COBACORE

Community Based Comprehensive Recovery

Grant Agreement № 313308

D6.7 Results from Adoption Workshops in the Dutch National Safety Domain

Version:	2.0
Due Date:	31 March 2016 (v1)
Delivery Date:	30 September 2016 (v2)
Nature:	Report
Dissemination Level:	Restricted
Lead partner:	TNO
Authors:	J.W. Streefkerk, M. Huis in 't Veld, M. Rijken, R. Pieneman, M. Neef (TNO)
Internal reviewers:	M. Madden (FAC) and P.A.J. Tilanus (TNO)

Version Control:

Version	Date	Author	Author's Organisation	Changes
0.7	19 Feb 2016	Streefkerk, Huis in 't Veld	TNO	Document made ready for first review
0.8	9 Mar 2016	Streefkerk, Rijken	TNO	Review comments addressed
0.9	15 Mar 2016	Streefkerk	TNO	Inserted Chapter 5 and excerpt from the scenario in Chapter 3. Document offered for final review and GA approval
1.0	24 Mar 2016	Streefkerk	TNO	Document finalized
1.5	23 Sep 2016	Streefkerk, Huis in 't Veld	TNO	Comments of EU Final Review addressed. Document offered for final internal review
2.0	30 Sep 2016	Streefkerk, Neef	TNO	Finalized document based on internal review

Deliverable Title   Results from adoption workshops in the Dutch national safety domain

Deliverable Number   D6.7

Keywords: Co-creation workshops, Appreciative Inquiry, professional-civilian collaboration, validation, stakeholders

Executive Summary:

This report summarises the key findings from the adoption workshops with Dutch professional stakeholders and other relevant parties. In total three workshops were held in which requirements for a co-creation method were established (WS1), the method was piloted and subsequently refined (WS2) and validated (WS3) to improve civilian-professional collaboration (CPC) in the aftermath of an incident or crisis. The goal, stakeholders, process, and key findings requirements for the method and lessons learned per workshop are outlined. From these workshops, we can conclude that this method provides a way to shape CPC activities together with stakeholders that allows them to voice their interests, provided that these stakeholders are involved in the method and that the necessary changes can be carried out by these stakeholders themselves. Feedback about the method from the stakeholders was positive. Conclusions from this restricted deliverable will be carried over to the public deliverable D6.8 "Guidelines for implementation" and used to substantiate generally applicable guidelines for local implementation of COBACORE project results.

Table of Contents

Tables

Figures

1 Introduction

The aim of the COBACORE project is to improve the collaboration activities between professional responders and community members, such as civilians, after crises or incidents. Such civilian-professional collaboration (CPC) will become increasingly important in the near future, because civilian activities can complement the limited resources of the professional organisations and because civilians often have local knowledge that professional responders require. In addition, civilians are expected more and more to take a degree of responsibility during response and recovery phases. However, CPC faces many challenges.

The crisis management domain is very complex, involving many stakeholders and many organisational, societal and technical challenges, with typically little room for generic solutions. Currently, collaboration activities between civilians and professionals are carried out on an ad-hoc basis. There is no structured process in place within professional organisations to create and implement CPC activities. Every application context will have specific characteristics that influence the optimal form of deployment. Not only are all crises different, the contexts in which they occur differ largely as well. For instance, crisis management governance differs widely across EU member states, with varying openness to non-governmental community involvement. Consequently, the COBACORE platform as mediating platform between civilians and professionals will need to be positioned in accordance with local standing operating procedures and existing governing crisis management structures. In addition, there are many other practical factors to take into account, such as local data availability, privacy concerns, available technological means, required interoperability with existing systems and so on.

Moreover, collaboration between civilians and professionals is done by people who together form a community. The intrinsic human nature of this collaboration is important to consider. If CPC is to be successful, the people involved should be able to recognize their own norms and values, cultural aspects, organisational processes and political aspects. Given this complexity and these many factors to consider, how can we ensure that CPC activities and the necessary tools are adopted?

1.1 Approach

What is needed is a systematic approach to create, refine and implement CPC activities and tools within specific communities. As we learned based on discussions we had with stakeholders, a promising approach seems to be to have stakeholders *themselves create these activities together* (cf. co-creation). This way, the complexity and the multitude of factors of a specific setting are taken into account by stakeholders who have an interest in rebuilding their own community. In COBACORE Deliverable 6.8, Chapter 3, the elaborate argumentation for this standpoint is presented. In addition, the reader is referred to D6.8 for a detailed description of the development approach that was applied in selecting, refining and validating a suitable co-creation method.

Within COBACORE WP6 "Dissemination", Task 6.6 focuses on dissemination of COBACORE results to stakeholders and developing a method that facilitates adoption of COBACORE results. It results in two deliverables, namely Deliverable 6.7 "Results from adoption workshops in the Dutch national safety domain" (COBACORE D6.7) and Deliverable 6.8 'Guidelines for practical introduction of COBACORE project results' (COBACORE D6.8). The restricted deliverable D6.7 (this document) presents the results from the three dissemination workshops (WS1, WS2 and WS3) that were held with stakeholder groups, focusing on the

Dutch national safety domain. For each workshop, the goal, stakeholders and process is described. From these workshops, stakeholder feedback was gathered and analysed, resulting in 1) key insights into CPC activities themselves and 2) requirements for the method to design and implement CPC activities. Each workshop built on results of the previous one, resulting in a refined list of requirements for the method. The implications of these key insights and requirements for implementation of the COBACORE platform and tools are described in D6.8.

1.2   Document Outline

The rest of the document is structured as follows. In WS1 (presented in Chapter 2) the aim was to gather stakeholder input on the requirements for the method, derived from past experiences and visions of the future of civilian-professional collaboration (CPC). Based on the resulting requirements, the method was changed accordingly and applied to the design of CPC activities. In WS2 (presented in Chapter 3), a group of stakeholder representatives (professionals and community members) piloted the adapted method. Based on their feedback and additional requirements, the method was refined and another group of professional stakeholders worked with the final version in WS3 (presented in Chapter 4). The final version of the co-creation method (described in detail in D6.8) and the experiences gained in the workshops formed the basis for the proposed policy advice in the context of the Dutch National Safety Domain, presented in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 presents observations across all workshops on the applicability of the method and concludes this deliverable.

1.3   Changes in this document revision

Based on the reviewers' comments in the Consolidated Review Report, we have made the following changes to this document to address the issues of substance and rigour of the findings. The following main amendments were made:

- Rewriting of the introduction (Chapter 1) of D6.7, to
    - better introduce why and how co-creation was chosen as appropriate basis for the method,
    - better describe the development of the method, and
    - better frame the workshops, their results and how these were analysed into requirements for the method.
- Adding to all three Chapters 2, 3 and 4 of D6.7:
    - More elaborate description of the workshop goal and process
    - Bring goals of WS1, 2 and 3 in line with the approach described in D6.8.
    - More elaborate description of participants' responses in the discussions
    - Grouping and analysis of participant responses into 1) key insights for civilian-professional collaboration (CPC) and 2) requirements for the method.
    - Elaborate description of key insights and requirements for the method.
    - More elaborate descriptions of the lessons learned when applying the method, both from the observer notes as well as from participants' comments on the method process.
- Added Appendix A in D6.7 with a Table presenting responses of participants in the workshops, the corresponding key insight and the corresponding requirement for the method.
- Updating the "Document outline" of D6.7 (section 1.2)

2 WS 1: Identifying Stakeholder Requirements

2.1 Goal and Stakeholders

The goal of this workshop is to identify the stakeholder requirements for the method to design and implement CPC concepts and activities. A workshop is suitable in attaining this goal as it is a quick and easy way to gather many insights on a topic provided that the participant group is suitably diverse. Moreover, a workshop facilitates the interaction between domain experts often resulting in new and added insights, as workshop participants inspire each other.

By having stakeholders discuss past experiences and ideas for future CPC activities, we gained insight into what current practices are in different Dutch stakeholder organizations and how CPC might develop in the future. This chapter presents the key insights gained from the workshop based on the responses of the participants. A grouping and analysis of these responses resulted in an initial list of seventeen requirements for the method.

During the workshop, thirty participants from different Dutch professional communities shared their past experiences and visions for the future on the topic of CPC. Their work domains encompassed local government, Ministries, the Dutch Safety Regions, Red Cross, and other non-governmental organisations in crisis management. They were invited based on the existing stakeholder-network within TNO, and with the aim of diversity in mind.

Figure 1: Impressions from workshop WS1

2.2 Process

The workshop started with a general welcome and introduction of the topic of CPC, after which participants had the opportunity to ask questions for clarification. The goal and process of the workshop was explained to the participants. In this setup, three discussion tables were used, each with another theme for the discussion. Themes were chosen so that participants could have had personal experiences with them in practice. The following themes were deemed interesting to discuss in the light of CPC: 1) which **activities** can civilians perform during crisis recovery, 2) what **information exchange** is necessary between civilians and professionals and 3) which **rules and responsibilities** are needed to streamline this collaboration? Participants were split into three groups, and each group alternately addressed all the themes by moving from table to table. This setup (cf. "World Café") helped to maximize

the number of participants that discussed a certain theme. At each table, two moderators from TNO guided the discussions and took notes on participants' comments and ideas.

The workshop was divided over two sessions: 'Current practices' and 'Visions for the future'. In the first session, the three themes were discussed by all groups. Participants were stimulated to think of current or past experiences they had concerning collaboration between civilians and professionals in the context of a crisis. In the second session, participants were invited to select one theme to create a vision for the future. They were stimulated to share their visions and ideas on how CPC might develop and under what conditions. See Figure 1: Impressions from workshop WS1

for an impression of the workshop.

2.3 Key Insights

The participants' comments and ideas from the discussions were gathered and grouped per theme. Each subsection summarizes the high-level findings from the 'Current practices' and 'Visions for the future' sessions combined. Then, based on participants' responses, key insights for CPC are derived.

2.3.1. THEME 1: Activities

- In day-to-day life, civilians are not preparing themselves for disaster all the time. Luckily, large-scale disasters are not commonplace in our society. So, participants of the workshop stress the importance for facilitating and stimulating CPC not only in the aftermath of a crisis; it needs to be present in society all the while. Thus, activities such as participating in a First Aid course or joining a WhatsApp group in your neighbourhood are small steps towards community engagement and the building of a necessary community network. As government, you need to become aware of such 'bottom-up' approaches and play a stimulating role towards such activities.
- Participants recognised there is a certain order in which to engage civilians: from affiliated volunteers (e.g. Red Cross volunteers) via their network to engage spontaneous volunteers. It remains important to get reliable indications what their capabilities are and which roles to engage them in. Do not force civilians or play on their emotions; voluntariness is an important prerequisite.
- Training together with civilians is seen as a good method to get hands-on experience in collaboration. Doing recovery activities together with 'active civilians' or spontaneous volunteers can be a learning experience for both professionals and civilians.

Table 1: Participants' responses and corresponding key insights for CPC for Theme 1: Activities

Participant responses	Key insight for CPC
Participants indicate that the need for and appropriateness of CPC activities depends strongly on the context of the crisis. Each situation has its own norms. In addition, the type of community influences the CPC activities. Participants experience is that in agricultural areas, civilians often take more initiative in helping each other than in urban areas. For example, participants mention farmers who help each other when confronted with risk of flooding.	CPC activities are context-dependent
Each incident or crisis has different phases. The involvement of civilians may differ from phase to phase, where each phase has its own	CPC activities are phase-dependent

challenges. These need to be identified further, to learn which civilian activities may contribute in which phase.	
The style of communication between professionals and civilians and expectations of civilians from professionals are two factors that differ between countries and are important for how professionals and civilians work together. For example, in Sweden civilians are incorporated more in crisis management (cf. civilian duty) whereas USA employs a directive style of communication to its civilians (cf. website for Californian bush-fires).	The form CPC activities take is country- dependent
Civilians want to decide for themselves in which CPC activities they participate. Participants doubt that civilians want to 'sign up beforehand' for activities during a crisis. As an example, they mention Team Österreich in Austria, where members can indicate on a case-by-case basis how they want to be involved. Even more, some participants doubt whether professionals can truly direct the way civilian initiatives are deployed. They can be influenced to a certain extent. On the other hand, professionals want to be able to scale civilian efforts to avoid being overwhelmed with help offers.	CPC activities should put civilians in the lead
All actors should strengthen their networks so that they know who they can go to during a crisis to get help or to give help. These should not be 'new' networks that only exist during a crisis, but should be based on established networks. For example, participants mentioned a general practitioner who mobilises his own network of other doctors during a crisis. Participants mention this explicitly for population groups who are less self-reliant (such as elderly or disabled people).	Strengthening (formal and informal) networks is key.
Civilians oftentimes contribute positively with their efforts. The only situations that have gone wrong concerned dangerous situations such as fire. Civilians kept entering a burning building to save victims. On the other hand, when civilian activities already take place and there is no increased risk, let these activities continue. For example, construction workers who evacuate many elderly persons from a care home. Professionals should more often make use of the existing knowledge and experience that civilians have regarding a crisis. This knowledge can be used to get a clearer picture of the crisis.	Active participation of civilians in crises is often helpful, but not always in dangerous situations.

2.3.2. THEME 2: Information Exchange

- The context of the discussion was the changing role of the government, and that the message towards civilians needs to change from 'we will take care of everything' towards 'you, as a civilian, are also responsible' (*responsible civilian-ship*). For this to work properly, civilians need information from the government and need to be informed as well as possible.
- Information exchange from professionals to civilians should focus on the message that professionals cannot take care of everything, and should give them actionable information on how to cope with the disaster. It is important to do this **prior** to a disaster, as well as think about which information to exchange with whom. On the other hand, it is an illusion to think information exchange can be planned perfectly beforehand or that nothing will go wrong. There still remains a need for flexible and ad-hoc collaboration, in addition to

planned collaboration. The better governments / professionals are at communicating this, the more it will improve mutual expectations and help civilians to cope better in the aftermath of crises.

Table 2: Participants' responses and corresponding key insights for CPC for Theme 2: Information Exchange

Participant responses	Key insight for CPC
Government is regarded as primarily the "information giver" regarding risks to society (such as the water level during flooding). They are required to be transparent in this respect (for example, during some crises, civilians need to fend for themselves for at least xx minutes). Participants expect that being open about this will increase pro-activity on part of civilians, it all depends on how this information is presented. The communication should outline the impact of the risks for civilians: what does it mean for them?	Government should be transparent in communicating risks
Participants mention that they recognise the importance and the strengths of existing channels of communication such as Twitter, news media, etc. They regard the creation of a new, crisis-specific channel as a weakness to effective crisis communication, primarily because people are unfamiliar with it. Currently, no structured action is taken based on 'civilian information' from open sources.	Information sharing between civilians should make use of existing communication channels
Civilians want to be informed quickly about what they can do regarding the crisis. Participants mention that professionals should not be too careful with distributing crisis-information among civilians. Civilians have been shown to make the right decisions for themselves based on this information. In fact, they can become important sources of information, such as during recent flooding in the Netherlands. Using this information requires an important change in mind-set of the professionals.	Information sharing between professionals and civilians
Professionals want to have insight into existing or ongoing civilian activities. For example, in the East of the Netherlands, one of the operational analysts is specifically tasked to do this. As this is very dependent on what is going on in society, professionals need to invest in their flexibility. They need to accept that they are not always in control, but need to relate to issues in society.	Creating insight into CPC activities for professionals

2.3.3. THEME 3: Rules and Responsibilities

- It seems contradictory to think in terms of rules and regulations, when you want to make use of spontaneous initiatives initiated by civilians.
- Nevertheless, establishing a "frame" in which volunteers can actively and safely engage with professional initiatives seems a good option, and would strengthen the idea that a crisis is not solely the professional's responsibility. One of the participants put forward that we should not even be discussing 'collaboration' but 'integration', meaning using each other's strengths and capabilities to the fullest extent.
- Professionals should trust in the flexibility that arises in society in the aftermath of a crisis, not focusing too much on what civilians are not allowed to do. Every crisis requires its own bespoke solutions of civilian engagement, participants confirmed that no two crises are the same.

Table 3: Participants' responses and corresponding key insights for CPC for Theme 3: Rules and Responsibilities

Participants' responses	Key insight for CPC
Civilians increasingly need to take on responsibility in order to stay safe. Government does not solve all problems ("keep calm, we'll take care of it" attitude), but changes its role into facilitation of civilian initiatives. Participants mention a number of programs organised by professionals, for example to improve civilian resilience; to incorporate civilians in professionals training, and to improve their self-reliance through Urban Survival Training. Such trainings do not have to be organised by the government, but could be organised by civilians / civilian groups themselves.	Role of the government changes from 'problem-solver' to 'facilitator'
There is a difference in what civilians are allowed to do, and what professionals are allowed to do. Professionals are (more than civilians) bound by occupational health and safety regulations and can only risk their lives under certain conditions. Civilians need to understand this, but professionals need to be open about restrictions to their work.	Civilians should have the right expectations regarding professionals' roles.
Recognition of professionals by civilians is very important, need to be identifiable as a professional. Participants mention that professionals should give explicit feedback or instructions to civilian initiatives. Furthermore, participants mention that each civilian has his or her own strengths that can be put to good use. This needs to be supported in a positive way by professionals. In addition, professionals should not think that the crisis is over when they leave, but should stay in touch. For example, during an evaluation discussion after the crisis, civilians should be included. Also professionals should show their gratitude more during and after a crisis towards civilians who appreciate this (this is not always the case).	The attitude of professionals towards civilians needs to be adapted.
Currently, professionals hold the view that managing and solving the crisis is their sole responsibility. New rules and regulations need to be set for professionals about how they can facilitate civilian initiatives. Obstacles that professionals experience include privacy, the risk of claims, cultural aspects in behaviour and governance. Participants have the feeling that during the crisis, a lot is possible, whereas after the crisis, problems and risks are identified which lead to new, stricter regulations. This is not helping their efforts.	Obstacles for professionals in CPC activities should be eliminated as much as possible.

2.4   Lessons Learned

Looking at the key insights from the workshop, it becomes clear that CPC during crisis recovery is still in its infancy and needs ongoing attention from both professionals and civilians.

Looking at the **Activities theme**, participants found it often hard to relate past examples of CPC activities. This could also be due to the fact that large disasters and crises do not occur so often. Another reason is that civilians' initiatives are hard to direct and control by professionals. However, the examples that were related by participants pointed out that civilians do spontaneously help when the occasion is there (such as a group of construction workers helping to evacuate an elderly care home) or when people already know each other

through (in)formal networks. Another important finding is that solutions for CPC should be country-, phase- and context-dependent. In other words, no one size fits all approach.

From the **Information exchange theme**, two important lessons are to be deducted. First, information sharing between civilians could be better exploited by professionals, as currently no action is taken based on such information. Second, information provision from professionals to civilians needs to be open, transparent in communicating risks and distributed widely. This will lead to civilians making the right decisions (i.e. complying with the evacuation of a crisis area).

Concerning the **Rules and regulations theme**, participants admit that mind-set and culture need to change in professional organisations as well as on part of the civilians, in order for CPC to work well. It is remarkable how many key insights focus on required changes in attitude, mindset, expectations and increased insight into each other's roles and responsibilities. A new 'frame' is needed in which CPC activities can take place safely and effectively while contributing to (instead of hampering) the professional handling of the crisis.

On the whole, participants indicated that they found the workshop inspiring and thought-provoking, especially hearing experiences from other colleagues in the field about how they cope and manage with CPC. During the discussions, it became apparent that CPC is a very complex challenge for the institutionalised (Dutch) Safety Regions, who currently rely on standing operation procedures and protocols.

Of course, these results were obtained in the Dutch context, and the authors do not imply that these results would be the same in all other European countries. Each country or region has its own culture and level of community engagement. What is needed is a method and practical guidelines that allow professionals and civilians to identify these characteristics in their own context and in this way build concepts for CPC that would fit their own needs.

Importantly, participants of the workshop did not foresee the use of standard templates for the development of CPC collaboration processes for their own organisations. The way CPC should be implemented depended on the type of incident, the number and types of actors and organisations involved, the rules and procedures that holds for the involved actors and organisations, legal issues, political climate, etc. This does not mean that CPC cannot be planned prior to the incident, but rather that the 'frame' of working should be flexibly tailored to each situation.

2.5   Requirements for the Method

The aim of this workshop was to identify requirements for a method to design and implement CPC concepts and activities. From the key insights and lessons learned presented above, a number of requirements for this method can be derived. This mapping is done by stating one or more requirements per key insight, as presented in Appendix A. The overview of the resulting requirements is presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Initial list of requirements for the method

Requirements for the method
1)   Method should allow for flexibility in creating CPC activities that are dependent on the crisis situation.
2)   Method should include an appropriate representation of the civilian and professional groups.
3)   Method should facilitate discussion about each phase of the crisis.

4)	Method should be internationally applicable.
5)	Method should result in country-specific solutions.
6)	Method should facilitate creation of initiatives / activities that puts the initiative itself central, not the existing crisis-management procedures.
7)	Method should facilitate the building and strengthening of networks.
8)	Method should focus attention to what risks civilians face in CPC activities.
9)	Method should coerce participants to communicate openly.
10)	Method should be open to incorporate existing channels of communication
11)	Method needs to facilitate change in mind-set of civilians and professionals.
12)	Method should facilitate mutual understanding between civilians and professionals.
13)	Method should facilitate in flexible solutions, depending on the societal context.
14)	Method should facilitate the dialogue between professionals and civilians concerning roles and responsibilities.
15)	Method should address the necessary attitude or code of conduct during each phase of the crisis.
16)	Method needs to identify strengths of each of the actors.
17)	Method should facilitate the creation of new rules, regulations and procedures.

As can be read in D6.8, our initial intention was to be able to derive generic collaboration concepts, i.e. ways of working together that are suited for CPC, from participants' responses in the workshop. This would help to identify which COBACORE project results ('building blocks') would be relevant to include in our method, and to offer a step-by-step method to select and tune these generic building blocks to specific contexts. Based on the key insights and lessons learned from this workshop WS1, a change to this initial idea is needed if the method is to be successful. Stakeholders themselves should be facilitated to create their own CPC activities, specific for their context and setting, by reasoning from strengths and flexible solutions. Also, the method should allow for an open discussion to facilitate change in mind-set and more insight into each other's roles and responsibilities.

These requirements serve as an input for the development of a co-creation method based on the principles of Appreciative Inquiry (AI). The development of this method is described in more detail in D6.8, Chapter 3 and 4. This method was tuned to the crisis recovery domain and subsequently piloted in the next workshop WS2.

3 WS2: Refining the Co-Creation Method

In the second workshop, a first version of the co-creation method was piloted and subsequently refined by having representative stakeholders use the method in a realistic, but fictional, scenario. We wanted to ensure the method worked well before presenting it to actual stakeholders. See for a current description of the method Deliverable D6.8.

3.1 Goal and Stakeholders

The goal of this second workshop was twofold. Firstly, the aim was to explore and identify collaboration activities between community members and professionals that have the potential to increase the speed and quality of crisis recovery processes. In which activities can civilians and professionals work together? The co-creation method should help to make these collaboration activities as concrete as possible and reach agreements on their implementation. Secondly, the aim was to practice and test the co-creation method for our purpose: Is it a useful method to co-create and implement CPC activities?

We aimed for two outcomes of the workshop:

- Examples of CPC activities specified by both professionals and community members and agreements on next steps to implement these collaboration activities in future crises (described in section 3.3).
- Insight into the usefulness of the co-creation method as a way to identify CPC activities and come to agreements on their implementation within a specific domain context such as the Dutch safety domain (described in section 3.4).

This second workshop was hosted by Safety Region "IJsselland" in the city of Zwolle, the Netherlands, in November 2015. For this second workshop, the project team invited relevant stakeholders active in the domain of crisis management, from among participants to the first workshop, the TNO network and the network of the Safety Region "IJsselland". In total twelve people participated, including Safety Region professionals, volunteers from the Red Cross, a number of citizens and one researcher. The citizens were invited from within the existing network of the Safety Region professionals. An overview of the participants is provided in Table 5 below. The workshop was moderated by two TNO researchers with experience in facilitation of AI workshops and observed by two other TNO researchers.

Table 5: Stakeholder groups and number of participants per stakeholder group in WS2.

Stakeholder group	Participants from	Number of participants
Civilians and Community	Citizens	7
Government	Safety Regions	2
Societal institutions	Red Cross	2
Research organisation	Subject Matter Expert	1

3.2 Process

This workshop was set-up as a test of the usefulness of the method to identify CPC activities in the setting of crisis recovery. Therefore, the workshop program was based on the phases in the method as described in Deliverable 6.8 (and summarised below). Furthermore, a concise crisis response and recovery scenario was prepared beforehand to inspire the participants and

guide the discussion. It focused on evacuating a neighbourhood with young families and an elderly care home (*response*) and subsequently finding shelter and rebuilding a school (*recovery*) (see Table 6).

At the beginning of the workshop, participants were welcomed and were explained the goal and approach of the workshop. In addition, the co-creation method was explained in broad outlines. After this introduction, they were asked to read and sign the informed consent form. Next, a short 'introduction game' was played. In this way participants got to know each other (name, organisation) and their (potential) role in crisis response and recovery, which would also be their role in this workshop.

Table 6: Storyline of the crisis management scenario used in WS2.

Storyline
In Assen, a city in the north of The Netherlands, a factory producing lighter fluid is struck by lightning. This causes a fire which spreads to the warehouses of the factory. The fire department is called in, as the fire rages out of control. Due to excessive smoke development, a number of neighbourhoods, schools and an elderly care home must be evacuated. In the workshop, four scenarios were presented that involved affected civilians helping themselves, helping children in evacuating the school and helping professionals to evacuate the elderly care home. The aim was to provide these situations as starting point to develop suitable CPC activities during Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Subsequently, we started with Phase 1 of the method (see Figure 2): 'Discover'. In this phase, participants have to interview each other about their experiences with collaboration activities in the context of a crisis. The phase was explained in detail after which participants formed pairs or trios to interview each other about **personal experiences** and success stories in crisis management settings. The moderators assured that each pair or trio formed a combination of different stakeholders. After the interviews were finalised, two groups were formed; in these two groups the participants worked on Phase 2 to 4 of the method.

The objective of Phase 2 'Dream' was to discuss the **ideal situation** regarding collaboration between all stakeholders in the scenario we provided. Here, the participants were asked to rely on the outcomes of the interviews they had performed in Phase 1 and elaborate on these outcomes to identify success factors that made the experience a success story. In this phase, the scenario was provided as input as well. Participants were asked to think about how the ideal situation they had sketched would look like when applied to that scenario.

After a lunchbreak, the groups continued with Phase 3 'Design': participants had to identify the **requirements and restrictions** for their ideal situation. The objective of Phase 3 was to generate proposals for changes to the current situation in order to reach the ideal situation (as the groups described it in the previous phase). The workshop concluded with Phase 4 'Develop': in this phase participants were asked to specify **concrete actions** that would lead to the realisation of proposed changes. They were further asked to put these actions on a timeline and specify agreements for their implementation (ownership, deadline, feedback). Each group took notes on flip-overs on the outcome of their discussions. After Phases 1 to 4, the groups presented their work to each other and commented on each other's results.

During each phase in the method, the two moderators supported the groups in their activities and discussions and in reaching the objectives of each phase. Meanwhile, the two observers collected notes on the discussions and observations on the process. Finally, the moderators evaluated the method, by asking participants to reflect on how they experienced working with this method. In total the workshop took six hours to complete.

1. Discover	2. Dream	3. Design	4. Develop
What are our strengths?	*What does the ideal situation look like?*	*What do we need for our ideal situation?*	*How will we realise that?*

Figure 2: The four phases of the co-creation method.

3.3   Key Insights

The first goal of the workshop was to explore and identify collaboration activities between community members and professionals that have the potential to increase the speed and quality of crisis recovery processes. In this section, the results of the two groups are presented.

3.3.1.   Phase 1: Discover

After the interviews participants indicated they liked this start of the workshop. It enabled them to get to know each other and to explore the topic. They also stated that it was not always easy to come up with specific, concrete experiences of CPC. Not everyone had experienced a crisis or incident, let alone personal experience with collaboration activities in such a setting. Therefore, some participants had discussed crises or incidents they knew from the media. Others discussed collaboration experiences with professionals in other settings. They indicated that the protocol was useful in making a report of the discussion. Every couple came up with a number of success factors as a result from their interviews.

3.3.2.   Phase 2: Dream

Group 1 focused on the actual collaboration between civilians and professional responders while evacuating the elderly care home. Their ideal situation encompassed situations where civilians with local knowledge ('Mr Johnson from the third floor is always in the day room on Thursdays') together with crisis responders would move through the home to quickly and efficiently evacuate all persons. In their dream, this cooperation would run smoothly. In the ideal world everyone would have access to an overview of relevant organisations for that incident or crisis. Additionally, civilians that need help and civilians that can provide help could find each other easily. The group did not focus their brainstorm on an entire evacuation scenario, they focused on elements of that scenario. They discussed for some elements what could be improved. Although many 'dreams' were identified, they might have come up with more had they addressed the complete scenario.

Group 2 also used the evacuation scenario to share their dreams. They succeeded in addressing the complete scenario and addressing all success factors that resulted from the interviews in the previous phase. In their dream too, the civilians and professionals cooperated smoothly in the evacuation scenario. Civilians would continue their involvement in this task even when professionals arrived at the scene as well. It was not necessary to let the professionals take over the evacuation; civilians continued with evacuation activities, because it unburdened the professionals. The transfer of information between them (which apartments had already been checked, which not) ran smoothly as well. The group exchanged some ideas about how this envisioned activity may look like in reality.

3.3.3.   Phase 3: Design

Group 1 used the phases in crisis management to structure their requirements and restrictions. They came up with all kinds of requirements and important concepts for success such as the necessity of trust, mutual understanding and respect between civilians and professionals, as well as the feeling of being treated as equals. Participants in group 1 further stressed the relevance of sharing information between the two groups, not only during the crisis, but also in the preparation phase(s). During a crisis, especially the information transfer between civilians and professionals at the moment professionals arrive at the scene is a relevant moment to be prepared for. Restrictions and issues that group 1 identified as relevant were the following: limitations due to privacy regulations, current (negative) attitude of (some) civilians, fear of liability (claims), and limited information sharing. Lastly they discussed the necessary change in mind-set on part of civilians as well as on part of professionals.

Group 2 also came up with many requirements and restrictions. In this group, some participants represented the Red Cross, and as a result this group identified more requirements and restrictions directly related to the role of organised volunteers. For example, the group also identified the issue of the current attitude of (some) civilians towards professionals. However, they added that Red Cross volunteers are viewed differently by civilians, making them a very useful linkage between civilians and professionals. They also highlighted the fact that when civilians can be involved in mitigating activities, they feel useful instead of feeling like a passive bystander, and this may make the experience of witnessing a crisis less stressful. This group also addressed the recovery phase after a crisis and the necessity to organise after-care for all (spontaneous) volunteers involved. Other concepts identified by this group were similar to the concepts identified by group 1: the necessity of trust, mutual respect and understanding, feelings of equality, the sharing of information etc.

3.3.4.   Phase 4: Develop

Group 1 identified several concrete actions for the time periods indicated. Their list ranged from making stickers with the text 'This house is evacuated' (within 5 hours), to developing an app to support CPC (5 weeks), to organising a training for a crisis with the involvement of civilians (5 months).

The discussions in group 2 also resulted in concrete actions. Among others, they suggested to organise a training exercise with civilians and professionals from all layers of Dutch safety organisations. Such an exercise would also give insight into whether a liaison would be a helpful role in CPC activities. Another action was related to the use of social media. They suggested to train professionals so they are able to use social media in line with the objective of support for CPC. Other actions related to the need to re-assess and adapt current protocols where applicable. Lastly, this group specified an action to start an awareness campaign about CPC.

Figure 3: Images from the second workshop WS2, where participants discuss critical success factors.

Both groups came up with the insight that current regulations restrict firefighters and other safety professionals from joining in such spontaneous collaboration activities. To mitigate this and arrive at the "near ideal" situation, the following concrete actions were put forward:

1. Training together with civilians and other community members (local shopkeepers, district nurses, …) might help to nurture mutual understanding on roles and responsibilities.
2. Social media can be used for achieving several objectives in CPC, e.g.: 1) encourage and engage; 2) monitor sentiment. Using social media to encourage and engage civilians to help with the evacuation, but also to monitor and know beforehand how the sentiments are amongst the civilians regarding the crisis. For example, are people angry because crisis response took such a long time?
3. A liaison person ('Crisis John' or 'Jantje Crisis' in Dutch) community members and professional responders. This person (or team of persons) should be approachable for community members with offerings of help and should relay this to the right professionals.

In addition to specific suggestions about how CPC can be organised, the participants of the workshop came up with relevant suggestions for preparing for CPC. We will use these suggestions to specify requirements for our method (see below under Lessons Learned).

Table 7: Participants' responses and key insights for CPC from WS2

Participants' responses	Key insight for CPC
Participants agree that the 'willingness' to work together should start at the bottom of the professional organisations.	Not only management should be involved in developing CPC activities.
In return, civilians should be respectful of the professionals' authority and experience and not react aggressively towards them in the heat of the moment.	The method should result in a way of working that contribute to mutual understanding.
Make current professional processes and protocols more flexible to facilitate CPC activities as outlined above.	Flexible processes and protocols might be more useful for CPC than fixed processes and protocols.

Insurance should cover the activities that civilians undertake in helping out with a crisis or incident.	Preparing for CPC might imply a review of insurance policies.
An important requirement is that the mutual expectations should be managed well ('what can this person do?')	It appears to be important to manage expectations at both sides of the collaboration. One way to achieve this is to involve actors of the target groups as soon as possible in the process of preparing CPC. This supports: • getting to know each other; • share and exchange expectations; • learn capabilities of other parties; • direct the actual of collaboration.
Community members should be respectful to professionals' decisions.	One way to gain respect for decisions taken by professionals is to involve citizens in and inform them about the way of working of professionals. This is therefore considered relevant for CPC.
When a situation is too dangerous for civilians, they should keep their distance.	CPC activities should not be too dangerous for civilians. Informing about risks will help to meet this objective.
In Phase 4, participants had to think about concrete actions that would lead to the realisation of proposed changes. They were further asked to put these actions on a timeline and specify owners for each of the actions. Participants indicated that they found this difficult, as they felt they did not have the position or role to act on the actions identified (not all participants were decision-makers in their organisation).	For the implementation of change decision-makers of relevant organisations should be involved.

3.4 Lessons Learned

The second goal of the workshop was to practice and test the co-creation method to answer the question: Is it a useful method to co-create and implement CPC activities? Several lessons learned are identified, which are presented below.

When creating pairs for the interviews or groups for Phases 2 to 4, not only must be ensured that stakeholders representing the same type of organisation are equally divided, but other individual characteristics seem to be relevant as well. For example, in this workshop one group consisted of more junior participants than the other group. In some cases, this appeared to be less effective. For example, the more experienced group found it easier to relate to the whole scenario. The less experienced group focused only on elements of the scenario that appealed to them.

⇨ **When the method is applied, an appropriate mix of actors (mixed with respect to background, age, seniority and experience) should be involved.**

Groups in this workshop consisted of seven participants, this appears to be an appropriate number: groups were small enough for every participant to take his turn and bring in his

opinion, the groups were large enough to have interesting discussions with different perspectives.

⇨ **The method should work with groups of around seven participants**

Both groups needed the moderation to achieve the objective of each Phase. In the less experienced group, participants sometimes needed encouragement to try and find answers and solutions for the questions asked. The moderator of this group took care of this. The participants of the other group, on the other hand, were so experienced that their discussions sometimes drifted off topic. They exchanged their own experiences even in the Phases were the assignment asked for other forms of discussion. Here the moderator intervened to keep on track. In both groups the moderator thus had a relevant role.

⇨ **The method should make use of a moderator for each (sub)group in order to either stimulate the group to proceed or keep it on track.**

Phase 1 and 2 focused on exchanging positive own examples and ideas, and on creating the ideal situation together. It was good to see that in one group all positive experiences from Phase 1 were taken into account in creating the ideal situation. Participants made an effort to relate all success factors to the ideal situation. From Phase 3 onwards, the dynamic in the groups changed. Here, participants argued with each other about current issues and challenges, and about the best way forward. Participants told the observers that they experienced the transition between Phase 2 and 3 as resulting in a different 'group dynamic'. They added that the first two Phases had been inspirational and were a good way to start a workshop. It enabled building a positive base for discussion within the group, which smoothens the discussion in later Phases. In other words, one of the objectives of applying a variant of the Appreciative Inquiry is achieved: Because participants had started the workshop with a positive focus, discussions in a later phase were less intimidating as they might have been without this positive experience.

At the end of the workshop, participants were asked how they had experienced working with this method. For most, this was the first time they encountered a co-creation setting or the AI approach. They found it an interesting and constructive manner to guide a discussion and they appreciated the clear structure. The use of interviews was considered an appropriate and effective way of getting to know each other.

On the downside, participants were doubtful whether the results they had reached would be taken up by professional organisations. They were missing a clear 'problem owner' at the discussion table. Also, they considered the scenario merely as an aid, instead of leading for the discussion. The suggestion was made to use a real-life case next time.

⇨ **Real-life settings are preferred over fictive scenarios to increase the uptake of results.**

Concerning which participants should be included in the follow-up sessions, participants saw that the method could also play a role in incorporating civilian groups that are more at a distance than the 'usual' crisis recovery groups such as Red Cross volunteers. The method could be used as a means for training at schools, churches or community homes.

On the whole, the workshop learned that participants liked the way of working that the method facilitated and considered the approach suitable for discussing and implementing CPC activities. About the organisation of the workshop the following lessons were identified:

- When the method is applied, an appropriate mix of actors (mixed with respect to background, age, seniority and experience) should be involved.

- The method should work with groups of around seven participants.
- The method should make use of a moderator for each (sub)group in order to either stimulate the group to proceed or keep it on track.
- Real-life settings are preferred over fictive scenarios to increase the uptake of results.

Insights into implementing CPC activities were already specified in section 3.3.

3.5 Updated Requirements for the Method

As in the previous chapter, the key insights and lessons learned in this workshop WS2 can be grouped and analysed to arrive at an updated set of requirements for the method. Appendix A presents again the mapping of key insights to requirements, together with the requirements identified after Workshop 1. Two new requirements were added to the list (18 and 19) and a number of requirements were updated based on the insights from the workshop. This results in the following updated list of requirements for the method, presented below in Table 8. This list will serve as a requirements baseline for our method in Deliverable D6.8 (Chapter 3).

Table 8: Updated list of requirements for the Method after Workshop 2

Requirements for method
1) Method should allow for flexibility in creating CPC activities that are dependent on the crisis.
2) Method should include an appropriate representation of the civilian and professional groups, e.g. operational experts and decision makers. Where applicable other organisations may be invited as well, such as neighbourhood organisations and, religious communities.
3) Method should facilitate discussion about each phase of the crisis.
4) Method should be internationally applicable.
5) Method should result in country-specific solutions.
6) Method should facilitate creation of initiatives / activities that puts the initiative itself central, not the existing crisis-management procedures.
7) Method should facilitate the building and strengthening of networks.
8) Method should focus attention to what risks civilians face in CPC activities.
9) Method should coerce participants to communicate openly.
10) Method should be open to incorporate existing channels of communication
11) Method needs to facilitate change in mind-set of civilians and professionals.
12) Method should facilitate mutual understanding and respect between civilians and professionals.
13) Method should facilitate in flexible solutions, depending on the societal context.
14) Method should facilitate the dialogue between professionals and civilians concerning roles and responsibilities.
15) Method should address the necessary attitude or code of conduct during each phase of the crisis.
16) Method needs to identify strengths of each of the actors.
17) Method should facilitate the creation of new rules, regulations and procedures.
18) Method should support thinking beyond current protocols (e.g. insurance).
19) Method should support involvement of all relevant actors in early phase of development of CPC.

4   WS3: Validating the Co-Creation Method

In this third workshop, we validated the final version of the co-creation method with actual stakeholders in a realistic, but fictive scenario. See for a current description of the method Deliverable D6.8.

4.1   Goal and Stakeholders

The goal of this third workshop was twofold. The first goal was to validate the co-creation method with actual stakeholders within a realistic scenario that they themselves currently experience. Considering the current issues with refugees not only in the Netherlands, but in all European countries, a scenario in this context was chosen. The second goal, for the participants, was to arrive at solutions to pressing problems regarding shelter for refugees. Participants were asked to come up with collaboration concepts in which the interests of all stakeholders were addressed. At the end of this workshop, participants were specifically asked whether the method helped them to arrive at these solutions.

We invited a number of relevant stakeholders, who are actively involved in the current refugee crisis. In total thirteen participants voluntarily took part in this workshop. They all signed informed consent forms prior to participating. The workshop was hosted by three moderators from TNO and one consortium-partner from the Red Cross. The work domains of the participants ranged from government (local municipality, Safety Regions), ministry institution (central body for refugee shelter; 'COA' in Dutch) and non-governmental organisations (Red Cross, bureau for community safety training, Foundation for Refugee Work). Due to time and ethical constraints, it proved not feasible to invite two important participant groups: civilians and refugees themselves. In real life situations where this method is adopted, it is important that all important stakeholders are present during the discussions. For this workshop, participants had experience with organising refugee crisis shelters (for max 72 hours) as well as shelter for longer periods of time (up to 3 months). The table below presents the number of participants who took the perspectives of the different stakeholder groups.

Table 9: Stakeholder groups and number of participants in WS3.

Stakeholder group	Participants from	Number of participants
Civilians and Community	Red Cross, bureau for community safety training.	3
Government	Local municipality & Safety Regions	6
Ministry institution	Central body for refugee shelter (COA in Dutch); Foundation for Refugee Work	2
Societal institutions	Red Cross	2

4.2   Process

In broad lines, the same approach was followed as in the previous workshop. First, participants were welcomed and explained the goal and approach of the workshop and the co-creation method in broad outlines. After this introduction, they were asked to read and sign the informed consent form. Next, the first phase in the method was explained in detail and participants formed pairs to interview each other on **personal experiences** and success stories

in these experiences (Phase 1). During the second phase, participants were divided into two groups to discuss their **ideal situation** regarding collaboration between all stakeholders in the scenario (Phase 2). The moderators ensured that all stakeholder groups were represented in both groups. Participants were asked to take the success stories from Phase 1 into account. During this phase, participants immersed themselves in the scenario, describing a fictive Dutch city called "Waaldrecht", where a long-term refugee shelter had to be realised in one of the neighbourhoods. After lunchbreak, participants identified the **requirements and restrictions** for their ideal situation in Phase 3. The goal of this phase is to come up with a proposition for actual changes that need to be made to the current situation to reach the ideal situation. Finally, in Phase 4, these changes are put into concrete **actions** on a timeline, including owners of these actions.

During each phase in the method, notes were taken on flip-overs in both groups. One of the moderators took notes on the discussion and presentation. After Phases 1 to 4 were executed, both groups presented their results and commented on each other's work. Finally, the moderators evaluated the method by asking participants to reflect on how they experienced working with this method. In total the workshop took six hours to complete.

Figure 4: Participants working on their ideal situation (Phase 2) during the co-creation method.

4.3 Key Insights

Below, key insights from the comments and discussions of the participants of WS3 are grouped and presented. Each Phase (1-4) of the co-creation method is discussed separately.

4.3.1. Phase 1: Success Factors

In Phase 1, participants uncovered important success factors for CPC from own experiences. A lot of success factors identified could be categorised as personal or social factors. For example: knowing each other's roles and responsibilities, the opportunity for personal contact, short and proven lines of communication. In short, 'knowing each other' was involved in many of the success factors for the participants. Quality or success is in the (often informal) interactions between persons themselves, not in the processes.

Another important success factor is leadership, according to the participants. Leaders (both formal and informal) must be able to make the right connections between the key persons involved and engage all stakeholders. They must be able to make use of existing networks and the potential in the community.

Finally, the way the community is informed, is an important success factor. Making the refugee crisis visible in the community and informing the community in a clear language helps the

involvement of the community and sparks initiatives. Especially professional organisations should overcome the 'system-reality': checking all the necessary boxes in a communication campaign does not guarantee that needs of the community will be fulfilled. Being able to communicate effectively and clearly increases the impact of a communication campaign.

4.3.2. Phase 2: Ideal Situation

In order to create the ideal situation for the organisation of a refugee shelter, participants were invited to incorporate the success factors from the previous phase into this phase. One of the most prominent points made was again the involvement of direct stakeholders (community members living in close proximity to the shelter). In communication, their fears should be alleviated and they should be involved as much as possible. In the ideal case, this should be their own initiative! Concrete examples from the groups include starting a second-hand shop or repair café, organising welcoming get-togethers with community members and refugees or organising culture or language courses. Societal organisations such as the Red Cross could play a significant role in mobilising people to start these initiatives. After that, initiatives should be carried on by community members and refugees together. Refugees should be allowed or encouraged to contribute too: for example, charity work or self-supporting activities.

In the ideal case, the right people with the right skills are brought together. Such key-figures need to be identified, need to be allowed to step up and arrange initiatives. Local government must play the role to facilitate these initiatives, and not be afraid to go beyond the rules for the sake of improving living conditions. This implies that the right competences (leadership, empathy, social skills) need to be developed for professional people involved.

4.3.3. Phase 3: Requirements and Restrictions

Requirements: Clear communication about intentions must be communicated to all levels, but specifically to the executing levels of the professional organisations involved and to the community. Focus in communication should be on attitude and message: for example, the professionals that organise the shelter should have the attitude of 'guest' in the community or district where the shelter is. The right communication and right attitude is an investment in the community on the long term: governments cannot expect communities to become self-organising and self-reliant overnight.

Looking at restrictions, current legislation, rules and regulations often hamper initiatives by community members or do not provide (government) professionals the necessary flexibility to facilitate such initiatives.

4.3.4. Phase 4: Concrete Actions

Concrete actions can be grouped on the short (one week), middle (one year) and long (multiple years) term. On the short term, contact with the community must be improved. For example, communicating clearly about the interests of all stakeholders (professionals, community and refugees) and facilitating the local initiatives that arise. On the middle term, the ability for professionals to know about existing networks and key persons that can be engaged, must be improved. On the long term, rules and regulations need to be changed to be more flexible without losing accountability.

4.4 Lessons Learned

Based on the assessment of the moderators and the feedback from participants, the following lessons could be identified on the phases in the method and on the applicability of the method itself.

During Phase 1 (**Discover** , *success factors*), participants liked the interview setting as it offered an easy and intuitive setting to start talking about their experiences. On the other hand, the subsequent gathering and combining of the success factors in the group took a relatively long time. The idea was to have everybody name their factors quickly and gather them together, but people tended to elaborate on the factor itself and the example behind it. Moderators should focus the participants to identify building blocks, but not to elaborate extensively on their experiences. In Phase 2 (**Dream**, *ideal situation*), one group found it difficult to form a concrete ideal situation. This was mainly due to the fact that a 'fictive' scenario was used during the discussions. Participants found it hard to relate to the challenges in this scenario, but still discussed the potential of the success factors. In the other group, participants took the liberty to diverge from the scenario and started tackling a real-world problem that they felt they could change. This proves the added value of the method, by leveraging the power of individuals to change circumstances within their own reach. Both groups indicated they missed the perspective of the refugees themselves in these group discussions.

Phase 3 (**Design**) and 4 (**Develop**) (*requirements, restrictions and concrete actions*) resulted in many comments on current challenges, specifically on procedures and protocols that are considered counter-productive at the moment. Especially the apparent contradiction of 'organised community involvement' proved difficult to solve. On the one hand, government and professionals would like to stimulate and redirect community efforts to better align with their own operational procedures. On the other hand, they too admitted that communities should be left to organise themselves as best as they want or can. Government participants tended to think in terms of 'who is responsible for what?', whereas community members more often think in terms of 'who can do what?' This hampered at least one group to arrive at concrete actions; they could not reach a concrete action plan with a timeline, despite moderation efforts. The other group could form a more concrete plan of action to arrive at their envisioned ideal situation.

At the end of the workshop, participants provided feedback on the method in general and its applicability. Participants found the method 'inspiring', 'fine' and 'valuable' and some wanted to use the method more often in their own organisations. Some quotes by participants:

- *"These kinds of sessions should be held more often. To really listen to each other and get insight into each other's interests".*
- *"Great to think out-of-the-box like this; no more 'yes, but…'".*
- *"I now better understand the organisations I thought I knew".*
- *"The power of the group arises out of the discussions".*
- *"This method improves the learning ability of the government".*
- *"The concrete actions identified should be put on the agenda for 6 months in our organisation; that would facilitate real change".*

From the feedback of the participants, we can derive that they were positive about the method and what it could do. At least three participants offered to explore if they could use this method within their own organisations.

5 Policy Advice for the Dutch National Safety Domain

Based on the experience gained in the workshops, it seems that the co-creation method can provide added value for designing CPC activities in crisis recovery. The co-creation method and some results from the workshops formed the basis for the proposed policy advice for the Dutch National Safety Domain. This advice is supported by the stakeholders from the workshops (NLRC, Safety Regions) and is offered to the relevant policy advisory board IFV (Institute for Physical Safety) in The Netherlands. Within the current document, the sections below serve as an example output of how the co-creation method can be further implemented in a specific country or region.

5.1 Proposition: Co-created Resilience

'Co-created resilience' provides a new concept in which professionals and civilians work together in the recovery activities after crises and incidents. This requires a network in which government bodies, civilians, companies and NGO's contribute to crisis management and in which civilians and companies are viewed as essential 'crisis partners' for professionals. The affected community and local organizations have an intrinsic interest in participating in recovery activities. In addition, their local presence, knowledge and network has proven to be of vital importance during recovery and aftercare activities. Co-created resilience is the result if we combine and connect current separate building blocks: the recovery activities of both professionals and of civilians (and others). It can provide a foundation on which society can build and trust during crises.

In a practical way, in every crisis co-created resilience leads to a different set of networks, actors and organisations working together. Every crisis is different, involving other local administrators, neighbourhoods and companies. Spontaneously organized help is hard to define and organize beforehand, but the right conditions can be created. If parties in society are more conscious of their own role and their possible contribution(s), and if it becomes less obvious that professionals will take care of everything, co-created resilience becomes an essential development. This will lead to the realisation of all parties that 'we're in this together'; that mutual interests in recovery activities can lead to shared responsibilities and collaboration.

5.2 How to Realise This Proposition?

In order for civilians, professionals, organisations and government to realise this proposition, several steps can be taken:

Initiate a dialogue between all parties, and be open and clear about the expectations and conditions of civilian-professional collaboration activities. For example, societal organisations can become the linking pin between civilian initiatives and government initiatives, and can work together at the same level as the Safety Regions.

- In this dialogue, create the realisation that:
    - o Policy makers and professionals should take into account that civilians will deploy initiatives to 'help themselves'. They should be allowed to play this important part in the recovery. The role of professionals will shift to guiding,

coordinating and protecting these civilian initiatives, and providing specialist resources and knowledge where necessary.
  - o Civilians should understand where their initiatives are most effective, and where the most added value to professional aid can be realized. On the other hand, civilians should take a step back in situations or initiatives that are considered too dangerous or harmful.
- Create the solution together: civilians and professionals work together on local level (district / neighbourhood) to realise concrete examples of CPC activities. By focusing together on activities that will work, understanding arises about mutual possibilities and concerns. This can be done by following the four steps in the co-creation method:
  - o Step 1: Discover: What are our strengths?
  - o Step 2: Dream: What does the ideal situation look like?
  - o Step 3: Design: What do we need for our ideal situation to work?
  - o Step 4: Develop: How will we realize that?
- Experience the solution: involve civilians in crisis management and crisis recovery training, practices and evaluations. Try to implement and test the resulting CPC activities and learn from them. Locally proven initiatives should be taught as 'best practices' of future collaborations (such as work procedures, supporting apps and tooling, ways to coordinate civilians, platforms, safety and protection, insurance).
- Keep supporting the network: civilians must feel motivated to invest in their own safety and in collaboration. Government organisations (specifically the department of Civilian Care) must provide information to civilians on interesting initiatives and success stories from own or other regions. The concept of a Community Liaison (Team) can be helpful in this respect.

6 General Conclusions

In this document, three workshops were described that helped 1) to identify requirements for a method that supports the implementation of CPC activities and tools; and 2) to apply, refine and validate this method.

The first workshop resulted in a list of seventeen requirements for the method to be developed. Based on key insights from the workshop and these initial requirements a co-creation method was selected as a base for the method to be developed. The co-creation method is based on the internationally applied theory of Appreciative Inquiry (see D6.8 for a detailed description).

The second workshop was used to pilot this co-creation method, and see if refinements to the method were needed. Two new requirements for the method were identified, and a number of requirements were refined or extended. The second workshop also identified lessons for organising a workshop in which this method is applied. These relate to type and number of participants and the role of the moderator.

The third workshop was held with stakeholders in the refugee crisis, who worked with the final version of the method. Key insights from this workshop identified factors that should be taken into account when organisations and civilians want to design and implement CPC activities. Also, feedback from observers and participants was collected to validate whether the method reaches its intended outcomes.

A number of general conclusions across the results of all three workshops can be reached:

The co-creation method applied here (described in D6.8) allows key stakeholders to arrive at envisioned CPC activities, taking into account their requirements and current restrictions. It allows stakeholders to reason from positive experiences and success stories, rather than from problems and things that go wrong. It furthermore creates an open atmosphere for discussion.

Positive feedback was received on the co-creation method itself. Participants enjoyed the open, informal but structured way of co-creating solutions that this method provided. They found it 'inspiring' and understood mutual interests better.

Four limitations to the method can be identified. Firstly, it proved hard to get the right decision-makers and stakeholders at the table. People involved in the method should be 'problem owners' who are motivated and capable to make a change to their environment. Secondly, the role of experience or other personal characteristics (such as extraversion or dominance) influenced the outcome of the group discussions. Moderators should beware that everyone contributes and every perspective is appreciated. Thirdly, fictional scenarios were used, while the original Appreciative Inquiry method stresses the need to tackle real situations participants find themselves in. Finally, for all participants, this was the first encounter with co-creation or Appreciative Inquiry. Consequently, participants found it hard to effectively reach their ideal situation through concrete actions. So in short, the mantra for this method seem to be: right stakeholders, real problems, and repeat often. It should be noted that the findings in this document focus on the Dutch Safety Domain only. However, the resulting guidelines in D6.8 were designed with the aspect of international applicability in mind, i.e. it is expected that they are applicable to other countries as well.

What is striking to see is that in every workshop stakeholders stress the fact that many solutions for effective CPC activities should be found in social, political or interpersonal factors. They stress the need for a personal approach and individual and respectful contact, especially

in last workshop about the refugee crisis case. Examples are creating a human liaison ('Crisis John') or making communication lines as short and personal as possible. These were considered the main foundations for efficient and effective collaboration activities, and resulted in policy advice on co-created resilience for the Dutch National Safety Domain (Chapter 5). When there is trust between stakeholders in what each can achieve, they can achieve more together.

7 References

Cooperrider, D.L. (1986), 'Appreciative Inquiry: Toward a Methodology for Understanding and Enhancing Organizational Innovation', dissertation, Case Western Reserve University.

Cooperrider, D.L. & Srivastva, S. (1987) 'Appreciative inquiry in organizational life'. In Woodman, R. W. & Pasmore, W.A. (eds) Research in Organizational Change And Development, Vol. 1 (129–169). Stamford, CT: JAI Press

8 List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

COA	Central body for refugee shelter ('Centraal Opvangorgaan Asielzoekers' in Dutch)
COBACORE	Community-Based Comprehensive Recovery
CPC	Civilian – Professional Collaboration
D6.7	COBACORE Deliverable 6.7: 'Results from adoption workshops in the Dutch national safety domain'
D6.8	COBACORE Deliverable 6.8: 'D6.8 Guidelines for practical introduction of COBACORE project results'
IFV	Institute for Physical Safety ('Instituut voor Fysieke Veiligheid' in Dutch)
NLRC	Netherlands Red Cross
RC	Red Cross
TNO	Dutch Organisation for Applied Scientific Research

Appendix A: Specification of Requirements – Overview

Workshop 1		
Theme 1: "Activities"		
Participants responses	**Key insight for CPC**	**Requirement for method**
Participants indicate that the need for and appropriateness of CPC activities depends strongly on the context of the crisis. Each situation has its own norms. In addition, the type of community influences the CPC activities. Participants experience is that in agricultural areas, civilians often take more initiative in helping each other than in urban areas. For example, participants mention farmers who help each other when confronted with risk of flooding.	CPC activities are context-dependent	1) Method should allow for flexibility in creating CPC activities that are dependent on the crisis situation. 2) Method should include an appropriate representation of the civilian and professional groups.
Each incident or crisis has different phases. The involvement of civilians may differ from phase to phase, where each phase has its own challenges. These need to be identified further, to learn which civilian activities may contribute in which phase.	CPC activities are phase-dependent	3) Method should facilitate discussion about each phase of the crisis.
The style of communication between professionals and civilians and expectations of civilians from professionals are two factors that differ between countries and are important for how professionals and civilians work together. For example, in Sweden civilians are incorporated more in crisis management (cf. civilian duty) whereas USA employs a directive style of communication to its civilians (cf. website for Californian bush-fires).	The form CPC activities take is country- dependent	4) Method should be internationally applicable. 5) Method should result in country-specific solutions.
Civilians want to decide for themselves which CPC activities they participate in. Participants doubt that civilians want to 'sign up beforehand' for activities during a crisis. As an example, they mention Team Österreich in Austria, where members can indicate on a case-by-case basis how they want to be involved. Even more, some participants doubt whether professionals can truly direct the way civilian initiatives are deployed. They can be influenced to a certain extent. On the other hand, professionals want to be able to scale civilian efforts to avoid being	CPC activities should put civilians in the lead	6) Method should facilitate creation of initiatives / activities that puts the initiative itself central, not the existing crisis-management procedures.

overwhelmed with help offers.		
All actors should strengthen their networks so that they know who they can go to during a crisis to get help or to give help. These should not be 'new' networks that only exist during a crisis, but should be based on established networks. For example, participants mentioned a general practitioner who mobilizes his own network of other doctors during a crisis. Participants mention this explicitly for population groups who are less self-reliant (such as elderly or disabled people).	Strengthening (formal and informal) networks is key.	7) Method should facilitate the building and strengthening of networks.
Civilians oftentimes contribute positively with their efforts. The only situations that have gone wrong concerned dangerous situations such as fire. Civilians kept entering a burning building to save victims. On the other hand, when civilian activities already take place and there is no increased risks, let these activities continue. For example, construction workers who evacuate many elderly persons from a care home. Professionals should more often make use of the existing knowledge and experience that civilians have regarding a crisis. This knowledge can be used to get a clearer picture of the crisis.	Active participation of civilians in crises is often helpful, but not always in dangerous situations.	8) Method should focus attention to what risks civilians face in CPC activities.

Theme 2: 'Information sharing'

Participants responses	Key insight for CPC	Requirement for method
Government is regarded as primarily "information giver" regarding risks to society (such as the water level during flooding). They are required to be transparent in this respect (for example, during some crises, civilians need to fend for themselves for at least xx minutes). Participants expect that being open about this will increase pro-activity on part of civilians, it all depends on how this information is presented. The communication should outline the impact of the risks for civilians: what does it mean for them?	Government should be transparent in communicating risks	9) Method should coerce participants to communicate openly.
Participants mention that they recognize the importance and the strengths of existing channels of communication such as Twitter, news media, etc. They regard the creation of a new, crisis-specific channel as a weakness to effective crisis communication, primarily because	Information sharing between civilians should make use of existing communication channels	10) Method should be open to incorporate existing channels of communication

people are unfamiliar with it. Currently, no structured action is taken based on 'civilian information' from open sources.		
Civilians want to be informed quickly about what they can do regarding the crisis. Participants mention that professionals should not be too careful with distributing crisis-information among civilians. Civilians have been shown to make the right decisions for themselves based on this information. In fact, they can become important sources of information, such as during recent flooding in the Netherlands. Using this information requires an important change in mind-set on part of the professionals.	Information sharing between professionals and civilians	11) Method needs to facilitate change in mind-set of civilians and professionals. 12) Method should facilitate mutual understanding between civilians and professionals.
Professionals want to have insight into existing or ongoing civilian activities. For example, in the East of the Netherlands, one of the operational analysts is specifically tasked to do this. As this is very dependent on what is going on in society, professionals need to invest in their flexibility. They need to accept that they are not always in control, but need to relate to issues in society.	Creating insight into CPC activities for professionals	13) Method should facilitate in flexible solutions, depending on the societal context.

Theme 3: 'Rules and regulations'

Participants responses	Key insight for CPC	Requirement for method
Civilians increasingly need to take own responsibility in order to stay safe. Government does not solve all problems ("keep calm, we'll take care"-attitude), but changes its role into facilitation of civilian initiatives. Participants mention a number of programs organized by professionals, for example to improve civilian resilience; to incorporate civilians in professionals training, and to improve their self-reliance through Urban Survival Training. Such trainings do not have to be organized by the government, but could be organized by civilians / civilian groups themselves.	Role of the government changes from 'problem-solver' to 'facilitator'	11) Method should to facilitate change in mind-set of civilians and professionals.
There is a difference in what civilians are allowed to do, and what professionals are allowed to do. Professionals are (more than civilians) bound by occupational health and safety regulations and can only risk their lives under certain conditions. Civilians need to understand this, but professionals need to be open about restrictions to their work.	Civilians should have the right expectations regarding professionals' roles.	14) Method should facilitate the dialogue between professionals and civilians concerning roles and responsibilities.

Recognition of professionals by civilians is very important, need to be identifiable as a professional. Participants mention that professionals should give explicit feedback or instructions to civilian initiatives. Furthermore, participants mention that each civilian has his or her own strengths that can be put to good use. This needs to be supported in a positive way by professionals. In addition, professionals should not think that the crisis is over when they leave, but should stay in touch. For example, during an evaluation discussion after the crisis, civilians should be included. Also professionals should show their gratitude more during and after a crisis towards civilians who appreciate this (this is not always the case).	The attitude of professionals towards civilians needs to be adapted.	15) Method should address the necessary attitude or code of conduct during each phase of the crisis. 16) Method needs to identify strengths of each of the actors.
Currently, professionals hold the view that managing and solving the crisis is their sole responsibility. New rules and regulations need to be set for professionals about how they can facilitate civilian initiatives. Obstacles that professionals experience include privacy, the risk of claims, cultural aspects in behaviour and governance. Participants have the feeling that during the crisis, a lot is possible, whereas after the crisis, problems and risks are identified which lead to new, stricter regulations. This is not helping their efforts.	Obstacles for professionals in CPC activities should be eliminated as much as possible.	17) Method should facilitate the creation of new rules, regulations and procedures.

Workshop 2		
Participants responses	**Key insight for CPC**	**Requirement for method**
Participants agree that the 'willingness' to work together should start at the bottom of the professional organisations.	Not only management should be involved in developing CPC activities.	An addition to requirement 2: 2) Method should include an appropriate representation of the civilian and professional groups; e.g. operational experts.
In return, civilians should be respectful of the professionals' authority and experience and not react aggressively towards them in the heat of the moment.	The method should result in a way of working that contribute to mutual understanding.	A specification of requirement 12: Method should facilitate mutual understanding and respect between civilians and professionals.
Make current professional processes	Flexible processes and	Method should support

and protocols more flexible to facilitate CPC activities as outlined above.	protocols might be more useful than fixed processes and protocols.	thinking beyond current protocols.
Insurance should cover the activities that civilians undertake in helping out with a crisis or incident.	Preparing for CPC might imply a review of insurance policies.	A specification of requirement 18: 18) The method should support thinking beyond current protocols (e.g. insurance.)
An important requirement is that the mutual expectations should be managed well ('what can this person do?')	It appears to be important to manage expectations at both sides of the collaboration. One way to achieve this is to involve actors of the target groups as soon as possible in the process of preparing CPC. This supports: - getting to know each other - share and exchange expectations - learn capabilities of other parties - direct the actual of collaboration	19) Method should support involvement of all relevant actors in early phase of development of CPC.
Community members should be respectful to professionals' decisions.	One way to gain respect for decisions taken by professionals is to involve citizens in and inform them about the way of working of professionals. This is therefore considered relevant for CPC.	Requirement 12): Method should facilitate mutual understanding and respect between civilians and professionals.
When a situation is too dangerous for civilians, they should keep their distance.	CPC activities should not be too dangerous for civilians. Informing about risks will help to meet this objective.	Requirement 8 and 9: 8) Method should focus attention to what risks civilians face in CPC activities. 9) Method should coerce participants to communicate openly.
In Phase 4, participants had to think about concrete actions that would lead to the realisation of proposed	For the implementation of change decision-makers of relevant organisations	An addition to requirement 2: 2) Method should include an

changes. They were further asked to put these actions on a timeline and specify owners for each of the actions. Participants indicated that they found this difficult, as they felt they did not have the position or role to act on the actions identified (not all participants were decision-makers in their organisation).	should be involved.	appropriate representation of the civilian and professional groups; e.g. operational experts and decision-makers.
For the co-creation method to work even better, more organisations should be invited, like neighbourhood organisations, religious communities, etcetera.		An addition to requirement 2: 2) Method should include an appropriate representation of the civilian and professional groups; e.g. operational experts and decision-makers. Where applicable other organisations may be invited as well, such as neighbourhood organisations and, religious communities.
Invite first-aid workers as well: these first-aid workers have been through it and know the challenges from their own practice.		Is already specified in requirement 2.