

Tool 1b: Facilitator's Guide for Participatory Integrity Risk Management Exercises

Participatory integrity risk management exercises are meant to initiate a change process in which participants jointly enhance the WSI's integrity. In existing WSIs that have not yet followed an explicit integrity management approach, the following exercises can serve as a starting point to align the WSI with these integrity management guidelines. The sequence of exercises is meant to facilitate a step-wise process to identify the key activities and the supporting tools that enhance the initiative's integrity most effectively. To use time effectively, exercises should be combined and adapted to include other risks a WSI may be facing and should be embedded into the overall management approach of the initiative. For WSIs that have integrated systematic risk management from the planning phase, the exercises serve to take stock, refine, and complement the measures put in place, plan next steps, and further sensitize participants.

Tool	Guidance for the facilitation of a sequence of integrity management exercises for WSI participants to jointly assess context and related integrity risks, and to agree on measures to ensure the initiative's integrity.
Related Activity	The exercises should be embedded into the regular consultations and management activities of a WSI and can be used to share the integrity risk assessment.
Purpose	Initiate a change process with participants to jointly enhance the WSI's integrity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Identify integrity risks that are most relevant to a given WSI, given its scope and context. ✓ Develop a workplan that specifies how activities that are most relevant at a given stage of a WSI will be implemented.
Possible Users	WSI participants and where feasible affected stakeholders .
Level of Effort	Included in a larger management workshop or selected exercises, and integrated into subsequent regular working meetings of the WSI.
WSI Phase	2: Formalization, and 3: Implementation.

Ideally these integrity risk management exercises would be included in a larger management workshop. In case a comprehensive risk assessment (Tool 1a) has been carried out, the results can be shared in Exercise 3 and provide guidance for the subsequent exercises. Where this approach is not feasible, individual exercises can be integrated into regular working meetings of the WSI.

The exercises should ideally involve all the active participants of a WSI. Wherever possible, the integrity management exercises can further be used to engage and understand critiques and other **affected stakeholders**.¹ As ensuring integrity in WSIs is closely linked to the overall development of such initiatives (i.e., how they are managed and governed), it is recommended to describe the logic of a WSI using the [Tool 2: WSI Model](#), and to use this description as a central reference point throughout the subsequent exercises. The outcome of the exercises is a workplan that specifies how the most relevant activities will be implemented, how they will enhance the integrity and impact of the WSI, and which risks will be addressed. The tool comes with a set of facilitation materials, developed to convey the content of these guidelines and to enable effective learning with a diverse group of participants (see the Overview at the end of this Facilitator's Guide). To analyze other risks a WSI may be confronted with, these materials should be complemented and adapted on a case-by-case basis.

Taking into account that collective action works on the basis of cooperation and not hierarchy, the sequence of exercises combines several methodological approaches to provide for dialogue and consensus rather than hierarchical orders.² It

¹ Otherwise, the outcomes of the workshop should be communicated with other **affected stakeholders** to activate them as potential external partners for activities.

² The facilitators' guide therefore combines the methodologies used in: (1) the Integrity Management Toolbox: Janek Hermann-Friede, Michael Kropac, Sarah Achermann, Johannes Heeb, and Lotte Feuerstein, *Integrity Management Toolbox for Water Service Providers — Manual for Facilitators* (Berlin: cewas, WIN, and GIZ, 2014), <http://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/publications/>; and (2) the Annotated Water Integrity Scan

enables WSI managers and facilitators to tap into the knowledge of the participants and jointly develop appropriate solutions for the local context. At the same time, such a process increases awareness of why integrity is crucial to collective action and helps build the trust needed among participants to effectively tackle shared **water challenges**.

Guidance for implementation

The six integrity risk management exercises are interlinked, which should be taken into account when implementing them over the course of several working sessions. The introduction to integrity management for WSIs (Exercise 1) and the development of the [WSI Model](#) (Exercise 2) can be implemented as stand-alone activities that raise awareness about integrity risks and that structure information on the WSI's **theory of change** inclusively and transparently. If there exists a well-structured description of the WSI's logic, participants can combine their efforts to prioritize integrity risk areas (Exercise 3) and further analyze the risks using the related guiding questions (Exercise 4). Identifying key activities to enhance the WSI's impact and integrity (Exercise 5) and developing a road map for action (Exercise 6) build on the results of previous exercises.

The sequence of these exercises is summarized below, highlighting their purpose and scope. Further guidance for the workshop facilitation is provided in the Facilitator's Guide below.

Exercise 1: Integrity Management Introduction (~1hr)

- This module is about setting the scene: familiarizing participants with the topic, setting the tone of the workshop, and clarifying questions and expectations.
- An integrity management workshop brings **WSI participants** together to jointly analyze the integrity status of their initiative and prioritize key activities to be put in place or strengthened to increase the WSI's impact.
- After the scope of the workshop has been clarified, it is important to introduce the seven operating principles included in these guidelines and how they frame the values and expectations that constitute integrity in WSIs.

Exercise 2: Developing the WSI Model (~1.5 hrs)

- In this module participants establish a common understanding of the WSI, providing a reference to embed the integrity management process within the overall WSI development.
- This exercise of structuring information about the WSI facilitates the different levels of engagement and understanding of the initiative across participants. This exercise captures each participant's perspective on the initiative and establishes a jointly owned reference point to analyze and enhance its integrity.
- The WSI Model will be used throughout the remaining workshop to analyze integrity risks and identify the most relevant activities and supporting tools to strengthen the governance and management of the initiative. Indeed, the WSI Model developed in this module can also be used for team building or organizational development processes that go beyond integrity.

Exercise 3: Prioritizing Integrity Risk Areas (~1.5 hrs)

- In this module participants assess the likelihood and hazards of different integrity risks related to the building blocks of the WSI Model (or other description of the initiative). Making this connection allows for an analysis in which risks are linked to participants, to the WSI governance, and to the WSI's context.
- Furthermore, the group will develop an understanding of how integrity risks affect the impact and performance of a WSI and identify which are the most harmful risks.
- Based on this assessment, the group will prioritize the three or four most important integrity risks.

Exercise 4: Assessing Strengths and Weaknesses (~2.5 hrs)

- Participants identify the specific strengths and weaknesses in the prioritized integrity risk areas by discussing the key guiding questions that are linked to each priority risk area.
- These questions are individually answered and then jointly analyzed by the participants in a facilitated discussion. During the discussion, qualitative information about the WSI is captured and documented as annotations to the different questions.
- If documented properly, the outcomes of this exercise will serve as a baseline from which to evaluate the development of the WSI's governance and integrity over the course of its life cycle.
- An inquiry-based approach provides for a constructive dialogue in assessing these sensitive issues and contributes to harmonizing the understanding of the WSI.

Exercise 5: Selecting Key Activities (~1.5 hrs)

- In this module, participants select the most important activities to enhance the integrity of their WSI based on the strengths and weaknesses identified in each of the priority risk areas.
- The selected key activities are linked to the WSI Model to establish clear objectives that enhance the integrity and impact of the WSI.

Exercise 6: Developing a Road Map (~2 hrs)

- In this module participants map out implementation steps for the identified key activities against a timeline and agree on responsibilities and practical next steps.
- To close the loop back to the values that constitute integrity in WSIs, participants analyze how the key activities they planned contribute to complying with the operating principles.

Exercise

1: Introduction of integrity management for WSIs

By the end of this exercise, participants will:

☞ *Know the scope and objectives of the integrity management workshop.*

☞ *Have a common understanding of what is meant by integrity in WSIs.*

time	activity	materials
20 min.	1.1. Introduce the concept and rules of the workshop to participants, clarifying the idea, scope, and principles of integrity management in WSIs. Ask participants about their expectations and display them on a flipchart.	✓ Introductory presentation
30 min.	1.2. Introduction to integrity: Ask participants to write down the three main ideas they associate with “integrity in a WSI,” each on an individual card. Place cards where they are clearly visible on a wall and group them (for example, along the three dimensions of the definition of integrity in WSIs). Clarify any ideas that are unclear. Use the ideas as a basis to introduce the operating principles for integrity in WSIs.	✓ Color cards and pens ✓ Flipchart with operating principles

Exercise 2: Developing the [WSI Model](#)

By the end of this exercise, participants will:

☞ *Have developed a WSI Model for their initiative from their collective viewpoint.*

☞ *Have a clear understanding of the ten building blocks of their WSI and how it creates, delivers, and captures value.*

time	activity	materials
15 min.	2.1. Introduce the WSI Model canvas concept and its ten building blocks, with the help of the introductory PowerPoint presentation. Distribute the WSI Model explanation sheet to the participants.	✓ WSI Model PowerPoint ✓ Explanation sheet for the WSI Model
60 min.	2.3. Ask participants to develop the model of their WSI. Appoint someone from the group to write on the cards. Supervise the group and if necessary explain to them the meaning of the individual building blocks, but let participants take the lead in developing the WSI Model.	✓ Pin board and pens ✓ WSI Model canvas on (large) brown paper ✓ Color cards and pens

Exercise 3: Prioritizing integrity risk areas

By the end of this exercise, participants will:

☞ *Be aware of key integrity risk areas for their WSI and their different levels of impact.*

☞ *Have identified, prioritized, and documented integrity risks particular to their WSI.*

Practical tip: If an integrity risk assessment has already been carried out, this exercise can simply be used to present it and review with the participants whether there have been changes. Depending on how detailed the assessment is, one may even combine Exercises 3 and 4 in this discussion.

time	activity	materials
------	----------	-----------

30 min.	<p>3.1. At the beginning of the exercise, the facilitator should explain the need to prioritize risks: that by tackling only the most important risks, 80% of the problems can usually be avoided with only 20% of the effort.</p> <p>Ask the group to familiarize themselves with, review, and reflect on integrity risk areas provided in these guidelines. Clarify any unclear terms.</p> <p>If the workshop is conducted in a large group, it may make sense to have smaller subgroups that focus on one main risk type each: (1) external context and outcomes, (2) participants, and (3) processes and governance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Pin board ✓ Integrity risk area color cards ✓ Description of WSI integrity risk areas (Tool 1a)
30 min.	<p>3.2. The group should now establish the link between the integrity risk areas and their WSI Model to understand the potential impact. At the end of this exercise, ask the group to think about the areas of the initiative's external context and outcomes, participants, and processes and governance, and determine if any risk areas are missing. Add additional risk areas using blank cards if needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Description of the WSI Model from Exercise 2
30 min.	<p>3.3. Ask the participants to prioritize the three risk areas they think their WSI should address most urgently. A suggested approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Using the score sheet for integrity risk areas, each participant scores the likelihood and hazard of the risk areas according to their perception. b. The facilitator processes the scoring results anonymously. The integrity risk area color cards are then placed in the risk matrix according to the results. c. Ask the participants to discuss the results and whether they agree with the prioritization. Based on the discussion, the group may adapt the prioritization and document why. (For options, see footnote.³) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Score sheet for integrity risk areas ✓ Risk matrix on brown paper

Exercise 4: Assessing strengths and weaknesses

By the end of this exercise, participants will:

- ☞ *Have a joint understanding of their WSI's strengths and weaknesses related to the most important risk areas and guiding questions*
- ☞ *Have documented the status of integrity and will have mapped strengths and weaknesses in the priority risk areas of the initiative.*

time	activity	materials
------	----------	-----------

³ In contexts where the views of participants differ drastically or where the entire discussion is very sensitive, one option would be to work with the approach of thinking hats (as explained in Exercise 4) to discuss each of the 5 to 10 most important risks areas. Alternatively, one may organize a debate: three groups are formed, one around each of the three most frequently scored risks, and each group has 10 minutes to prepare an argument to address their risk as a priority. A structured debate will then ensue.

20 min.	4.1. Turn around the three priority risk cards and put each on one box of the brown paper. Ask the group to pick from the board the cards with guiding questions indicated on the risk cards. ⁴ Put the guiding questions in the box of the relevant risk. In case of new risk areas (added during the previous exercise, without pre-defined guiding questions), participants should establish a set of three to five questions related to the selected risks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Color cards with guiding questions ✓ Pin board with brown paper divided into 3 boxes
30 min.	<p>4.2. Hand out scoring sheets with the guiding questions and answering options for the priority risk areas. Ask the group to go through the guiding questions and answering options, and clarify any unclear terms. Explain to the participants that the answering options shall provide only a rough picture and that the specific situation of the WSI will be discussed in the next step. The participants should then <i>anonymously</i> answer the questions using the available answering options.</p> <p>During a 5-minute break, the facilitator collects the scoring sheets and generates the average scores based on the answers to each question.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Scoring sheets for the guiding questions related to the priority risk areas
10 min.	4.3. Explain the same hat approach (see box) and the annotation process around the answers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Presentation to introduce the same hat approach
90 min.	<p>4.4. The facilitator presents the average scoring results for the first risk area by writing the scores next to the cards with the guiding questions for that risk area.</p> <p>Depending on the group, the facilitator may kick off the dialogue by opening the floor to an initial discussion. You can then do a card exercise by asking the participants to write down the arguments for the level below the average scores (weaknesses), and after having discussed these cards, do another round for the level above (strengths).</p> <p>This exercise is repeated for each of the guiding questions. The output is a map of strengths and weaknesses for each of the prioritized risk areas.⁵</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Color cards and pens for each participant ✓ Pin board with brown paper divided into 3 boxes ✓ AWIS facilitator's guide (Visscher and Hermann-Friede, 2011, pp. 22–24) for instructions for the facilitation process

⁴ Each risk card indicates the relevant guiding questions on the back.

⁵ It might be advisable to have a coffee break between weakness and strength scoring to make this exercise less tiring.

Adopting the same hat approach

WSI participants have different types of information, which may affect their perception of the integrity situation. For example, consider the guiding question: *How well have risks with regard to public sector collusion and policy capture been identified? Are they being managed?* Average score of 1.8 implies that some participants may have given an answer that scores 1 and others have given an answer scoring of 2 or higher. The corporate partner may have spent significant time discussing capture risks with the WSI manager, but other **WSI participants** are not aware of this analysis and provide lower scores. When discussing their perception with others, several participants may tend to stick to their opinion and will try to convince the other party. This may lead to a long debate with winners and losers.

Therefore we suggest adopting an approach based on the concept of the “thinking hats” to facilitate the discussion of the guiding questions (School of Thinking, 1983). This method encourages participants to collectively look at the guiding questions from different angles. This approach stimulates dialogue and blocks debate, as all participants have to adopt the same way of thinking (they wear the same hat) — for example, by giving only positive remarks about a guiding question in the first round. In the next round, everyone then changes their attitude (hat) to give only negative remarks. This implies doing away with the famous phrase “yes but ...,” which is a root cause of unproductive debate.

For more guidance on the concept of the thinking hats, refer to Visscher and Hermann-Friede (2011), pp. 12–13.

Exercise 5: Selecting key activities

By the end of this exercise, participants will:

- ☞ *Have identified key activities to enhance the impact and integrity of their WSI.*
- ☞ *Have analyzed how the key activities improve their WSI Model.*

time	activity	materials
15 min.	5.1. Turn around the guiding questions cards and ask the group to add the related supporting tools (listed on the back of the cards) to the annotations that have been documented.	✓ Color cards for key activities
30 min.	5.2. Ask participants to reflect on the map of strengths and weaknesses, and ask them if they know any other measures that can help. Add cards with additional measures to the list. Ask participants to analyze how the supporting tools and suggested additional measures will tackle the identified weaknesses, and how they will build on the strengths. Add these aspects to the map of strengths and weaknesses on oval cards (to differentiate them from square/rectangular used previously). Based on this assessment, ask them to select the five most promising measures.	✓ Pin board with map of strengths and weaknesses for the prioritized risk areas ✓ Colored oval cards and pens for each participant
15 min.	5.3. Participants place the color cards with the selected measures in the WSI Model where they have the first direct effect. Ask participants to visualize the expected effects of the key activities throughout the WSI Model using oval or round cards, for example.	✓ WSI Model pin board

Exercise 6: Road map for integrity management

By the end of this exercise, participants will:

☞ Have a jointly established action plan and timeline for the implementation of the most relevant key activities.

☞ Understand the link between the key activities and the operating principles.

time	activity	materials
30 min.	6.1. Let the group discuss how they want to implement each of the selected measures, and if or how they want to use any of the supporting tools.	✓ Color cards and pens for each participant
60 min.	6.2. Ask the group to identify implementation steps ⁶ and write them on color cards. Ask participants to agree on dates for the implementation of each step and the timeframe and responsibilities ⁷ for overall activities. For resource-intensive or otherwise complicated activities, participants should mark options where they need to seek support. Refer the participants back to the analysis of how the selected activities relate to the strengths and weaknesses (Exercise 5) and ask them what aspects need to be taken into account during their implementation. Add these as “remarks” in the planning matrix.	✓ Pin board with planning matrix ✓ Pin board with map of strengths and weaknesses as reference
20 min.	Optional exercise: For a WSI that is entering the renewal phase, it may be beneficial to map activities against the life cycle and identify which activities are time sensitive and which could be postponed.	✓ Life cycle presentation and pin board
30 min.	6.3. To clarify the link between key activities and the integrity of a WSI, participants should link the effects of each key activity (Exercise 5) to the operating principles. Ask the participants to add the anticipated effects of the activities to the timeline and highlight which operating principle(s) these contribute to. If working with a large group, this can be done in smaller groups, each focusing on one activity and sharing afterwards.	✓ Color cards with operating principles

Follow up

After having attended the management workshop or completing individual exercises, participants need to implement the measures chosen. The implementation phase is the longest and most difficult step of the whole integrity risk management process. Depending on the complexity of the measures, this phase can take anything from six months to a year (or even longer). It is very important to create ownership and leadership to ensure that the implementation process is successful. It is therefore important that responsibilities for each measure have been clearly assigned and that a focal person (e.g., the WSI manager, coordinator, or another **WSI participant**) for the integrity risk management process is established.

An integrity risk management focal person shall lead the implementation process along the road map that has been jointly developed by the **WSI participants** in Exercise 6. In doing so the focal person should identify support needs among **WSI participants** who are responsible for the implementation of key activities. The focal person should further communicate with those responsible for the implementation of activities to regularly agree on the next implementation steps and communicate outcomes to other **WSI participants**.

Unexpected difficulties can arise, and resistance from different levels may affect progress and the overall implementation of key activities. A sound understanding of why activities were completed, and why certain milestones were not met, is crucial for a successful integrity risk management process. The focal person should therefore receive adequate support (for example, from the neutral WSI facilitator or from an external coach) to reflect on the

⁶ The stepwise guidance in the each tool provides assistance for this exercise.

⁷ It may be difficult to agree on detailed responsibilities, but the focal point for initiating the implementation of an activity should at least be clarified.

implementation process. Note that the primary objective of the support function is not to control the focal person but rather to ensure a successful process that leads to integrity assurance for the WSI.

Overview of facilitation materials

A set of facilitation materials is provided to support the implementation of an integrity management workshop for WSIs. These materials are available upon request from the Water Integrity Network, the CEO Water Mandate, and GIZ, and include:

Presentations (PowerPoint files):

- Introduction of the WSI Model
- Presentation on the same hat approach
- Introduction of the stages of a WSI life cycle

Color cards (PDF files):

- Integrity risk areas on the front and related guiding questions on the back
- Guiding questions on the front and related instruments on the back
- Operating principles

Hand-outs for participants (PDF files):

- WSI Model explanation sheet
- Score sheet for integrity risk areas
- Score/Answer sheet for the guiding questions for each risk area

The following templates⁸ should also be prepared for the workshop:

- WSI Model template
- Risk matrix template
- Vertical scale from 1 to 4
- Template for the timeline and life cycle of a WSI

Further Reading:

- Janek Hermann-Friede, Michael Kropac, Sarah Achermann, Johannes Heeb, and Lotte Feuerstein. 2014. *Integrity Management Toolbox for Water Service Providers — Manual for Facilitators* (Berlin: cewas, WIN, and GIZ). <http://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/publications/>.
- Alex Osterwalder and Yves Pigneur. 2009. *Business Model Generation: A Handbook for Visionaries, Game Changers, and Challengers* (Osterwalder & Pigneur, ISBN 978-2-8399-0580-0). <http://www.businessmodelgeneration.com> (2010. Wiley, ISBN-10: 0470876417).
- Jan-Teun Visscher and Janek Hermann-Friede. 2011. *AWIS Facilitator's Guide* (Berlin: WIN and Transparency International). <http://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/publications/>.

⁸ We suggest using 3 x 5 ft (116 x 140 cm) brown papers to provide sufficiently large workspace for participatory exercises. If available, using a sticky cloth (nylon cloth with repositionable spray adhesive) is an effective alternative to visualize results.