeting with the communities they work with</td>
<td>Businesses, community bus users, dog and cat owners, rate payers, customers, youth, disability, cultural groups</td>
<td>112 volunteers were invited to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inform</strong> IAP2 Core Value #4</td>
<td>A personal invitation was sent to a randomly selected 400 residents to ensure a good cross section of the community</td>
<td>400 residents</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Promotional activities included an on hold phone message, QR code and a people to a YouTube clip used to promote engagement opportunities and allowed people to choose how they would like to participate. We had a total of 289 people scan and view the clip.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>City of West Hollywood 2013 Community Study – Engaging, Listening, Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Location</td>
<td>City of West Hollywood, Social Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Hollywood, California (population ~35,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Question/Problem</td>
<td>The diversity of cultures and social groups in West Hollywood is remarkable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nearly half of the population identifies as LGBT, 11% are immigrants from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>countries of the former Soviet Union, and 17% of families live in poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City budgeted over $4 million for contracts with social service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nonprofits in 2012–2013, a clear statement about its priorities to promote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>equity, well-being, and dignity. The 2013 Community Study asked residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about social services that would best suit their needs and about how the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can do the best job of communicating available resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Methods</td>
<td>Statistically valid mail and web survey, 11 pop-up workshops, 31 one-on-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one community member interviews, 13 focus groups, and one community meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional methods: live polling (manual and electronic), participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>budgeting, visioning exercises, children’s activities, group problem-solving,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>online and in-person communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Public input gathered through the Community Study, along with major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>socioeconomic, demographic, and health data trends, guided the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the City’s 2013 social services funding priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Level</td>
<td>Residents, business sector, visitors, and decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Frame</td>
<td>January–May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Engaged</td>
<td>~1,500 participants (4% of West Hollywood’s population)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem and Challenge
The breadth of cultures and social groups in West Hollywood is remarkable in California and the nation, with approximately 47% of residents identifying as part of the LGBT community, 15% seniors, 11% immigrants from countries of the former Soviet Union, 5% living with disabilities, and more. Each of these groups has played a significant role in the formation of West Hollywood today, and their communities continue to attract new residents.

The City of West Hollywood has a long history of supporting underserved communities, especially through the provision of social services. West Hollywood’s City Council allocates over $4 million per year to different social services providers and nonprofits that address a variety of community needs, including homelessness, HIV/AIDS, children and youth programming, care to support independent living, mental health, substance abuse, employment and job training, legal services, and transportation. The City was among the first to fund HIV/AIDS prevention programs and to include the transgender community in civic decision-making through its Transgender Advisory Board.

The City excels at offering residents consistent access to high-quality social services and takes public opinion about funding priorities very seriously. Many West Hollywood residents are already deeply engaged in civic and neighborhood activities. The Community Study addressed two challenges: to design a public participation program that reached out beyond the usual participants and to engage all community members to collaborate on a shared future.

The City has long supported many community groups, yet data gathered during the Community Study revealed shifting trends. For example, traditionally underrepresented community groups in West Hollywood, such as families living below the poverty level, are increasing, while traditionally represented groups, such as Russian-speaking residents, are decreasing.

The goal of the project was to articulate socioeconomic, demographic, and health trends in West Hollywood through a comprehensive analysis of available data, to collect public input from a wide range of community groups, and to present the findings along with funding recommendations in an easy-to-understand and valuable way.

The Role of Public Participation
Public participation directed the Community Study process. At the beginning of the project, the project team developed an outreach strategy that combined new techniques with past public participation successes and served as a blueprint for the Community Study process. The City understands that engagement preferences vary among different cultures, ages, and lifestyles. Therefore, the project team designed an outreach program to solicit input in a variety of ways, ensuring the greatest number of participants.

The City felt strongly that input from the community regarding social services and health needs would be vital to making effective funding decisions. There was a great determination among City staff to ensure that the supported social services reflect community-identified priorities and needs. A six-page summary of “fast facts,” a City television program, and the full final report summarized census data, health outcomes, and the results of the community engagement activities. At the end of the project, the City made the final report publicly available, summarizing the community’s feedback at each stage of the Community Study process.
Public Participation Methods
During the Community Study, the project team provided multiple public participation opportunities, as described below.

Statistically Valid Mail and Web Survey
The City conducted a statistically valid mail and online community survey that contained questions regarding community demographics, social services, quality of life, housing, and communication between the City and residents. The survey was offered in three languages: English, Spanish, and Russian. For those who were not randomly selected to take the statistically valid mail survey, the survey was available to all residents online and in hard copy (though results were analyzed separately). The results of each survey were checked against each other, and any discrepancies were highlighted in the final report.

Pop-Up Workshops
In order to collect feedback from residents who don’t typically participate in civic activities, the project team designed a pop-up workshop that could be set up on sidewalks around town. Eleven pop-up workshops were positioned in high foot-traffic areas on different days and at a variety of times. The project team led passers-by through the following activities:

- Sticky-Dot Matrices. Participants approached two giant matrices listing key community groups and service areas, and used sticky dots to indicate the categories that are most important to them, to their friends and family, and to the community.
- Budget Buckets. Participants used poker chips to vote for the three social services areas that the City should support financially. The chips were color-coded to indicate whether the participant was a West Hollywood resident, a visitor, or someone working in West Hollywood.
- Bright Ideas Wall. Participants used sticky notes to share any bright ideas they had for the future of social services, quality of life, and City communications.
- Children’s Activity Station. To engage children in the Community Study, a creativity station...
was included in the pop-up workshop. Children were asked to draw their ideal city using crayons and markers and were additionally encouraged to think about how a city can help people in need.

Additional informational materials about City services and programs were available at the pop-up workshop. City staff was on hand to answer residents' questions.

Community Member Interviews
The project team spoke with 31 community members in 30-minute one-on-one interviews to gain a deeper understanding of social services needs. Interviewees included elected officials, board and commission members, neighborhood watch organizers, and local service providers.

Focus Groups
The project team facilitated 13 one-hour-long focus groups with the following groups: seniors, youth, families with children, gay and bisexual men, lesbians and bisexual women, transgender individuals, people living with HIV/AIDS, social services providers, people living with disabilities, women, and immigrants from countries of the former Soviet Union.

Each section of the focus group began with a Turning Point live polling exercise where participants used remote clickers to respond in real time to questions about social services, quality of life, and communications with the City. After the last question for each topic, participants engaged in a facilitated conversation about the overall results: Why did the group vote the way they did? How did the overall results align with individual responses? Focus group participant comments were recorded during each session and considered alongside all community feedback from outreach efforts when developing the recommendations included in the final report.

Community Meeting
The project team hosted a community meeting to further educate residents about currently available social services and to engage participants in conversations about the future of social services in West Hollywood. Three main activities took place during the community workshop.
Similar to the pop-up workshop’s budget bucket exercise, participants were invited to develop three social services budget priorities on their own. Then the group discussed each option, with the entire table involved in developing and agreeing on a second budget scenario.

Small groups used the City’s Social Services Guide and a scenario representing a person or family living in West Hollywood. Each group worked as a team, using the Social Services Guide, to list available or needed services to support the person(s) in the case study.

Finally, participants engaged in speed brainstorming exercises to generate and refine as many bright ideas on the topics of social services, quality of life, and communication with the City as possible.

**Uniqueness of the Project**

The Community Study sought to answer the following question: What social services should the City of West Hollywood prioritize? To make this decision, the City used hard data and public opinion to formulate the study recommendations. The request for proposal issued to prospective social services providers stated that applicants should address those recommendations. Applicants knew that the City Council added $250,000 to the funding allocation specifically to address the study's findings. As a result, the City received the following new program concepts:

- A program to place interns trained in new media skills with local social services agencies
- A program innovation to provide intervention in households experiencing stress or crisis to prevent the loss of housing in a partnership between two service providers and law enforcement
- Increased access to psychiatric services and medication management through an innovative partnership between a nonprofit provider and private practitioners
- Social services, nutrition, and a variety of educational, cultural, and recreational engagement activities for LGBT seniors
- More intensive case management for people who are homeless, using the "whatever it takes for as long as it takes" model
- Expansion of the "housing first" model of services for people who are homeless, through access to a variety of housing vouchers, housing placement services, and wraparound supportive services for people once housed

Public participation fostered a sense of camaraderie among participants. While community input influenced social services funding decisions made after the Community Study project, the process also fostered relationships between residents and with City staff. People who may have not known about the breadth of social services learned about City resources and key personnel who can assist them when they need help. City staff demonstrated their accessibility and, armed with the knowledge of the Community Study, will be better able to respond to individual cases in the future. Social services will improve as a result of the Community Study, and the community’s capacity to help themselves is also greater.
The pop-up workshops transformed the traditional community meeting by bringing civic engagement to the streets where people already are. The City prioritized participation techniques that work best for the lifestyle and interests of the community. The workshop “popped up” in parks, nightlife spots, and busy intersections. The project team developed interactive activities that appealed to a variety of people. Connecting with people on the street engaged a greater number and a different set of people than would normally attend a traditional community meeting. Participants enjoyed engaging in the activities—children loved coloring a picture of their ideal city, a stilt walker mesmerized participants, and the prioritization activities made civic engagement enjoyable. The pop-up workshop was ubiquitous, demonstrating that the City of West Hollywood cares deeply about the community’s well-being.

The project advanced the practice of public participation by demonstrating high-quality results through the use of a variety of outreach techniques. The project also made involvement in civic decision-making more accessible to residents. Public meetings held at City Hall in the evenings are no longer the best way to get quality input from local constituents.

To monitor the results of the statistically valid survey, the project team periodically checked to make sure the number of people responding from each zip code, gender, and ethnicity group was proportional to the actual population. Additionally, the focus groups were carefully selected to ensure a wide range of interests were represented. At the close of each public participation activity, results were tallied and summaries of the events were featured on the project website. The final report includes a summary of all participation events and results.

**Project Results**

Community members and elected officials were pleased with the results of the 2013 Community Study. Over 1,500 individuals engaged in the process. Current Mayor Abbe Land shared her belief, “You’ve really set the bar for community engagement in West Hollywood!”—a significant compliment for the Social Services Division in an already civically engaged community. The project successfully listened to the public’s needs and provided a solid basis to make funding decisions. It also created a buzz in the community and enhanced a positive relationship between local government and residents. All City departments now have new, proven strategies to use in future civic engagement projects.

**Alignment with IAP2 Core Values**

The overall goal was to reach as many people as possible. However, feedback from those who actually use the City’s social services programs was also important. Thirteen focus groups (as listed above) were conducted with community groups that may have social services needs. One focus group was conducted with social services providers, which ultimately could gain, maintain, or lose funding based on the outcome of the Community Study.

The recommendations created through the Community Study will directly influence how social services dollars are spent in the coming fiscal year. The results of this project are highly tangible, meaning residents will see their input in action almost immediately.

One of the Community Study recommendations is to “Enhance outreach, marketing, and communication.” Due to the success of the outreach program, the City would like to maintain a year-round public participation program mirroring the study’s community engagement process.
The outcome is sustainable, because the City now understands how to engage the West Hollywood community to collect information that will help to make sound economic, environmental and equitable decisions.

Opportunities to participate in the Community Study were advertised through community-based organizations and social services providers, the City’s extensive commission and board network, the City’s website, in local newspapers, and with large colorful signage around town and in the City Hall lobby. City staff connected with service users and providers to promote upcoming public participation events. The project team also recorded an episode of “Trending” for WeHoTV, the local cable access channel. The 30-minute show featured a summary of collected data, demonstrated pop-up workshop outreach activities, and shared upcoming opportunities for public input.

The City worked with interested community members to match them with a Community Study activity that would be best for them. If an individual did not feel comfortable sharing thoughts through any of the “official” channels, the project team worked with that person to develop something that did work. One-on-one phone calls, the inclusion of written letters, or private conversations after public events were just a few of the ways participants chose to engage outside of the scheduled activities. All input was analyzed collectively, no matter where the feedback originated.

The outreach program was designed to educate residents as well as to collect feedback. Each outreach activity included opportunities to learn about community demographics and available social services and resources, and to ask City staff pertinent questions. At pop-up workshops, participants gained a better understanding of limited funding and tradeoffs by participating in the budget bucket exercise. During the community meeting, participants were encouraged to think about the needs of others and what services would be important to serve the entire community. This focus on collective, rather than individual, input provided participants with a deeper awareness of existing social services and how the City is working to meet a variety of needs with limited resources.

Participants will see the results of their input within the next few years. The City Council will make social services funding decisions in September 2013 based on the recommendations put forth in the Community Study report. Social services providers will use the report to outline services that best match community needs. In addition to the final report, the project team created a colorful six-page brochure. The brochure is available for download online or in hard copy. The brochure highlights the data and public input that led to each recommendation and features several easy-to-understand infographics.

Additional Information

The 30-minute episode of “Trending” on WeHoTV dedicated to the Community Study is available at the following link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vh-99oY3k6w

The results of West Hollywood’s 2013 Community Study are summarized in a “fast facts” brochure, accessed via the following link: http://weho.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=13188
Showcase of 2013 Core Values Awards
With an increasing proportion of seniors who wish to remain engaged and active in the community, a key to making cities more age-friendly is including seniors as partners in directing their future lifestyles, as social participation and inclusion are connected to good health and well-being (WHO, 2002). The objective of this research was to explore what constitutes liveable, sustainable and affordable neighbourhoods and dwellings for seniors within existing communities in South East Queensland and to do so using two participatory research methods: Photovoice and design Charrettes.

Using Photovoice as a method of participatory research and engagement in the first stage of the project, 40 senior participants from Brisbane and the Sunshine Coast used digital cameras to take up to 20 photographs each around four thematic questions to illustrate what hinders or helps them in the built environment as they age. Following a workshop session where participants shared their images and perceptions, they combined their photos with captions into one presentation. Representatives of the seniors’ groups presented their views to a design team, as input into the second stage, a series of design Charrettes. Fifteen principles for design of neighbourhoods and accommodation
for seniors were also derived from a rigorous analysis of the seniors’ photos in conjunction with their captions.

In the second stage, seniors directed a planning team of architects and urban designers to design accommodation within existing communities. The outcomes were seven innovative accommodation typologies that responded to seniors’ input and reflected their desire for universal design, resource-efficient accommodation with natural light and ventilation, and flexible spaces, all within an affordable price range.

Photovoice is an engaging and empowering process by which people can identify, represent and enhance their community by taking photos to share expertise and local knowledge (Wang & Burris, 1997). The Charrettes offered seniors an opportunity to interact with planners and designers to gain knowledge of this industry and discuss trade-offs in order to achieve all their principles. This is the first time that these two participatory methods have been used together in a multiple methods approach, and as far as we know, the first time that seniors have been engaged in design Charrettes. An evaluation survey of participants at the end indicated that they enjoyed the engaging photovoice method, learning about other seniors’ perspectives, the ability to discuss ideas with design experts, and felt their ideas were well represented by the principles and design typologies.

The project was funded by Sunshine Coast Council, Queensland government Urban Land Development Authority (responsible for delivering affordable and innovative housing), Churches of Christ Qld (a not for profit aged care provider/developer), and Diecke Richards (an urban design firm) whose representatives were involved throughout the project in the photovoice workshops, charrettes and report review. What had initially attracted them to the project was the proposed participatory methods which they felt would provide in-depth insight into seniors’ needs as they age. Three of these research partners are now working together to implement the learnings in a real development site. In terms of broader application, several of the 15 principles offer additional insight into seniors’ needs that are not represented in existing international, national and local policies and strategies for seniors, such as the importance of outdoor public (parks, walkways) and private (decks, balconies, patios) space with shade, visual amenity, and sustainable design. The innovative accommodation typologies illustrate how accommodation for seniors can be designed to be sustainable, liveable and affordable. They offer models for planners, developers, aged care providers, State and local governments to facilitate greater industry uptake of age-friendly concepts in neighbourhood and dwelling settings. Importantly, they validate the benefits of using visual methods for voicing issues and planning for an active ageing population. This project addressed all seven IAP2 core values and used techniques across much of the IAP2 Spectrum from information to collaboration, depending on the goal, phase, and participants’ needs at the time.
Once every four years, councils in South Australia are required under the Local Government Act to review their strategic plan. This comprehensive review sought to provide a vision and ‘high level’ strategic directions for the City of Marion for the next 30 years. The revised Plan is known as the City of Marion’s Community Plan. The delivery of the 30-year Community Plan 2012-2040 will provide a clear line of sight for the organisation and our communities through the development and implementation of a suite of plans. This is represented as:

- Council Plan (10 years) that outlines Council’s strategic directions and contribution to the Community Plan including recommendations for Council’s Development Plan, Asset Management Plans, and Long Term Financial Plan.
- Service Plans (4 years) to mobilise and prioritise Council resources.
- Annual Business Plan & Budget (1 year).
- Individual position descriptions for Council staff.

The six-week engagement occurred between September 10 and October 19, 2012.

The City of Marion’s Elected Members wanted to create a 30-year blueprint for the city and, in doing so, involve the community in the biggest and most innovative engagement in Marion’s history. The aim was to strengthen council’s connections to its community and ensure that each of the 85,300 residents had the opportunity to participate in the engagement.

The role of the public was to participate in the development of:

- A vision for Marion 30 + years.
- A plan developed by, and for, the community (community feedback collated by Elected Members).
- Strengthened partnership with us and each stakeholder group.

City of Marion also won the South Australian Regional Project of the Year.
Australasian Project of the Year

Runner Up: Straight Talk Pty Ltd

Project: Coffs Harbour City, Master Plan Community Engagement Plan

This community engagement program is noteworthy because it was implemented on a shoe-string budget (less than $35,000) by one industry full time employee, who embraced the IAP2 values and ethics and delivered amazing widespread awareness. This engagement program galvanised and mobilised the Coffs Harbour community.

The outcome was far greater than the individual parts. The community engagement techniques applied, in isolation, were fairly standard. This community were extremely well informed; voices were heard from the beginning and overtly reflected in the, eventual, final decision. There was widespread confidence in the robust community engagement process implemented.

What sets us apart is the public reaction when it became apparent Council ignored what the public wanted. The engagement robustness we delivered gave the community uncompromised confidence to very publicly challenge Council. We created an environment where the community felt empowered to demand media coverage that instigated scores of online polls, a swathe of social media and Facebook groups that left councillors in no doubt about where the community stood. As one example, one community member created a Facebook ‘event’ page, Skate8Park4Coffs that gained over
1000 followers within days.

The key innovation to this program was the seamless integration of two core communications disciplines, public participation and media relations. We avoided media spin, leveraged relationships, spoke with the right people and delivered a robust grass roots program. Our transparency built confidence.

These foundations activated word of mouth and generated community excitement about the masterplanning process. A symbiotic communications flow underpinned the success of the engagement process as it ultimately galvanised the community into action.

We created a platform that ensured everyone knew, every voice was heard.

Coffs Harbour is a coastal city equidistant between Sydney and the Gold Coast. The region is a tourist haven but its CBD is economically depressed. Between September 2012 and March 2013, Council and its business community, commissioned Straight Talk to engage with the wider Coffs community and urban design specialists to create a draft plan to reposition the city centre as a 21st century city in a bid to stimulate the Coffs Harbour’s city centre economy.

The backbone of this public participation program was founded on establishing a well-informed and connected, 10-person, City Centre Working Committee; a series of well-targeted public workshops supported by a local newspaper partnership and integrated communications.

By working closely with this elected City Centre Working Committee, representative of the city centre community, we created an integrated engagement program that meaningfully connected with young people, the business community, elderly and residents. We delivered what they wanted. The community consensus on a city centre values set, mission statement and three masterplanning design principles ensured competing needs from the various community segments were accounted for.

By investing the time upfront we were able to use word of mouth techniques to identity quality recruits for a range of workshops. Stakeholders unable to attend workshops were updated on inputs and outcomes via free newspaper publicity and project website. Subsequent feedback, such as letters to the editor, online polls, emails, letters and phone messages were fed into our process.

Well defined masterplan objectives and financial parameters ensured realistic contributions were received.

“It’s about community consultation, that’s what it boils down to. They spoke, we heard, we listened and it’s done,” said Coffs Harbour Mayor following the decision to fully endorse the masterplan.

Straight Talk also won the New South Wales Regional Project of the Year.
Western Australian Project of the Year

Winner: City of Fremantle in association with Creating Communities Australia and CODA

Project: Kings Square Project

The Kings Square Urban Revitalisation Project is an integrated redevelopment of key sites in Fremantle, Western Australia.

Kings Square is the geographical and civic heart of Fremantle and the aim of the project has been to establish the conditions that will lead to the regeneration of the Square (and surrounding sites) as an important social and commercial hub in the heart of the City.

The Kings Square Community Engagement process was undertaken to inform the urban design planning for the future redevelopment or refurbishment of a number of properties within the precinct.

In March 2012, the City of Fremantle engaged the consultant team of CODA, Creating Communities Australia and Kelsall Binet Architects to provide architectural, urban design and landscape architecture services. Creating Communities Australia led the community engagement process, which was developed in partnership with the City of Fremantle and CODA to effectively facilitate public participation to inform the development of an urban design strategy.

A comprehensive engagement process was developed to ensure the urban planning outcomes met the needs and aspirations of the community and to re-establish a place that would capture the hearts and minds of the local community.

The collaborative and interactive community engagement process included a series of closely spaced workshops and presentations that generated a great deal of public interest and utilised a variety of techniques to ensure that the desires of Fremantle’s residents, commercial owners, operators and other stakeholders were elicited and subsequently considered in all decision making. The engagement process included the use of interactive “keepad” survey technology, workshops, open days and a Citizens’ Jury.
This project involved a series of seven engagements implementing the STEP (Science & Technology Engagement Pathways) framework. The series, entitled *STEP into the Future*, was designed to test the framework and develop a set of case studies to accompany STEP, to demonstrate the framework and how it might be used. The engagements explored a range of topics of relevance to policy decisions, focusing on nanotechnology and other enabling technologies. Most of the engagements involved deliberative workshops, using a variety of methods, and involving members of the public, decision makers and stakeholders.

The STEP framework was developed by the National Enabling Technologies Strategy – Public Awareness and Community Engagement program within what is now the Department of Industry, Innovation, Climate Change, Science, Research & Tertiary Education. It was developed through a multistakeholder co-design process and was launched in 2012. Information about STEP and the STEP into the Future is available at: [http://www.innovation.gov.au/step](http://www.innovation.gov.au/step).
Northern Territory Project of the Year

Winner: City of Darwin/Michels Warren Munday
Project: Cavenagh Street Upgrade

Digging up a 50-year old road might seem simple, but not when it’s the main road into the city.

Bus routes and taxi zones need to be moved, hotels and businesses will lose vehicle access for weeks, a school is going to lose its pick up and drop off point, hundreds of commuters need alternative parking spots and previous attempts to fix the other end of the street had been thwarted by angry traders worried about losing parking.

A key element of the success of this project was first persuading the City of Darwin that it needed an engagement strategy, rather than just sending letters to key stakeholders. The second was the Council’s agreement to an intense stakeholder engagement program that relied on face to face communication and good relationships.

The City of Darwin had $3.3 million in Roads to Recovery to upgrade Cavenagh Street in the Darwin CBD that had to be used by the end of 2012.

The Council had recently done IAP2 training so was sympathetic to the need for an engagement strategy but felt there was little scope for consultation.

Michels Warren Munday walked the street and mapped the impact on properties, then prepared an engagement strategy that had an emphasis on the Council working with stakeholders to find solutions to access issues.

This included a working party with the bus services and taxis, personally visiting every property affected, setting up temporary access for one of the hotels, the printing business and a busy supermarket, finding an alternative pick up and drop off point and marshal for school children and appointing a Council staff member to be the chief problem solver for all affected businesses.

Communication included regular updates, media, a website and public notices. But, above all, it was based on face to face contact with the most immediately affected stakeholders.

The final result was a beautifully built road that was completed almost two weeks ahead of schedule and with no delays or stoppages due to stakeholder concerns.

“The Cavenagh Street Upgrade (Searcy to Daly Street) set the benchmark for working in the Darwin central business district in the future and next time we have another road to reconstruct we will be doing something similar, because we know it works.” - Drosso Lelekis, Manager Design, Planning and Projects, City of Darwin

Drosso Lelekis, Manager Design, Planning and Projects, City of Darwin
Victorian Project of the Year

Winner: OurSay/Hepburn Shire Council
Project: What’s the Big Idea?

OurSay partnered with Hepburn Shire Council to design and deliver an innovative online and face-face community consultation process with the express objective of involving as many people as possible in the drafting of the Hepburn Shire Council Plan for 2013-2017. The project was named “What’s the big idea?” and ran from 15 February to 26 March 2013.

To inspire public participation, the Hepburn Shire Council committed to addressing the top ten most voted ideas registered by the community on OurSay.org/Hepburn-Council-Plan. The promise was that the top 10 ideas put forward and promoted by the community would be discussed at a Conference of Big Ideas by councillors, council officers and the community. Outcomes of the debate would then inform the strategic directions of the Council Plan.

To ensure that ideas were effectively registered, OurSay and Hepburn invited community organisations and leaders to 6 workshops across the Shire to help the community to define strategic ideas and actions. These
ideas and actions were registered directly on to the OurSay forum and community members were trained to use the forum. The workshops were attended by 93 community members and a total of 61 ideas were registered. Once the workshops were complete the community was ready to promote the OurSay forum. To ensure community ideas received votes, each community member had to use the OurSay campaigning tools embedded in the forum and share their ideas using social media, email and traditional community organising. This transformed the community member from someone being engaged to someone championing the engagement process. To receive as many votes for their idea as possible, highly involved community members had to reach out and find new people to vote for their idea.

At the conclusion of the online forum over 10% of households in Hepburn Shire had contributed 264 ideas, 3399 votes and 693 comments.

The top 10 ideas, which received the most votes were then discussed at the Conference of Big Ideas.

The conference was attended by all the Councillors, the Council management team, the OurSay team and 75 community members, including authors of 8 out of the top 10 ideas. Importantly, the author of the idea was provided the opportunity to present their idea, which was then followed by Councillors and Council officers discussing the strengths and challenges of each idea. Following this, all community members in groups of 8 were then asked to note down their thoughts about each idea. All this information was then collected and used to develop the council plan.

The proceedings were filmed so that anyone who couldn’t attend the conference can still benefit from hearing the council’s perspectives on the strengths and challenges of each idea. The video can be found at: http://oursay.org/hepburn-council-plan

Summary of the Process

1. Formal commitment from Hepburn Council to proceed: January
2. 6 face-face community workshops to get the ball rolling: Start of February
3. Online forum begins and maintained for 5 weeks: Start 16 February
4. Conference of Big Ideas: March 26
5. Council Plan is developed and a consultation draft is published: April
NSW 2021 clearly articulated the NSW Government’s commitment to consultation. Meeting the transport demands of a growing population is one of the biggest challenges facing NSW. That is why the Transport for NSW created an inclusive and comprehensive transport planning process involving community, business, industry and government stakeholders to develop the NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan.

Elton Consulting was engaged by Transport for NSW to support the statewide stakeholder and community consultation for the NSW Long term Transport Master Plan, released in December 2012.

Featuring over 220 short, medium and long term actions, the Plan outlines a clear direction for transport over the next two decades; identifying the role of each transport mode in meeting future needs including rail, road, buses, ferries, cycling, and walking.

The Plan will also help develop a freight network that maximises the benefits to the economy.

The Plan has involved unprecedented collaboration with the people of NSW. Every person across the

State interested in improving transport in NSW has been
encouraged to participate in the Plan’s development. Whether a commuter or a truck driver, an industry representative, business person or part of local government, all have been given opportunities to provide input that is shaping the approach to the future of transport in NSW.

Achievements of the consultation process included:

• A launch event attended by over 130 stakeholders from across business, community, customers, government and industry.

• A dedicated website, a 1800 telephone number, and Twitter to talk with our stakeholders and gain feedback.

• Four Advisory Groups – representing customers and community, local government, industry and transport specialists – which provided input to the development of the Master Plan.

• The creation of a Long Term Transport Master Plan Discussion Paper, released in February this year, which has been downloaded from the dedicated website over 8,500 times.

• Over 1,200 submissions from the community on the Discussion Paper between 24 February and 27 April. These submissions have been analysed and fed back into the technical and strategic planning process for the Master Plan.

• Holding 14 regional forums across the State between February and May, involving over 1,000 participants. This enabled us to hear and understand the views of people in all parts of Sydney, and every region of NSW. Summaries of these sessions are on the web site and have been fed back into the planning process.

• Over 140 stakeholders attended an industry briefing.

• Ongoing stakeholder meetings.

• The team also used a number of innovative methods in the public participation process for the Plan. These included:

  • Introducing consultation into a NSW Government announcement – from day one of the project. For the launch, 130 key stakeholders were brought together for small group discussions, to get their input from the outset. Simultaneously, a dedicated website was launched seeking immediate community feedback.

  • The use of social media such as Twitter and online surveys with ongoing monitoring to assess the effectiveness of the approach.

  • Inclusion of the draft Plan online which allowed the public to make comments on specific sections, to inform the final version.

The draft Plan will soon be released for comment. This is a major step in the 12-month process to develop an integrated transport plan for the State over the next 20 years. The focus of the next phase, following the release of the draft Plan, is to gather specific comments on how it can be strengthened.

The release of the final Plan means that for the first time NSW has a comprehensive and integrated strategy for all modes of transport, across all of NSW – informed and driven by stakeholder and community engagement.

NSW Winner for Project of the Year was Straight Talk. See page 9-10.
The Salisbury City Centre (SCC) is earmarked to become one of Adelaide's major activity centres by 2040 in accordance with the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. To this end, the City of Salisbury has embarked on an 18-month process to develop a Structure Plan and Renewal Strategy to revitalise the SCC. The City of Salisbury decided to change the way it conducted strategic planning exercises to proactively seek more diverse community views and to ensure that the local community – residents, traders, property owners and users of the SCC – as well as other interested parties – had opportunities to contribute their ideas in developing the Structure Plan.

The community were invited to join Council on the journey to develop aspirational visions and a strategy/structure plan that ultimately guides the future development of the SCC for the next 20 years.

Over the 18 months, dozens of activities, workshops and street talk events were held with all sectors of the community including youth, elderly people, residents, traders, landowners, workers, visitors, non-users as well as Government agencies and utility providers.

The project involved an evaluation of previous consultations, a pre-engagement phase and a four-stage community engagement process, followed by an evaluation of that process. Approximately 1,800 people participated throughout the project, which is significant considering the ‘hard to reach’ community the City of Salisbury has. The result was also an unprecedented level of participation in strategic planning from a diverse range of the community and the plan that reflects the aspirations, views and priorities of the community.

This project demonstrated the effectiveness of ‘Street Talks’ in engaging with the ‘hard to reach’ community in a strategic planning exercise, attracting a range of input from a diverse community within a small amount of time. It also validated the importance of genuine community engagement and how it helps to build better relationships and trust with the community and stakeholders. As a result, the City of Salisbury succeeded to develop a plan to guide the future development of the SCC that is well supported by the community and a framework that allows all parties to work together to achieve our future vision.

South Australian Winner for Project of the Year was City of Marion. See page 8.