REPORT ON FACILITATION PROCESS / MEETING SEMINAR - ECHO NETWORK JANUARY 2023

I. To meet each other

A. MYSTERY PARTICIPANT

- ✗ Number of participants: minimum 8 participants
- ✗ Materials needed: paper, pens
- ✗ Upstream preparation of the facilitators: they investigate upstream, in order to have some information on the profile of each participant (professional missions, hobbies, city of origin...) and prepare a document with a number of boxes corresponding to the number of participants by leaving an insert to find the first name of the mystery person.
- ✗ Preparation time: 20-30 minutes
- ✗ Duration of the animation : 45 min

Participants receive this document and are asked to meet, initiate discussion and complete the boxes. Which participant fits which description? The goal is to succeed in putting a name in front of each mystery box.

Feedback in big group. The first person is asked to name someone he or she has met ("The person who lives in Paris, comes from the CEMEA, and works on Zourit is so-and-so"), and then this person does the same with someone else, until everyone is accounted for.

B. MEET YOUR PARTNER

- ✗ Number of participants: at least 4 (to have at least 2 pairs)
- ✗ Materials needed: Post-it notes, pens
- ✗ Preparation of questions beforehand by the facilitators
- ✗ Preparation time: 15 min
- ✗ Duration of the animation : 45 min

Participants meet in pairs and must discuss different questions such as: (20 min)
- What is your structure? What are your missions?
- What are your interests?
- What are your personal uses of digital technology?
- What do you like about digital technology?
- What do you dislike about digital?
No questions about geographical origins.

Each pair must then present their pair to the whole group (25 min).

C. SE POSITIONNER DANS L'ESPACE

- ✗ Number of participants: no limits
- ✗ Materials needed: Nothing special
- ✗ Preparation time: 30 min
- ✗ Duration of the animation : 20min

The room is divided into several "areas" according to the questions asked by the facilitators
For example: In which city do you live? In which country do you live? Where were you born?
Position yourself according to the North, South, East, West of the room (the compass is given by the facilitators).
Types of questions: What languages do you speak? Do you consider yourself to be digitally literate? Etc.

D. ALPHABET OF NAMES

- ✗ Number of participants : no limits
- ✗ Materials needed: Nothing special
- ✗ Duration of the animation : 10 min

The facilitators give instructions to position themselves in the alphabetical order of our first names. The facilitator places his or her letter and the others must position themselves according to it, asking for the first names of the people next to them.

E. CREATION OF INDIVIDUAL COATS OF ARMS

- ✗ Number of participants : no limits
- ✗ Materials needed: paper, pens, tape
- ✗ Duration of the animation : 30 min

Each participant creates his/her own coat of arms by answering the following questions:
Who am I?   Where do I come from? What do I do?   A quotation that I like or that corresponds to me?

F. COATS OF ARMS OF STRUCTURES

It is possible to produce the coat of arms approach to present different structures that are represented in an event with the following questions:

NAME OF THE STRUCTURE	
WHAT ?	WHERE? WHO?
VICTORIES/EVENTS	FREE SPACE

II. DIGITAL ETHICS AND ASSOCIATIVE VALUES

Objective : Clarify what digital ethics is and consider a common definition

A. VISITORS AND HOSTS

- ✗ Number of participats : minimum 6
- ✗ Equipment needed: tables, chairs, a set of meta-cards.(not yet translate in english but possible to).
- ✗ Facilitator preparation: choice of cards to be presented to participants (in the meta-card game).
- ✗ Duration of preparation : 30 min
- ✗ Duration of animation : 1h30

Information on the process available on the Libre Cours platform (only in french):
https://librecours.net/module/enjeux/int02/

Step 1 ➜ Participants are divided into small groups of 2 to 4 people depending on the number of participants. All the cards (chosen by the facilitators beforehand) are presented on a table. Each group must choose one or two cards that the group would like to discuss among themselves (e.g. inclusiveness, transparency, decentralization...).
Each group sits down at their stand/booth (1 table per stand/booth) and turns the card over to read the details. They can consult the links provided on each card. They build their argument around this map, the objective of which will be to welcome visitors afterwards (30 min).

Step 2 ➜ Depending on the number of participants, several rounds are possible
If there are four groups, then two groups run their stands and two others visit. The participants welcome people to the booth and discuss the theme. The "visitors" are solicited on this subject in a dynamic way, by being challenged by those who have dug the subject (new reflections emerge on the subject since new arrivals). (20 min).
And role reversal, the visitors become the participants who welcome (20 min)

Step 3 ➜ Return to the large/big group
Participants' feelings - what are the dividing lines? What exchanges? What do I retain from the exchanges?

B. FIND A COMMON DEFINTION

- ✗ Number of participants : 8 minimum
- ✗ Materials needed : differents spaces in the room (in the same room)
- ✗ Preparation of the facilitators: choice of a list of fifteen words that could define digital ethics.
- ✗ Duration of preparation : 15 minutes
- ✗ Duration of animation : 1h30

Step 1 ➙ Participants are divided into small groups according to the number of participants
Each small group is given a list of 15 words (previously defined by the facilitators).
In each group, the participants must agree to choose 4 words from the list that they think correspond to a definition of digital ethics (15 min)

Step 2 ➙ One group meets with another group, the group expands and the participants have to exchange their word choices to find a common definition. At the end of the time (20 min), the group must have chosen 4 words in common.

Step 3 ➙ The group expands one last time to the large group to compare the choices of the two previous groups. Same instructions: reach an agreement by comparing arguments (20 min).

Step 4➙ Feedback in large group with the facilitators on the choice of words, the meaning, the feelings, what could have limited the decision making. (20 min)**.**

Warning : depending on the language spoken, words do not have the same meaning / Pay attention to the meaning of words according to the translation.

C. MOVING DEBATE

- ✗ Number of participants : no limits
- ✗ Materials needed : Noothing special
- ✗ Facilitator preparation: development of topics to be discussed
- ✗ Duration of preparation : 30 mn (finding compelling phrases takes time)
- ✗ Duration of animation : 45min

The room is divided into 3 areas:
- Agree
- Disagree
- No opinion

Facilitators state the first statement. The participants position themselves according to their opinion. Once positioned, the facilitator launches the debate "Why agree? Why disagree?
Depending on the arguments and thoughts expressed, the participants are free to change places.
Examples of statements:
- « Digital tools are neutral, so ethics has no place in this debate »
- « Talking about ethics is above all talking about values »
- « Linking digital and ethics is difficult »
- « Making the choice of ethical digital tools is a waste of time ».
- « The debate on ethics in the digital world is a battle lost in advance ».

D. ARPENTAGE (METHODS OF COLLECTIVE READING)

- ✗ Number of participants : 6 minimum
- ✗ Materials needed: pens, paper, tape
- ✗ Preparation of the facilitators: choice of texts beforehand
- ✗ Duration of preparation : 45 mn (find suitable texts)
- ✗ Duration of animation : 45 min

Step 1 ➙ The participants are divided into several groups (6 to 8) according to the number of participants.
Each group is given a text. This text is read aloud by the whole group.

Step 2 ➙ Each group marks on a poster two points on which they agree (from the text) and two points on which they disagree. These posters will be displayed.

Step 3➙ Feedback in large group

If the moving debate and the « Arpentage » are done in the same session, there may be individual time to mark on a sheet what was retained by each participant, which will be posted on the walls.

III. COMMON: DECENTRALIZATION, ARCHITECTURE IS POLITICAL

Objective : Understand the decentralization of networks and the functioning of decentralized bodies.

A. INVENT THE TERMS OF USE OF YOUR SOCIAL NETWORK

- ✗ Number of participants: minimum 4 (to make two groups of 2 or 4 individuals)
- ✗ Materials needed: paper, sheets, pens, tape, post-it notes, a sample UGC
- ✗ Duration of preparation : 30 min
- ✗ Duration of animation : 2 h

Step 1 → In small groups of 3 to 4 people: write the Terms of Use / Rules of the game of your social network with the profiles below:
Start up
Librists
Political movement
"Safe space
Each participant draws one of the roles at random (from a basket) to form their group. Each group has 30 minutes to write its own rules of the game based on a proposed framework to guide the writing

> *To write the rules of the game or terms of use, the facilitators can give ideas such as*
> *- pay/free*
> *- respecting the law or not*
> *- inclusive writing allowed / forbidden / tolerated / mandatory*
> *- main language*
> *- anonymity, pseudos, identified...*
> *- size of the messages in number of characters*
> *- limit of messages per day, month, week...*
> *- add media to messages (videos, images...)...*

Step 2 → Each instance writes a message (depending on its instance) that will be posted on all instances, as these social networks are federated = linked together.
These messages will be displayed in the room to simulate a posting on all the social networks

Step 3 → Moderation - It is up to the group that created the rules to moderate the received posts, by putting a post-it note with its reactions. Each group moves to read each message and react:
- You can reject the message
- Block the instance on yours : all future messages will be refused
- Alert
- Accept the message
- Accept but respond to it
- Accept and modify/adapt your rules of the game

Step 4 → Return to large group
- Opening on the issues of using proprietary software / limits in the freedom of expression and action of people

Suggested alternatives:
Mastodon = decentralized and federated microblogging social network.
Peertube = decentralized and federated social network for video publication
Mobilizon = platform for organizing and publishing events with respect for anonymity with several possible identities for each person. Decentralized and federated network

B. GAME « A WORLD OF MUSIC » / Who decides on the musical program?

Objetive : to understand how decisions are made in groups at different levels, to see how much freedom one has to listen to what one likes in this or that instance, to agree on the rules of a musical program to satisfy all the people in an instance and to avoid that each person ends up alone on his/her own instance.

- ✗ Number of participants : from 4 persons
- ✗ Necessary equipment: loudspeaker, something to play music (via internet)
- ✗ Duration of animation : 1h30

Step 1 → Starting instructions: form clusters of participants·es who must agree on a musical program to compose a radio. (40 min) Each group must agree on a list of 5 musics, choosing one music in particular that will be played to the others.
Goal: To have 3 or 4 different radios, each with a musical program composed by the members of the radio.

Each group will play one music to the other groups.

Étape 2 → Groups are mixed: In each group, the participants·es exchange on the process of choice that took place around the radio: what criteria did they choose to compose their radio, what difficulties they encountered and the parallel with the previous activity ("Finding a common definition"). Broaden the discussion more generally on the criteria for making a common cause work and the pitfalls to avoid in order not to jeopardize/put a risk on the common cause.
Encourage the two groups to identify the advantages of the commons and to understand that their existence requires respecting a set of rules

C. PRACTICE AN INSTANCE IN REAL LIFE

- ✗ Number of participants: 4 minimum
- ✗ Materials needed: paper, markers, pens, tape
- ✗ Duration of animation : 2 h

PART 1
Step 1 → In groups (varies according to the number of participants), participants construct their own rules of authority that govern communication within their community (terms to use, actions to take when speaking, finishing a sentence, posture, etc.) and write them down on a flip chart (25 min)

Step 2 → Groups present their rules orally to the whole group with the help of the flip chart (applying their own rules) 25 min

Step 3 → 3 sub-groups that debrief the experience, the construction of rules in their community...

PART 2
Some real instance parameters taken as examples and possible impact(s) on the misdeeds of social networks

Step1 → 5 min individual: list of "positive effects" and "negative effects" of social networks. 2 colors of post-it notes.

Step 2 → Then 2 people join and share [5 min]. A list is consolidated. Duplicate post-it notes are put aside.

Step 3 → Then 4 people join. Same.

We start again until we have a paper board with all the different post-its.

Then, in a large group, we ask ourselves about the possible influence of the technical parameters below (translated by the facilitator) with regard to the previous list:

# Maximum allowed character count	# Maximum number of pinned posts
# Maximum de caractères autorisés dans un pouet	# Nombre maximum de pouets épinglés
MAX_TOOT_CHARS=5000	MAX_PINNED_TOOTS=5
# Maximum allowed bio characters	# Maximum allowed poll options
# Maximum de caractères pour la présentation du compte	MAX_POLL_OPTIONS=5
MAX_BIO_CHARS=1000	# Maximum image and video/audio upload sizes
# Units are in bytes	MAX_IMAGE_SIZE=8388608
# Taille maximum des vidéo et des photo	MAX_VIDEO_SIZE=41943040
# 1048576 bytes equals 1 megabyte	# Maximum search results to display
# limitation dans les résultats de recherches	# MAX_SEARCH_RESULTS=20

IV. TAKING CARE OF AND MAKING THE INTERNET USER-FRIENDLY

A. FROM RESOURCES TO MODERATION TO CARE

- ✗ Number of participants : no limits
- ✗ Materials needed: internet, paper, pens, tape, list of sites to consult
- ✗ Duration of preparation : 30 mn
- ✗ Duration of animation : 2h

Liste des sites à titre d'exemple :

◦ Plateaux Numériques which offers small accessible sites for communities with small means https://gauthierroussilhe.com/en/articles
◦ Resources for queer people who want to protect their privacy on the Internet https://en.wiquaya.org/
◦ Maps to help you act collaboratively or learn about ethical digital technology, expanded into a web version https://www.metacartes.cc/
◦ Céleste https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Celeste_(video_game) including the way it talks about mental health
◦ Biodiversity atlas to identify species seen https://sig.dinan-agglomeration.fr/cartes/atlasdelabiodiversite/index.html

PART 1 – EXPLORATION [45 min]

Based on the list of resources / sites of people who use digital care → By 3, choose two / three sites, explore them and make an identity card (Name, purpose, 6 notable points to share) to be displayed on an A4

Prepare "human charts" by group on two key ideas around the invariants of "taking care in digital" that we want to convey

PART 2 - EXPRESSIVE RENDERINGS [15 min]

Each group presents its "human pictures"

PART 3

Possibility to testify about a moderation experience (if a person wishes)

PART 4

Discussion around the experience of moderation with the hindsight of experience of moderation.

B. DISCUSSION ABOUT CONVIVIALITY

- ✗ Number of participants: minimum 4 people
- ✗ Materials needed: post-it notes
- ✗ Duration of preparation : 15 minutes
- ✗ Duration of animation : 2h

Step 1 → Problem solving (large group)

Accompaniment and conviviality around the digital: basically, what's the point?

Using post-it notes, participants list the problems they encounter in their daily lives, around digital literacy, and the problems that digital technology can pose. The problems are classified according to their cause/origin, following the triangle of responsibilities: person (is it a problem related to individuals?) / government (is it a problem related to government action - public policies?) / business (is it a business problem?).
Each participant places his or her post-it note, explaining if necessary what he or she wanted to express. At the end, we try to gather the post-its/problems that are similar, in order to bring out the most recurrent problems.

Step 2 → Exchange on the subject (in small groups)

The participants are divided into small groups and the following question is asked: "In view of all these problems, what is the point of accompanying? Is the sum of the problems to be solved not too great?

If necessary, the facilitator can contribute to the discussion by reminding that there has been a clear improvement over the last 10, 15, 20 years, with awareness, European measures (RGPD ...), and that there is not necessarily a need to change the whole world: changing one's world is already good!

C. CARRÉ DU SOIN / SQUARE OF CARE

- ✗ Number of participants : no limits
- ✗ Materials needed: a large sheet of paper with 4 axes and key words to help understand each axis.

- ✗ Duration of preparation : 15 min
- ✗ Duration of animation : 2 h

The philosopher Xavier Guchet, professor of philosophy at the Costech laboratory of the UTC, has identified through his book "Du soin dans la technique" four ways of apprehending the care in the technique. He exposed these 4 axes under the shape of a square: the square of care.

Based on these 4 axes (identified by key words to help understanding), the groups are asked to look at these axes and describe what each person perceives in them and to compare them with the others.
4 axes of the square of care (« carré du soin ») (reworded for the context)

Knowledge: Seek knowledge / empower citizens / explain to users how it works
Explanation: Explain rationally (talk about objects) and provoke debate / Question one's practices/tools / do we make the effort to explain, to share knowledge
Natural: To insert oneself in nature (and to incorporate its complexity) / talk about the "ecological" dimension: what impact on the environment
Human : Considering the users (inserting humans) : how users are included in the project

Course of action
1) Divide into small groups of 3-4 people.
Time 1 of 15 minutes in 4 small groups:
"For the themes "Knowledge" and "Explanation", note what for you evokes these words in care. What does it mean to you in your practice? Find examples of actions that support this.

2) Gather 2 groups to form medium groups.
Time 2 over 45 minutes in 2 medium groups:
"Each group exposes and justifies its choices to the others. Give concrete examples of the care and words that evoked this care. As well as the words that did not make sense to them.

3) Return to the initial small groups of 3-4 people with the same device as at the beginning
Time 1 over 15 minutes in 4 small groups
"For the themes "Natural" and "Human", note what these words evoke for you in care. What does this evoke in your practices? Find examples of actions that go in this direction.

4) We meet in large group (all the small groups together)
Time 4 of 45 min.
"Each group explains and justifies its choices to the others. Give concrete examples of the care and the words that evoked this care. As well as the words that did not make sense to them."

5) A time of collective assessment is also devoted to analyzing the approach used for this theme.

V. DIGITAL SOBRIETY AND LOW TECH

A. LIFE PHONE (OPTION 1)

Cards « Lifephone » : https://framagit.org/stph.crzt/lownum/-/blob/main/lifephone/lifephone-cards.pdf
Origin of LifePhone : https://librecours.net/module/lownum/lifephone/methode.xhtml
Need to be translate in your language
- ✗ Number of participants : no limits
- ✗ Necessary material: a set of "Lifephone" cards, preferably plasticized because they can be reused, erasable pens, felt-tip pens, blank plasticized cards to invent your own lifephone, plasticized "notes" cards
- ✗ Duration of animation : 1h30
- ✗ Preparation of the animation: the facilitators chose in advance the cards that could be chosen by the participants by varying the themes by group

The participants are divided into groups of 2/3 (depending on the number of people) and have to choose among

3 cards a feature of an energy-efficient smartphone and judge its ecological impact and their acceptance of the effort of this feature.

Step 1 → 20 min: each group chooses one of three cards from the title of the card, then reads the details and determines for that card how many hearts it assigns (according to its ecological impact) and how many spades it assigns (according to its difficulty of acceptance). The group starts again with a second card if time permits.

Step 2 → 15 min: a blank card is distributed to each group that invents an eco-responsible feature.

Step 3 → Then each group presents one of the chosen or created cards and presents it to the other groups. Each group must then indicate on a voting card, whether they find each feature relevant on a scale of 1 to 5.

Step 4 → Then, as a large group, each group gives the result of their vote and the reasons for their vote. The points are added up to determine which feature is considered the most beneficia

B. LIFEPHONE (OPTION 2)

- ✗ Number of participants : no limits
- ✗ Materials needed: a set of "Lifephone" cards, preferably laminated because they are reusable, erasable pens, markers
- ✗ Duration of animation : 1h30
- ✗ Preparation of the animation: the facilitators chose in advance the cards that could be chosen by the participants. https://framagit.org/stph.crzt/lownum/-/blob/main/lifephone/lifephone-cards.pdf

Course of action :
- • The cards selected beforehand by the facilitators are placed in the middle of the participants' circle. (so that there are approximately 2 per person)
- • One person nominates him/herself and fetches a card, reading it aloud. He then expresses himself on the proposal of the card: he gives the number of hearts he affects on a scale from 0 to 5 and he also gives the level of discomfort by quantifying in number of spades on a scale from 1 to 5.
- • Debate for 3 minutes about the functionality proposed by the card with the whole group and then, all the participants vote with a raised finger to give their number of hearts and spades for this functionality.
- • The total of hearts and spades is collected as you go along to get an average. Each participant is asked to make his or her own average so that he or she can see where he or she stands in relation to the consolidated group average.
- • Following this vote, the group can make new proposals.
- • Debriefing led by the facilitators.

C. ROLE PLAYING GAME

- ✗ Number of participants: minimum 4
- ✗ Materials needed: post-it notes
- ✗ Duration of animation : 1h30
- ✗ Preparation of the animation: the facilitators have chosen the themes of the debate beforehand

Course of action :
- The facilitator chooses a theme for the debate, to question our use of digital technology, and whether it is still necessary to use it.
- The thematics chosen should leave room/allow for debate, interpretation, and different responses depending on the context.
- The facilitator gives each participant a role, either as a "technophile/techie" or as a "technophobe"; each participant must defend this point of view during the debate.
- Each debate lasts between 10 and 20 minutes; when we finish a topic, we move on to the next one, changing roles (to avoid one person always being "technophile" or "technophobe").

Examples of thematics :

- Voting: couldn't electronic voting make the democratic process more fluid, allowing citizens to take part in more decisions? Doesn't remote voting for associations (GA ...) simplify the process by removing the need to meet physically in the same place? What about trust in the vote (and its results) in these cases?
- The events: is it still necessary to bring people in person? Couldn't we do an ECHO network remotely, which would avoid logistical problems, the financial cost of transport, the tiredness linked to transport...
- Digital at school
- Digital technology to help vulnerable people: both for vulnerable people (who have more difficulty with digital technology), and for people for whom digital technology is the only accessible means of communication

VI. OBJECTIVES AND FOLLOW-UP OF THE PROJECT

As a reminder, this meeting seminar was the first activity of the European project ECHO NETWORK, which will end in November 2024.

7 partners of the project : Ceméa France, Framasoft, Céméa Belgique, Center for Peace Studies (Croatia), Solidar Foundation (Belgium), Weilli Eichler Akademie (Germany), Fédération Italienne des Ceméa.

This project must be able to produce different resources (in the languages represented by the consortium of partners) :

1. A **repository of existing training courses** for popular education actors in the partner countries of the project in relation to the principle of "digital citizenship"

2. A **repository of resources and tools** available in the network of European partners of the project.

3. A **plea** for an ethical and sustainable digital transition

4. A digital **defense kit** for young people

5. **A survival guide for association representatives**

6. A **map of organizations** working to promote ethical digital practices in the project's partner countries.

The next project activities for the year 2023 are:

✗   Study visit in Berlin, Germany « Young people and social medias » 28th to 30th of march.

✗   Study visit in Brussels, Belgium « Active education methods/education nouvelle principles to raise awareness of digital alternatives » 13th to 15th of June.

✗   Study visit, Bari in Italy « Between face-to-face and distance learning / Digital sobriety » 26th to 28th of September

  ✗   Study visit in Zagreb, Croatia « Accessibility and Digital Inclusiveness » 5th to 7th of December