Results of discussions in groups, Malmö April 2024

# Planning of a network meeting (presented by Arne)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advantages** | **Disadvatages** |
| Work approach: Scheduling wisely: planning for many breaks makes it work. Schedule can be design for optimal interaction between stakeholders | Work approach: Personal priorities can win over - scheduling for longer breaks can lead to that’s participants prioritize personal issues and even leave earlier |
| Stakeholders: Pre mapping of stakeholders, getting to know their needs is crucial | Stakeholders: Pre engaging with participants for recruitment is time consuming |
| Stakeholders: Pre engaging participants- investment in contacting people in person leads to having motivated participants; important to get results (good soil makes a good growth). Personal contact in recruitment lead to higher participation rate.  | Work approach: Language barrier: How to make people come together when they are nervous to do this because of the language issue? |
| Work approach: Design for networking broadly with others made getting new contacts efficiently.  | Work approach: Format resembling conference, a once off, not a network.  |
| Work approach: A social event as icebreaker to make people comfortable- helped to feel being a member in the group: | Learning: Other ways of sharing knowledge not utilized  |
| Work approach: Fun during activities leads to good work; important to have less rigid forms |   |
| Work approach: Lessons learned are applicable on any different types of meetings |  |
| Stakeholders:International settings brings the glam aspect increases importance if someone travels to see you |  |
| Stakeholders: Clear support of board /directors and internal commitment justified what was supposed to do |  |

# Running a structured network (presented by Ingela)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advantages** | **Disadvatages** |
| Work approach: Clear goals, attractive offer and set expectations makes easy to work together | Financial issues: May be too rigid if you need to combine different approaches |
| Stakeholders: Build for limited number of participating companies | Financial issues: Limited reach, Limited number of companies |
| Financial issues: Tangible results work as a good motivator. In most cases results are translated to direct savings- what makes even better motivator | Financial issues: Time and effort demanding for SMEs to participate |
| Financial issues: Saving money for participants: good motivator | Financial issues: Some may questioned why it should be financed by participating companies |
| Financial issues: Participation fee- only something that costs you something you put worth on | Financial issues: Fees: Can be though to find a critical mass |
| Financial issues: Costs means commitment from both coordinator and participants | Financial issues: External financing needed |
| Financial issues: External financing make it possible to build and hold a structure over time | Financial issues: Short term program, not a networkHow to secure continuation when the program is over |
| Work approach:Step approach: Use your and your colleagues network | Stakeholders: Hard to recruit companies that can make commitment |
| Work approach:Comprehensive tool for self evaluation |  |
| Learning: Visiting other companies of value. Learn from each other without fear of competition, mutual trust (hight ceilings, thick walls) |  |
| Stakeholders/Work approach: Good to workshop with other companies |  |

# Running long term network (presented by Johannes)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advantages** | **Disadvatages** |
| Time perspective:Long term effort on building a network | Work approach: Perhaps unavailable yet to drive H2 demand by public investments |
| Stakeholders: Important role played by authorities as orchestrating efforts | Work approach: Not just one decision will be of importance: H2 vs diesel |
| Stakeholders: Wide groups of stakeholders involved: good to cooperate with experts to ensure reliable outlook and data | Work approach: Hard to work only for H2 in transoirtation in the same way- many questions are valid for municipalities: H2, biogas, BEV |
| Stakeholders: Important to have big/important players: the ensure powerfulness of network | Work approach: Patience is needed- it takes a long time to reach the goals, maybe the goals need to be changed over time |
| Stakeholders: Good to gather the “coalition of the willing” | Work approach: Integrated approach: energy, fuel |
| Work approach: Both individual counselling and network meetings ensures willingness to participate | Time perspective:Driving a network is a long term solution to changing goals/methods within a political agenda and it takes time to see effects |
| Work approach/Learning: To make a picture of networking organisations as puzzle makes it easy to understand own importance, where your organisations fits and gives a common vision  | Stakeholders: Challenges with recruitment- you need the big players to create “importance” of the issue |
| Work approach: Can be operative on any subject, not only biogas |  |
| Work approach: Clear structure makes willingness to participate |  |
| Work approach: Low risks for involvement: you gain a lot, invest little |  |

# Lobbying to change the political agenda (presented by Kees)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advantages** | **Disadvatages** |
| Work approach: Making an appointment to person who was in charge: makes you focus your idea to key facts | Work approach: You need to know the decision makers |
| Work approach: You learn to be convincing | Work approach: You need to know your enemies |
| Work approach: One on one strengthen your position | Time perspective: Political frame/goals- hard to change political goals |
| Work approach: Show the advantages; do not be against: show the solutions | Work approach: It is not building on personal relations |
| Stakeholders: Bringing a professional lobbyist on board: keeps the focus, makes access easier to relevant persons | Work approach: Difficult to keep attention of decision makers over long term |
| Work approach: Professional approach. Think big | Work approach: Staff rotation makes is vulnerable |
| Work approach: Tiny house as an artefact for communication | Work approach: Changing political context makes it vulnerable |
| Stakeholders: Continuity of staff and people involved | Work approach: A lot of effort for a result: you get all or nothing |
| Work approach: Commitment- stick to the plan | Time perspective: Takes time, you need to be patient |
| Stakeholders: Ensure commitment of your own organisation | Stakeholders: You need to be standing for yourself and you can’t do it alone |
| Work approach: Fun while working means people want to belong to | Work approach: It can be difficult to find a right person/right company to help you |
| Work approach: Great with structure for work and division into steps/parts | Stakeholders: Few stakeholders, few resources |
| Learning: You build up competence of the subject | Work approach: You make yourselves enemies |
| Learning: Your organisation gets knowledge |  |
| Work approach: Idea/method could work anywhere |  |
| Stakeholders: Commitment within your organisation and other companies |  |
| Learning: Trained to be a lobbyist at your job, learn to make a differenceLearning: You become professional and secure |  |
| Learning: You become professional and secure |  |
| Work approach: You become professional and secureNice to have a checklist |  |