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1. Press Release


Making the unthinkable imaginable and plausible: Oxford Futures Forum looks at scenarios and designs

A postcard wall, “feeling” systems, Don Quixote, black swans: the fourth annual Oxford Futures Forum introduced some surprising images and objects to investigate the latest thinking at the intersection of design and scenarios, and generated new ideas in fields as diverse as politics, public sector services, corporate strategy, product development and engineering.

On 30–31 May 2014, 70 invited participants working in academia, consultancy, design, government, and business used visual stimuli and written abstracts to prompt a wide range of conversations conducted in an Open Space format. The theme was “design and scenarios”, which inspired the addition of an exhibition as well as a hands-on design session. The exhibition enabled greater generative dialogue by providing examples of visual and sensory means for conceptualisation and interaction that represent futures in novel ways.

Participants discussed the five characteristics of iterative discovery, purpose, materiality and embodiment, human experiences, and translation that lie at the heart of both design and scenarios work, and developed questions for further research and experimentation into these fields.

“The Oxford Futures Forum 2014 was designed to enable generative dialogue, productive collaboration and deep reflection on the connections between scenario thinking and practice and design – particularly the scholarly study of design,” said Rafael Ramirez, Fellow in Strategy at Saïd Business School and Director of the Oxford Scenarios Programme. “The fact that many designers must first design before they can describe, while scenario planners must first describe before they can design ensured a creative tension that ran throughout the forum. Participants all contributed exciting ideas and intriguing – if sometimes disturbing – images that will resonate with us all for years to come and, I hope, be the start of creating new knowledge in these different yet complementary fields.”

Oxford Futures Forum was co-hosted by Yasser Bhatti, Lucy Kimbell, Rafael Ramirez and Cynthia Selin - and brought together by Saïd Business School, Green-Templeton College, the Walton Sustainability Solutions Initiatives from Arizona State University and benefited from scholarships generously funded by the Global Business Policy Council of AT Kearney.

During the Forum, participants had a chance to visit the recently re-opened Oxford Futures Library, located at Egrove campus, which houses the Pierre Wack Memorial Library and Boucher Futures Research Library. This reference Library boasts an impressive collection of over 5000 items, and is open to futures and scenario planning scholars and visiting practitioners.

Tweets from Oxford Futures Forum 2014:

https://twitter.com/search?q=oxFF2014&src=typd
Future Things

Modest in size, extremely short in duration and limited in audience to those who happen to be at the Egrove Park building in Oxford for two days in late May 2014, the Future Things exhibition is fleeting and exclusive. The practices of scenario planning involve artefacts and materials of many kinds, the practices of designers more self-consciously so. The point of the exhibition is to bring these two fields together and showcase a few exemplars in order to trigger and deepen the dialogues at the Oxford Futures Forum.

Works for the exhibition Future Things were selected from responses to an open call to all OFF invited participants. Together they present a range of analogue and digital materials that capture some of the different ways that futures are materialised in scenarios and design practice. Calling them future things emphasizes how their objectness is tied up with the practices of commissioners, creators and users of scenarios and designs. Drawing on design theorists using the term “thing”¹, the title of the exhibition recognizes the irony of de-contextualising objects from their contexts of production and engagement. Captured in this exhibition, many of the objects are severed from the worlds they grew up in, although some of the works – notably Ilona Gaynor’s Paper Moon – are native to exhibitions.

Together, the ten projects in Future Things proposed by twelve OFF participants throw up some – although not all – of the tensions of making and engaging in the present with possible future things. These tensions are between:

- Relishing ambiguity and multiple and contradictory interpretations, and constructing artefacts to make things simpler;
- Creating parts, or assembling wholes;
- Making the unfamiliar strange and the strange familiar.

Credits
Curated by Lucy Kimbell and Cynthia Selin
Assistant curator Kerri-Anne Chisholm
Assisted by Eleanor Turner

Said Business School, Egrove Park, Oxford OX1 5NY
May 30-31, 2014

Scott Smith proposed Winning Formula, a project he worked on with the Near Future Laboratory that takes the form of a newspaper sports section dated April 2018, exploring the future of data-driven football. Although this exhibition includes only the newspaper, it is part of a larger project commissioned in 2014 by FutureEverything, the National Football Museum, Centre for Contemporary Culture Barcelona and Fundación Telefónica.

Michelle Kasprzak proposed Ilona Gaynor’s Paper Moon, which she commissioned as part of an exhibition at the V2_ Institute for the Unstable Media, Rotterdam in 2013. Paper Moon explores the emerging legal and economic consequences of territory claims in outer space in the form of an assemblage of papers, and found and printed 3D objects including a cake and a printer.

Sanae Charibi and Dzmitry Aliakseyeu of Phillips Research proposed a project about the future of retail lighting launched in 2010. New Ways to Control Lighting features a booklet describing the scenarios and a digital demo of the lighting controller.

Kit Lykketoft and Christian Bason from Mindlab proposed a game they and designer Laura Winge created for the Danish Ministry of Education in 2013. The game was designed to create a shared understanding of the objectives for the Ministry’s new initiative aimed at Denmark’s 65,000 teachers.


Stuart Candy and Jake Dunagan of Found Futures proposed two projects. Postcards from the Future is a set of four postcards showing contrasting versions of Hawaii in the 2020s and 2030s, created in 2006 for a workshop at the Hawaii Research Center for Futures Studies. Their Bird Cage project from 2007 comprises future artefacts created and installed in Hawaii and photographs of them in situ.

Aisling Kelliher presents Re-Emerge. This shares results from the process of designing and representing futures scenarios to diverse audiences during the Emerge event at Arizona State University in 2012.

Noah Radford proposed artefacts from the Museum of Future Government Services, an interactive design futures exhibition launched at the UAE Government Summit in early 2014.

Photos by Kerri-Anne Chisholm, Assistant Curator of Exhibition
3. Round 1 Dialogue

GROUP A: Experiential Futures: Enlivening Scenarios through Interaction Design

Number of participants: 11
Note taker: Kiely Flanigan

Points from Discussion:

- Ways of thinking about scenarios
  - Scenarios are meta-risk analysis
  - Scenarios are creative tools that can be used in a variety of ways
  - Scenarios involve architecture of ideas
  - Need to make explicit people’s implicit understandings; need that to understand where are and where need to be
  - Tension between goal-based design versus futures (projection, forecasting, unfolding)

- In scenarios practice and design thinking there is a tension between ideas/abstraction and reality/practicality.
  - How deal with tension?
  - How can context help navigate tension?
  - Terra firma versus sky—people find comfort in both extremes. Acknowledge value and knowledge of both. Be non-judgmental of that tension inside everything.
  - Could be quantitative versus qualitative. What do you know (tangible and intangible)?
  - Could be normative or objective
  - Could be knowledge or ignorance (and who owns each?)

- In pursuit of love, we do design and interaction. Love is substrate to what we work on.

- There is an essence you can look at multiple levels
  - Metaphors are powerful

- Going out and getting information important to reframing thinking
  - Many design elements to it
    - Design on many different levels
    - Until you can conceive, can’t make it material
  - What is difference between innovation and design?
- Social versus business innovation—all design; different ways of reconceiving

- Megatrends in change
  - What happens to citizen? Organization? Systems?
  - Where people work
    - Way people experience change important to consider
    - Drawing powerful way to provide information
    - Cartoons can help others understand purpose and the why

- Freeing up imagination
  - Can get too unrealistic
  - Combine idealistic design with practical thinking (backcasting)
    - Take into account constraints
    - Create ideal conditions for sustaining goals
    - Idealized design + constraints = backcasting (similar to notion of earth and sky)
  - How to integrate design orientation (I have a goal, design) and forecasting/trend/assessment orientation (this is the way the world is going, how do I fit in, how do I adapt)?
  - It’s the marriage of the two that is important
  - Exploring strategic options: planning assumptions (implicit) and how shared or not shared with colleagues (environmental assessment framework)
  - How to make trade-offs visible?
    - Mapping can help make trade-offs explicit as nodal point
  - Nigel Cross book: race car design; looking for edge; gas-weight-distance-stopping trade-offs in race strategy; classic desire-constraint tension
  - Emery & Trist: context environment and externally imposed angle; Ackoff: desires and emotions towards an idealized design
  - The Art of Looking Sideways book: how infinite imagination is
  - The future is now; it’s not tomorrow (the futures we are in)
  - What we structurally project are already inside; to make explicit what is implicitly known

- Need visualization for scenarios
  - Not concrete, though
  - Children do it; part of human condition
  - Daniel Gilbert book: what makes a human being different from other species is that we visualize the future
    - Could be narratives, products, whatever
    - But, we’re bad at visualizing the texture, details of the future

- Seeing the wood for the trees; seeing the forest through the trees
  - Design is a way of making sense of too much information/complexity
  - Once make sense, then can plan
  - Until sense-making, difficult to move forward
  - Scenario and design process affected by policy development/needs

- Idea of making things explicit
  - It’s the process of scenario and design in that context that makes the identity of the explicit in an iterative way
  - Engaging futures thinking because purposeful and connective; connect in order to serve a purpose
  - If represent and visualize in systemic way, can get much more in thinking through implications of scenarios
    - Business rationale one way
    - Could be through values
  - Explicit representation of identity important to thinking through futures of organization; affects value creation within the system
  - Even need in society important to identity of business
  - Three components of co-creation of organizational identity: capabilities (internal), business context (internal and external), social need (external)
• What business are we in? Framing affects contextual awareness.
• Process of designing framing interesting aspect to explore
• Something compelling of production process itself that sustains how think of business
  • EXAMPLE: Operationalizing wellness in structure of disease management will be difficult when structure has old values
• Sometimes outcomes at different levels just add something to an existing structure
  o Was it a change factor or an add-on?
  o Design interventions made to change something, but also to facilitate growth
  o Is it desirable to have continuity in various ways that aren’t explicit?
  o Future fills in wholes, but keeps shell of original structure—are we meant to break free of that? Are they places that stop us or are they opportunities?
    • What remains and what changes?
• Relationships
  o Artifacts – facilitating conversation between difficult groups; bridge past and future; bridge two different groups
  o Often think about relationship as important but what thing mediating? Will color relationship so must attend to it because will set frame and parameters for sensibilities between them
  o A thing is specific; artifact can have a world of other meanings: toggle between specific and symbolic space (more open and fluid)
  o Trust in process. Artifacts can be manifestations of the process.
• Change does not always equal progress
  o Are we trying to create a different future?
  o Are we trying to help people adapt to futures they are facing?
  o Aristotle: change just is; Plato: change should be idealized
  o Scenarios not meant to be stagnant; continually change according to futures
    • Strength of scenarios is evolution
    • While ideal and intention of implementation of scenarios, there is a sedimentation settled in ideals. Tendency to wave white paper and say ideal future will manifest.
    • The explication of unarticulated understandings doesn’t have to take place in just one medium or at one point in time. Creates much richer horizon.
      • Paper by Patrick Humphreys and Derek Jones: collaborative authoring of outcomes
  o Scenarios look different after building artifacts; artifacts improve scenario development
    • When engineers build bridge: drawing, build, redraw what built
    • Ethnography of future: artifacts (help you build a world)
    • Are we using ethnography enough in scenarios work?
• How could design help overcome limitations of scenario stagnation? Putting outputs in service of describing possibilities in ways that lives and breathes more than most documents.
  o Clients don’t necessary want living object
  o People pay for answers, not uncertainty
• You in unity of time, place and action
  o 4 dimensions: relation, place, time and action
  o Diagram: dimension of relation is spectrum from you to not you; place from here to not here; time now to not now; action from doing to not doing.
  o As a result of elegant framework, can map any situation. Deploying design to bring scenario to life: ideal is to approach you, here, now and do in a way that reduces distance. Make a futures scenario come to life by you here now doing this now rather than intellectual concepts. Feels real and can compete on same footing with today’s urgencies.
  o Force to confront future as if now. Split second of belief is powerful. Tendency of people to dismiss future inhibits.
    • Create safe space for dangerous experience
- Analyze processes
- On which dimensions can create trust

- Guerilla scenario design dynamic: making people confront things may not want to otherwise
  - Purely experimental
  - Arousing emotional involvement
  - Engagement
  - But, is it ethical? Participants did not sign up as co-creators. Attacking people’s defenses is clinical and the cultural responses could be very different.
    - Requires careful balance; ethnography to identify concerns/desires; this is bringing to the surface conversations not already happening
    - When people find out it’s a hoax they are often indignant. Can provide workshops for those interested in talking about what happened.
    - But manifestation is different from abstraction; when thought true, participants reoriented their perspective and accepted reality in way very different from just thinking about it
    - Tension from intervention, lots of debate; anger produced productive emotion/conversation
    - But, latent concerns get addressed
      - History plays big part in contextualizing the scenario
      - EXAMPLE: Secret cinema in London

Points to Carry Forward:
- Desires and emotions
- Experienced futures
- Distinction and tension between prediction and idealization. Prediction linked to the contextualization of the environment.
- Relationship between design and constraint
- We are a species who can visualize the future
- Important to make explicit what is implicitly known (art can play a major role in this)
- Ethical issues are salient (how far can you take people out of their comfort zones?)
GROUP B: Radical Re-perceiving through Scenarios and Design - 1

Number of participants: 9
Note taker: Neena Veeraraghavan

Introductions
- Working beyond scenarios – How we can use scenarios to build interventions to address complex problems across the world.
- Cognitive belief in the future
- Definitions of design

Points from Discussion:
The discussion began with a summation of abstracts, as interpreted by another team member. Points to note include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Points</th>
<th>Questions Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Futures and prototypes which were rooted in local knowledge and built on local strength</td>
<td>- Where is the power? How do you give participants the power to act/ intervene?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both Scenarios and Innovation are experiential and participative, culturally engaging</td>
<td>- Are you not setting them up for failure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meta perception of frameworks and where do design and artefacts bridge the gap from Binary perceptions to deeper re-perceptions and help people break free of a passive approach</td>
<td>- How do people perceive the future in relation to changes in time? How do they handle uncertainty and risk?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual and Cultural influences on the</td>
<td>- How do we tackle a purely western view to include a more holistic or plural approach to change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How do we collectively evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perception of the future. Individual experiences such as sensory feelings and practices and the broader cultural perspectives

| Design for the future and influences from the past | How can we use technologies such as “Knucklebone” for forecasting and producing scenarios?  
| How can these symbols affect the process of producing scenarios and how do they change when processing design elements? |
| Cognitive and cultural factors influencing mental models – Expertise and knowledge, experiences, how we think and do and how these behaviours are influenced by practical changes such as technology, and subjective changes in literature and art, emotional and motivational understanding. | How are mental models of the future shaped and how they differ over space and time  
| How can we overcome the mental models of being “Prisoners of our own metaphors”? |
| Process of design thinking linked to process of learning and creativity. How are these two factors in support of each other and how can we build an integrated model of learning and coaching based on the dialogue between learning and creativity?  
| Extrapolation of individual learning and thinking to a better process of collective action and teamwork and how each supports the other | How can we link emotional and motivational aspects to this learning model? |
| Discontinuous notions of how the future can be; Hard and Soft designs and how these are relevant to business model designs.  
| Building a transmodernist, philosophical ethos to counter hegemonic dialogues.  
| “Asabiya” and learning from History and other cultural philosophies, as a starting point of thinking and building credible and engaging narratives.  
| Drawing on existing knowledge of large and small issues. | How can these designs be radically different in the future, based on an alternative, counter-hegemony scenario?  
| How do Micro-practices such as experiences, perceptions of change meet with a more Macro perspective?  
| What niches or collectivities might a revolution come from? |

**Exhibit:** 3D Printed Object looking like Jewelry – Discussion on profound consequences that modern manufacturing may disengage and how newer economies, based on these current scenarios, will have to consider a change.

| Redesigning form and shape in light of resource constraints and societal construct – “Supervalence”  
| Design is about politics – Example: Many constructions such as bridges and high-rise apartments which are not ecologically sound  
| “Ontological politics” – We prefer/judge/reproduce norms when we choose/visualize specific futures | How do we stand outside the barriers of our own experiential construct and see new possibilities and a new philosophy?  
| How do we work with dissenters and technology optimists? |

Innovation practices which involve design are constituted in multiple social processes and at
multiple layers, including experiments, reflexivity, sensing, re-structuring etc. Some processes stabilize innovations while others destabilize structures. How can scenario processes mimic these processes to improve innovation?

**Points to Carry Forward:**

- Learnings from Africa – A more holistic thought process combining the economically developed future but rooted in the rich culture and tradition.
- Boundaries between individual and cultural and ways to bridge the gaps; Links between Individual and collective thought processes and mental models.
- Idea of not just agency and participation, but also responsibility
- Philosophical underpinnings of foundations vs. Critical realist perspectives
- “Ontological Politics” – norms, judgements, subjectivity and values are embedded in futuristic design work and scenarios.

**Special Exhibit:** Newspapers of the Future and how Big Data is likely to have an impact on the design.

**Key Takeaway** - How to escape current mental models on a cognitive level and the ways in which design interacts with cultural, explicit and implicit models and the levels of society it affects, an example being the exhibitor’s installation about the newspaper of the future. The design goes into the hands of the people and encourages a different way to think about the future.
GROUP C: Tools from Scenarios/Design for Mediating Dialogue

Number of participants: 9

Note Taker: Alice Redfern

Points from discussion

Discussion and comments on abstracts

- **Abstract 1** – Central Idea: Rehearsing for the future; use of visualisation in scenario planning
  - Challenge – developing relationships with stakeholders
  - Visualisation can be used to explore connections between projects, stakeholders and key challenges
  - By showing graphically allows people to come to their own conclusions about the ideas and make different connections
  - Was developed because it was difficult to talk with business leaders about challenges faced in projects. Also provides facility to talk to students.

- **Abstract 2** – Central Idea: Designing public futures; prototyping scenarios to transform public governance
  - Exploring the important role of scenarios and design in public governance
  - Managers decisions effect larger scale positive change
  - Idea to creatively manifest the ideas that later shape products and services
  - Key questions – what is design attitude? Does it matter and why?
    - Design attitude
      - How do leaders and managers relate to/engage with designs and scenarios?
      - What does it mean to think like a designer? – i.e. empathy with users, subjective experience
      - A bureaucrat/public manager is not a designer – could they become more like designers?
      - Designers explore problems, develop scenarios and enact new practices
      - The role of management in engaging with the unknown
- Design as an ‘orientation of the mind’ - a way of thinking

- Abstract 3 – Central Idea: Integrating scenario planning and design thinking
  - Using design to make scenario and immersive experience
  - The stages of scenarios planning
    - Current state analysis can aid understanding deeper political issues
    - Design helps us to link scenarios to strategies
      - Design mindset helps to figure out where problems lie and find solutions rather than getting the perfect answer from the outset
    - Visualisation and immersive experiences help improve product outcome
    - Need to be intentional about application of design thinking – how to keep sense of energy
      - Benefits of being deliberate in link between designs and scenario
    - Scenarios as a specific application of design thinking
    - Instructional design
      - It matters what order you present a set of scenarios – designing an experience – people disengage if you start with a difficult, troublesome scenario, but engage easier if you start with a more digestible scenario

- Abstract 4 - Central Idea: Democratisation of design; designers as change agents
  - ‘Design decisions impact every aspect of our daily lives’
    - Life is shaped by the products of design decisions
  - We interact constantly with different design systems e.g. security systems, information systems, ecological systems, organisational systems
  - The democratisation of design
    - Where are the democratic spaces? The undemocratic spaces? Are these spaces appropriate? Who decides that? Do all designs need to be democratised? Is nature’s design democratic?
  - Can designs of new things/ re-designs of things be democratised to change the effects
  - Who is a designer – e.g. city planners, workforce planners
    - Each subcategory brings their own special tools.
    - Different subcategories can learn from each other.
    - Fluency in the way of thinking but difficult to reach conclusion – they speak a different language
    - Process, tools and materials – are somewhat predictable, but new materials are appearing daily making less and less predictable
  - Overlap in design language/ basic rules, but different processes and tools
  - Use of visualisation to overcome that engages a different part of the brain, to see new realities

- Abstract 5 – Central Idea: Expanding hybrid zones and synthesising new dictionaries
  - Developing effective tools to improve designs
  - It is important that the future is not an absolute, but rather a hybrid zone
  - Companies use scenarios to tint their thinking – use bits of different scenarios – lump them together to alter the effects - use an overlap/hybrid of different scenarios
    - Projects become messy
    - Clear-cut scenarios very rarely happen as expected
  - Methodological problem in understanding the driving forces
  - Technique to overcome problem – snapshot of the scenario experience
    - Get experts to talk about their process – engage them within the room
  - How do we move from understanding we develop in scenarios to action?
Alternative view – projects do sometimes go to plan

- What determines whether a project is ‘a mess’ (a system of many interacting problems) or goes completely to plan and how this interacts with success?

Abstract 6 – Central Idea: Serious leadership, serious games; scenarios and designs as leadership competencies

- Idea of producers and consumers bringing different frame to the discussion
  - Producers – conceptualise scenarios
  - Tension literate and time literate – there’s time spent doing things but tension in doing so productively
- Consumers look for immediate results and are used to short time frames – need to develop competence around the notion of time and how it effects decision making
- People in the producer role play a very different role in the consumer space
  - Technique of rotating offices over the year so that people spend time in these different roles; makes them more competent in both roles
- Need to build competency over the time – how do we achieve that?
  - Games as products of design, immersive experiences
- The use of mental time travel – our understanding of the past and our conceptualisation of the future are not dissimilar
- Is a scenario an efficient tool anymore?
  - Way to achieve a new language/process within the participants
  - Producer and consumer as a hybrid zone

Abstract 7 – Central idea: Bamboo scaffolding for ecosystems

- Bamboo scaffolding metaphor – What’s the context? Where is it coming from?
  - OFF scoping document
- Designing ecosystems of organisation; a way to look at collaborative and network governance
- No such thing as simply local environments; they are embedded in institutional influences
- What can design draw on in the future, for example emerging new technologies
- What’s the scope – are they capabilities for the entire ecosystem or for individual companies?
- Bringing the background into focus as a possible object of design
- Equating scenarios with design interventions – perhaps not equated but scenarios for design intervention
  - If you explore possible future ecosystems and possible future design capabilities, you can combine the two in simulations

Abstract 8 – Central Idea: Design approaches to the use of scenarios

- Two divisions – research and design – how to make them compatible
- Designers prefer the ‘better’ scenarios
- Scenarios give systematic framework for aligning ideas about what’s driving the future
- Need to be focused about what are the drivers so that everyone using the same language
  - Scenarios aren’t about exacting precision – produces framework only
- Tendency to think of ‘good futures’ from scenarios – becomes strategic
- Scenario planning means different things to the two divisions
  - Designers automatically step into the scenarios they like
  - Designers have preconceived ideas – source of tension with scenario planners

Exhibition – central idea: Scenarios in product innovation project teams
Using scenarios to work out why and where design capabilities can be applied in project innovation teams

Summary of discussion

- Designers as producers rather than consumers – makes combinations more successful
- Fruitful Collaboration between scenarios and design
- Scenarios as an interface between strategy and design
- Using design thinking as a tool for scenario planning
- Scenarios can be too theoretical and designs can be too practical
  - Breaking silo thinking – abstract vs practical
- Scenarios allow you to influence and create ‘better’ future via designs
  - Link to how design affects real life
GROUP D. Design and Scenarios to Instigate Change

Number of participants: 9
Note taker: Saba Riaz

THEME: INSTIGATING CHANGE

Points from Discussion

- Redesigning new organizations using scenarios
- Link (and difference) between risk and uncertainty
  - Who bears which uncertainty and who bear which risk?
- Reflexivity in scenarios – individuals are implicitly bringing their values into the scenarios
- The question is whose behaviour is being changed - whose scenarios are being studied here
- Scenarios could prevent design issues
- Scenarios can present design approach but not vandalism approach
- Do not worry about how you got there as far as you got something
- What is the purpose of scenarios – instigating change?

Design and Creative output
- What is the amount of design to have the maximum of creative output?
- No direct relationship between design and creative output

- There should be inductive scenario agenda

- Eliminate the unnecessary – focus on the core
- In scenarios you are in the position to realise what might be around
  - Perceptions are also necessary

- How can we get govt procurement people to ‘buy’ from the development people?
- New methodologies collide with old organization systems – which scenarios bring competition?

Key points which are intriguing/interesting/sticking in your mind? Which are the ones really interesting?

Building maps for scenarios: Mapping is a way to structure, to already impose a logic already there, or to put a new frame / structure in there

- Use of maps for mapping the processes to help generate ideas and to make the process simple
- maps as ways to organize information

- Bring your own framework
- Bring your own framework to create the scenarios
  - How do we do this? Which method?
- How can we support the functions to do this?
- Inductive approach – how to use design to present scenarios in a better way

- **Waterfall / Structured Method**
  - Large projects have more failure rate as compared to small projects using the waterfall method

- **Scenarios Emerge**
  - Scenarios – they keep on improving and emerging
  - Better to call scenarios an emerging/acting kind of thing rather than staged things!
  - Scenarios are emerging (ongoing) rather than project scenarios – it’s an ongoing process you get better and better as you go on

- **Behaviour change**
  - Behaviour change in scenarios- whose behavior is being changed and what is being done here?

- **Ambiguity**
  - People never know what they want until they see it – this increases the pressure point
  - You make things for people and when you deliver they say that is what I ask for but that is not what I want
  - This is a fundamental thing that people never know what they want

  - People don’t want to know unless something wrong happens – They don’t need to know the design

- **Agile Method**
  - Agile method is to avoid the type 3 problem - agile schedule is built to avoid error – it evolves and emerges by incorporating changes (adaptable)
  - It is a learning approach
  - Agile allows a certain amount of emergence- people don’t know what they want
  - Agile shortens the feedback cycle- start with- what is it that you want as a user?
  - Agile methods contradict organizational processes
  - Agile is a lot about are you solving the right problem.

- **Learning Cycle**
  - You can do the things as a learning cycle but you’ve to break down the assumption that first you know what you want

- **Effort versus output**
  - We have to tell people that what our effort versus output approach is

- **Taguchi Matrix**
  - As a pragmatic practitioner you have to be careful in your language
  - When user tells us this is what I am looking for we say Ok you told me X but let me gather other information and then I am going to translate it using Taguchi approach
  - Taguchi matrix is a very useful tool to improve the processes and functions

**ISSUES**

- How do you get groups who are using scenarios together?
  - How you make them there?
- How do you facilitate people to be part of the organization so that they put themselves in the positions?
- How will you make them part of the system?
- How they relate to organization themselves.
- Can an org prototype using scenarios.
- How you go about facilitating that and making people part of that scenario.

- How do you have this scenario thinking into the organization?
- How do these methodologies blend and how they are different globally/culturally.
  - How can they be adaptable?
  - Where they will work and where not?
  - How to Blend?
  - What is the application of these things?
- Pragmatism and practicality are the real issues

QUESTIONS AROSE FROM THE DISCUSSION
- In redesigning the organization what do scenario thinking gives you?
- Why are we using it- what methods and how to create this?
- How to include perceptions of people/users into scenarios?
- Can we use the prototype to learn the actual scenarios?
- Are scenarios prototypes or are they part of prototypes?
- How to review the formal function of organization using scenarios?
- What to consider and what not to consider?
- Is scenario part of the process or is it a prototype to learn?
- Is scenario part of prototyping experience or are they prototypes themselves?
- Is there a direct relationship between creative output and design?
- How much design is needed to make that creative output? /What is the amount of design to have the maximum level of creative output?
- Can you develop policy through agile methodologies?
- How much creative output do we need for design interventions?

POINTS TO CARRY FORWARD
- Use of Maps in Scenarios, and scenarios as maps: maps to help think; maps to communicate
- Purpose of scenarios
- From Tacit \(\rightarrow\) Touch it: how do you make explicit what is implicit?
- How do you achieve “Economy of Line”? (In other words, the fewest amount of lines necessary to draw something”)
- Methods (comparing waterfall ‘buyers’ and ‘agile’ sellers)

SUMMARY
- Purpose should be clear from the beginning
- Developing scenarios is an iterative process
- Whether the scenarios are end product or whether they are ways to reach to the end product
- The Economy of Line – Not too much but just enough information so that people can have little bit of idea to start with
GROUP E: Merging Design and Scenarios to Scale Design

Participants: 8
Note taker: Farzana Dudhwala

Fictions

Discussion arising from the exhibit on the Future Museum in Dubai

- In the Future Museum in Dubai - there was an artefact of the future that was created to show people what the future could hold. The education minister asked if he could buy 300 of them. The gut response was to say -‘they’re not real!’ but actually they are real!
  - This is how we are enacting the future, now!
- When you get an emotional response out of someone from interacting with a ‘fictional’ interactive artefact then it’s much more evocative and visceral than a stack of documents.
- The exhibition about people putting their hands on a screen to get a ‘reading’ of their health (which wasn’t ‘real’ in the sense that it wasn’t running any diagnostics) gave people a way to think about the implications of how it would feel if someone or something could collect that sort of data about you. It brought them into the future and into a shared vision of how it might feel to be a part of that future.
- This takes people away from their daily experiences and lets them imagine and experience a different potential future.
- This is a way of using tactical media of engaging the government and the public.
- These are aspirational visions and it’s up to us to see how they may pan out
- This is a risky strategy: we’re not giving a traditional report or document which is the medium that people usually feel comfortable with, but nonetheless this is a great way to get people get actively involved. . .
  - This is an easier way to get the dialogue going
  - This is high risk, high reward
- How far does this sort of interactive and immersive scenario design help with the creation of trust between public and government?
  - This opens up a conversation before it’s too late.
  - You have to make sure you take people along with you - and explain to them what it is that you are trying to create with these artefacts from the future
- What about the impact of these futures on the environment?
Discussion arising from the introductions to each others work

- We are trying to incorporate the uncertainty in our day to day lives.
  - “The weird, now!”
- Many scenarios are only very few - what do you do when you move into a more dynamic and complex space
  - How do you create scenarios for those complex futures?
  - How do you decide what kind of scenarios to create?
- “History doesn’t repeat itself, it rhymes”
  - Create bubbles until they get to the point of collapse and then think about how to stop them or come up with the next bubble.
- Scenarios can take you from imagination to thought to embodied ‘stuff’.
- The capacity for serious imagination is very important.
  - The experience of the Dubai futures museum was very important but we need to find a way of re-doing that with a lower budget or in other words how to scale that to 20 different countries or sites.
  - Bringing the future into the present is very powerful
- Could we use scenarios to create a sincere and credible political momentum?
  - to create cross stakeholder dialogue.
  - to go towards an official vision to learn form the scenarios
  - based on these different visions we could create a water management prototype
- Using posters as frames has helped with timing in policy.
- The purpose being to generate good discussion with various stakeholders.
- We can use scenarios to help thinking but we need to embody this thinking and this is where the design comes in
- It’s a way of evolving the fiction by using other people’s experiences and reactions
- You need a flexible prototyping process to scenarios.
  - this is not the way most people think but it makes sense to do it this way - an iterative process rather than a linear process.
- There’s a kind of cyclic move - it’s a self-reflexive loop that helps us to refine the thinking and the embodiment.
- Matter matters - when it’s conscious and intentional we call it design, otherwise it’s just stuff. But the stuff matters regardless. We need to empirically say that imagination and thought and stuff is intimately connected whether we like it or not. . .
- Perhaps we shouldn’t think about it as futures first and then design
  - There is a disconnect - designers need to sit alongside policy planners and futurists and be a part of the process from the beginning
- Design process is very similar to soft-systems approach
- “As a designer we never use the word design-thinking”
  - because as a designer we think all the time anyway!
- What year will it be when groups like this meet and all of the people involve come from some kind of an institution where we all think about places like ‘museums of the future’?
- the prototyping tools allow us to make these ‘futures museums’ - it’s a process which needs to be incorporated into scenario planning and futures work
- French video about who makes baby prams - was it men who built them?
- We need to think about this in the context of futures - are we actually talking to the people that it affects or that it may come to affect?
  - This is not a methods question but a political question
  - You can’t put new wines into old skins. . .
- There is also a scale question here - using new tools can scale things much better. . .

Summing up

- We talked about the process of thinking
- How scenarios help imaginative thinking and embodying that imagination through design
  - How do we bring that to life with the right people?
  - How do we do that in a co-design way?
• Then we need to make change happen with policy - it needs to be an iterative process - but this isn’t how we think about things normally so something needs to change
• This is about realising that the way people think and have thought in the past could have been different
  o – the way we currently think is shaped by how we do science and how we think about science but looking back we may be able to learn from history. Remember: “History doesn’t repeat itself, it rhymes!”
Main Themes and concerns

UNCERTAINTY

- What are the new and qualitative ways of visualising uncertainty? One possibility: Dynamic arithmetic - moving from purely numbers and data to looking at blob-like functions, approximations, bringing together qualitative and quantitative – more possibility of revealing uncertainties.

EPHEMERALITY

- There is a use and important role for ephemeral objects, ephemeral scenarios, and popup scenarios:
  - ephemeral objects/scenarios are not necessarily built to last (although they may last for a while – this is not about something with a planned end, and to clarify, planned obsolescence is a separate issue as that is something where the end is deliberately planned in)
  - ephemeral objects/scenarios also change over time
- Embedding design philosophy into our human considerations, using new techniques for creating dialogue, such as workshops to imagine possible processes of creating products.
  - Best to do it when investment in product is in early stages.
  - As investment and development proceed, people may become more creative in the way products evolve.
  - It can be used to open up debate about issues (and at a timely and critical stage when it is needed)

COHERENCE VS DISSONANCE

- Concept of Gesamtkunstwerk – the company is a world in itself. There are codes of communicating things, and you exist in a specific “world” and context. As a company it is
important to find the fit and avoid dissonance.

- How do we make coherent worlds, and search for the right strategies to fit these coherent worlds?
- There is often very little tolerance for dissonance, we try to avoid it.
- Sometimes innovation might come from dissonance?

DISTRIBUTED RESPONSIBILITY

- From a proactionary view, there are concerns that design has been colonised by productivism which is opposite of what design birthed. What about real prototyping? Is design a word for anti-design actually? Has there been enough forethought?
- From a decentralised view, maybe it is more useful to distribute responsibility for scenario design and exploration of science, such as in citizen science. How can we imagine the future of science – why not bring science to the developing world and nurture it so that it will spread through citizen science groups?
- “Let’s worry about it” vs “Let’s just do it”
- Proactionary vs Decentralisation - ideas which are on opposite ends of a scale – but their concerns can be summarised as a kind of distributed decentralised responsibility?

SCALE IN SCENARIO DESIGN

- Is small beautiful?
- “Is small beautiful” – is that an affirmative statement?
- But is anything really small? Bio-tech and nanotech are always at risk of being large? Risk analysis?
- Risk Analysis – is that creating situations where people try to avoid being responsible as well? How do we avoid multi-causal risks? Someone else does the policy? But then, this does not solve the problem that over time responsibility been concentrated and spread and concentrated and spread over and over again!

MATERIALITY, AND EXTREME SCENARIOS

- Buildings are about architecture shaping us - the agency of things and forces, which often gets overlooked in scenario design. We often look at places, people but what about things?
- Object Oriented Ontology: What is the role of things? What does this material want? When you get great material? “The brick wants to be an arch. It wants to fly”
- How do objects shape us? How do we shape objects?
- With spreadsheets, now anyone can calculate the rate of return and “ratioification” of finance. As a result, people who have never been working in a company can tell others to do things without knowing how a company works, just on basis of these numbers.
- How does digital materiality change everything?

EXTREME SCENARIOS AND MONSTROSITIES – AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH INNOVATION

- Do we need extreme scenarios in order to spur innovation? What is the role of extreme scenarios and user in design innovation? What is the role of context?
- On extreme events: What would the world look like if the war never took place? It may have been the catalyst for untold innovation. If not for the war, the planes that we would be flying now still be the ones from the 1960s.
- Do we use extreme/monstrosities because we need to debate? To try to open up debate? But does it really open up debate. Or does it fuel people’s imagination that its needed to be debated – people misreading it as a beautiful future – the worse case scenario paradoxically becoming something they aspired toward instead of being revolted by the horrible possibility – due to its aesthetically pleasing presentation? (That said, it is not the artist’s job to resolve
The Postnormal Cake – the example of the leftover cake in the exhibition hall (by Ilona Gaynor) that retained its form and was regarded by all as freakish, monstrous. No one wanted to eat it anymore. Like the ephemeral object, it too was ephemeral at one point (while we could have eaten it all) but because it was left there and remained the same for longer than expected, it turned into something monstrous.

- Something that remains the same eventually becomes monstrous.
- The cake became monstrous because we expected it to change with the times but it did not.

There is the paradox of committing to a scenario but then knowing it may change along the way – just as how people enjoy movies because the characters, situation, and narrative is usually always changing.

**Points to Carry Forward**

- What are the ways in which we can distribute responsibility in deciding on ways to design the future?

- Do we need extreme scenarios in order to spur innovation? Does it open up interesting debates, or is it complicated by the readings of these scenarios, which cannot be controlled? Can we design scenarios in a way that allows the readings of these scenarios to be more predictable?

- The paradox of committing to implementing or designing a scenario, but then knowing it might change along the way.

**Summary - Keywords from Discussion**

Uncertainty

Ephemerality ↔ Materiality (Digital materiality)

Ephemerality ↔ Extreme/Monstrosity

Coherence ↔ Dissonance

Hacktivism ↔ Proactionary

Decentralised/Distributed Responsibility

Scale in Scenario Design
GROUP G: New Forms of Storytelling through the intersection of design and Scenarios
Number of participants: 7
Note taker: Azeem Faraz

Points from Discussion:

- Are narrative and stories equivalent?
  - Story: is a plot and is time bound
  - Narrative is a subjective account of the story
- We can say that “a boy meets a girl” is a story. “Romeo and Juliet” is one of the narratives.
- How storytelling and scenario planning are related?
  - A story helps to explain a scenario to layman, but there is an analysis behind the story linking it to the scenario.
- Stories help to create reality. There is a relationship between the narrative and the realization of the narrative.
- The culture adds a dimension to the story. And the process of storytelling (or narrative) should be able to accommodate it. E.g. different cultures view time differently.
- And accommodating time can be challenging when using stories to explain scenarios. E.g. Chinese culture which views time as circular with rebirth after demise.
- Time horizon considerations can be different in different industries from scenario planning purposes e.g. construction vs consumer items sectors.
- Similarly some industry cultures prefer numbers while other prefer graphs/pictures.
- A closely related aspect is how to link narrative theory and systems theory.
- Is a story curated or it emerges (from scenario planning perspective)?
  - If scenarios are used to create future, people curate stories vigorously.
  - We need to have governance for curating stories for scenario planning
- The systems can be presented using games and visuals.
- The systems and narrative can influence each other.
A visual of the story discussed among group members during the session. It can be narrated differently by different members. Key to the whiteboard visual:

- **Red and blue circles:** key starting themes from the discussion
- **Large black rectangle:** visual of the combined discussion
  - Plot is a sequence of events through time
  - Stories told are a spatial-isation of ourselves
    - it is the envisioning activity that progresses a concept, as we tell stories we create as well as describe the space. By creating stories we create realities.
    - It is problem-solving
    - When we consider this as a co-creative event, we also acknowledge accountability
  - Narrative is a path through those events, and is curated
    - The narrative language reflects the audience concerns (and metrics)
  - Stories have,
    - a curator/designer/teller of a story
    - a tale – the tale (in design terms) has multiple forms and formats (ways of experiencing the world)
    - an audience, which experiences the story
- **Small black rectangle:** when we create worlds, we want to understand the (blue) levers

**Points to Carry Forward: (joined + black circles)**

- How can we explore future and designing future aspects of storytelling and scenario planning? There is clear potential for joining well-hewn scenario methods (which include hard numbers), joined with the fundamentals of narrative theory.
Ambiguity, Complexity and Frailty

- Most organisations view systems thinking as tangible and certain. In reality, systems thinking is actually ambiguous, intangible, tangled and complex.
- The solution to a problem within a system will transform according to feedback from stakeholders. Therefore, decision makers need to understand that the design of solutions is inherently frail and dynamic.

Communication through systems mythology

- In thinking/designing the unknown future, communicating these futures through different names and tones matter more than the technologies themselves. These names and tones should be value neutral and non-hierarchical.
- Communication should induce reaction to ideas rather than focus on immersiveness.

Identity, environment and systems design

- Identity requires the consistency of being. This favors resilient systems as opposed to fragile. As such, transformative societies tend to be identity-less. We must pay attention to how systems identity is manifested and communicated.
- The physical infrastructure in our environment will change the way broader elements will transform, which in turn, changes our identity. In the same manner, our identity is formed as an immediate feedback of what we experience within the environment we interact with.

Strategic risk and decision making

- Solutions are designed for a future point in time at a point in time while problems tend to be a complex interaction between multiple issues and timeframes.
- Systems thinking abstracts and sacrifices information. By leveraging design and visualization, decision making can be made easier as a complex issue can be simplified without oversimplification.
- At the same time, while information tells one what is happening, and is usually used to reduce anxiety regarding decision making, we should not over-rely on information to design solutions within the system. Moving away from the information realm to other domains.
within the frame of the problem will enable decision makers to design better solutions under complexity.

**Looking Outside-in to Design Better Solutions**

- Decision makers tend to develop solutions based on significant amounts of information and ideas created by the people involved in solving the problem. A paradigm shift is taking place in which decision makers realise that better solutions can be designed when we use information from the perspective of the outsider.
- For instance, a service oriented organization will need to consider the points of views of the different scenarios of customers it serves, and create solutions based on these scenarios.

**Leadership and System**

- Leaders of large organisations have to be designers; they create movement and bring people along through the designing of a story or images. They need to look quickly at the reaction to the prototype of the story and adapt their designs according to the feedback loop.
- As such, leaders need to look beyond the problem as a simple point in the space but to view the problem as a holistic system.

**Engaging experts and stakeholders in designing solutions and scenarios**

- The initial framing of which types of uncertainty matters because this affects what becomes the dominant system and the dominant thinking. As such, engaging multiple stakeholders is needed to mitigate the risk of not paying attention to the minority voice and not discovering the unknown unknowns.

**Scenario thinking and service innovation**

- There is a need to shift the current frame of organizational thinking from product orientation to service orientation.
- The skills required to be a service-oriented organization is very different from that of product orientation. This is because service orientation looks at issues from the customer’s point of view; looking at the customer’s journey in future contexts. By making the customer the focal point, a process of co-discovery of potential solutions can be implemented.
- In addition, the capability requirement varies according to different time horizons (the present, medium term and long-term future). A call for action is required to move away from the predominant practice of using the same toolbox for different horizons to a habit of creating capabilities that cater to different premises and horizons.

**Scenario Thinking and Design**

- There are certain similarities between design and scenario thinking. This includes the language used and the focus on non-linear thinking. However, scenario thinking and design are fundamentally different in that design uses an approach of experimentation while scenario thinking does not. In design, stakeholders build relationships and experiment the potential solutions to the problem before they formally design the final solutions. However, in scenario thinking, the norm is to create solutions based on concepts without any form of experimentation.

**SUMMARY for SESSION 1**

3 domains were discussed:

1. The perceived reality – which entails ambiguity and unknown unknowns
2. Scenarios – which entails commonality and the use of a conceptual framework to understand reality and to reach an outcome
3. Design: To create a solution to a problem

The desired outcome of the discussion is to understand how the three domains can react in meaningful ways in the process of solving problems realizing the following key take-aways:

- Experiencing *before* designing
- Identity is created in interaction
- Visual thinking re-solves complexity
- Systems thinking abstracts and sacrifice information for greater understanding
- There are capabilities *in* and adaptability *of* systems
- Experience of systems vs conceptualization of systems
4. Plenary Feedback of Round 1

Note taker: Irina Fedorenko

Group A:
- Only humans can visualise the future,
- Tension between prediction and idealisation
- Constraints and reality-check,
- The role of art. E.g. artwork in Hawaii to increase awareness about justice. How far can you take people out of their comfort zone?

Group B:
- How can we escape our current models?
- How design interacts with our cultural models, shapes them and is shaped by them.
- Is it a top-down or bottom-up process or both?
- E.g. put the design in the hands of people.

Group C:
- Design and future is an attitude.
- Mental process is going to help the decision makers to see the potential futures.
- Co-producing is helping to see holistically what is going to happen.
- Process. How can we find the tools to make the process simpler?
- Difficult to have a designer to make something for a scenario with a negative outcome.

Group D:
- How do you make the scenario concrete? How can you touch it?
- Maps as a way to organize information.
- Importance of methods, how to actually implement things?

Group E:
- Imaginative thinking.
- How we embody the thinking and bring it life?
- Co-design is important.

Group F:
- Uncertainty and materiality.
- How extreme scenarios could open up the debate.
- Space and how to use the space mode.

Group G:
- Narratives. Not enough integration in scenarios thinking.
- Narratives can emerge from system analysis and vice-versa
- Interacting with different modes of reporting

Group H:
- System thinking. Need to come up with a mental model and a frame
- The design process is very different. Need to make choices.
- New practices and tools would be needed for this interaction and communicating the problems people are trying to solve.
Q: Maps and tools. How do you avoid your clients mistaken a map for the territory?
A: Need to explain that maps are something to enable someone to navigate. Need to find a common ground between the present and the future. This could be done using maps.

Q: Only humans can visualise the future?
A: Only humans have desire, because algorithms don't desire.. or do they?

Q: Designers don't want negative future
A: Design used to have social positive purpose. But design could be matched with negative futures. Some asks for scenarios that would kill the company first, thus creating the opportunities for creative destructions. By coming up with the worst, one could avoid it from happening.

Q: Debate on the end of the process.
A: There is always the challenge that you bring people to see things differently. You are trying to rebuild the process. There is no end of the process.

Comments:
- Anthropogenic influence and misunderstanding of the concept of resilience.
- DIDA (Data, information decision action) A tool to allow decisions to cause actions.
- Design is a medium to be more engaging. Design is a far more effective to engage the audience – the impact the outreach (e.g. videos on youtube vs World Bank reports).
- One can explore the future, we can make scenarios, but what can we create? Design helps to envision the context and to embody the scenarios.
- If we think of design only as intervention, it is reducing to normativity.
We discussed the definition of design and the difference between scenario thinking and design thinking with the value of design being a re-iterative practice.

The topic of our discussion was the achievement of strategic innovation, defined as a system’s ability to renew itself. An impediment to that is risk aversion. The observation is that strategic risk is not adequately targeted in companies and risk analysis is focused on quantitative deviations. Strategic risks are the vehicle to address strategic innovation by creating a desire to change.

The discussed framework starts with identifying the identity of a business, starting with the nature of the business. Looking at the context in the next step, the question is which changes would invalidate the nature of that business. The framework focuses on qualitative coherence. Identity is defined as the need that a business serves, capabilities a business has and enabling conditions. It’s a systemic view on what brought a business to this point in presence. The context focuses on relevant futures. The fit of identity and context should be in coherence. If there is incoherence, the question becomes: How to recreate the state of coherence? After the analytical process, the company then allocates resources to develop strategic options and a new identity.

The strength of the process is to apply this framework in a collaborative and socialized process including a high exposure of leaders (through business executive workshops, workshops in big teams including externals etc.).

The goal is to enable informed decision-making and to institutionalize entrepreneurship by creating “constructive fear” with regards to the future context.

We then discussed the application of the framework and process in a country context and concluded that the discussion on “identity” would be more complex and requires more time. Strategic options will be determined by different identities in society and thus require negotiations.

In a second breakout discussion we talked about the collapse of time and its impact on decision making processes. Time is becoming more “horizontal” as opposed to vertical with the “now” becoming more important and more complex. Data of the past is becoming less relevant for future predictions and the future is becoming more uncertain.

We concluded that a time collapse means a higher importance of intuition in decision-making. Decision-making tools need to take that into account and simplify information to enable faster decisions. We also discussed that it might become even more important to raise awareness on longer term issues with more and more attention being in the “now”.
GROUP: Ministry of Design Futures
Number of participants: 13
Note taker: Kiely Flanigan

Points from Discussion:

- Questions to explore
  1. What is the future of public governance?
  2. Hybrid of design and futures @scale? What are the capabilities and mindsets from procurement, source, and delivery to do this to scale?
  3. Where does the power lie?
  4. Which tools and methods for which problems?
  5. Politics of design futures?
  6. How can design futures create more futures government?
  7. What does a victory condition look like? For whom?
  8. How do new models fit with older ones?
  9. How to unstick institutions?
 10. Whose vision of the future?
 11. How can this help government make visions people hope will come true?
 12. Is a ministry of design futures a good idea?

- EXAMPLE: Tunisia example (insurgent); opening new shopping malls, welcoming into borders, media simulation; national simulation. Twitter popularity ended up changing the conversation. Tunisia arm of Ogilvy.
  - What does it mean to use all that design can offer?


- EXAMPLE: South Africa; commission of 20 people taken from civil society, collectively created national development plan (what should be doing); National Planning Commission organized jam with IBM software to engage 20,000 young people across country for idea generation; organized, mass participation (some suggested themes, but some left open). Never taken forward.
• EXAMPLE: Serbian wargaming
• Theme between three: role of technology in collaboration. Crowd sourced ideas have mass themes/not tangible, difficult to translate into tangible design and difficult to generate traction
• Hybrid design and futures – be able to show unintended consequences and risks; what mean in real life terms (policy usually separate from our everyday lives)
  o Unintended consequences: ways we create a scale intervention policy adaptive and open-ended; in that space
  o What is value of scenarios versus designs?
• EXAMPLE: Singapore; 2012-2013 public consultation/mass participation exercise; linked to politics so wouldn’t fizzle; timed so that end of process 2 months before Prime Minister gives address (fed into what he would say); success: people talking more about their concerns and not just individually-vested interests; making mainstream daily process; assumed have to have education but not true; not direct tangible outcomes, but now every ministry wants to run their own process.
• Stops normalizing narratives; gives better understanding of how certain narratives can be destructive
• How new model of participation fits into old model of governing
  o Elections
  o Willingness to participate
  o Richard Lum: The Third Era. Time and strategic fit. Various horizons. Aspirational. Shaded space is where systemic conflicts hold up system longer than it should. Or, virtual systems enabled to emerge. Not bridge, but messy.
• How unstick and explore future possibilities for an institution? Major challenge. Ways to break open that conversation?
• Can we generate trust with muddling through strategy?
• Shiv article – critique of “Our Common Future” – what’s called for is not common future but a future of the commons. Not how to get everybody singing from same hymnbook, but how to realize democracy by genuinely diverse perspectives expressed. An ongoing capacity.
• Democratic processes: opposite move happening, civic conversations in bottom-up process that is informing decisions; how does system become legitimate? Dynamics of that? Place of power? Motivated by enthusiasm, meaning, resource availability? When talk about democracy, what do we mean by that?
• From North America: populism (100 years of people demanding to be heard), forum now taken since 9-11/George Bush, aspirational futures (not surprisingly we would leave off oxygen even though need it to survive); demand for education. Now populists folks represent taking ignorance for granted, run through advertising agency and govern with that.
  o EXAMPLE: Drones for good. In US, asking, “could I shoot this thing down if it’s in my backyard?” Level of conversation versus UA was striking.
• If do think parliament is legitimate, ways tools, techniques can inform, challenge, modify, and help government making visions real?
  o Transcending elections
• 15% diffusion versus 100% centralization
• Public platform for imagination that isn’t co-opted – what look like?
• Is there something where we all can contribute on question – what are organizational and procedural questions radically shifting capability of system to deal with this?
• Educating people on design/scenario capabilities?
• How do public managers engage with designers? Unrealistic that will have that literacy. Educational component, but what is engagement/interaction dynamic?
  o Inside/outside/hybrid?
  o Analogy: behavioural insights team in UK; generation of research being operationalized in structural policy and architecture/design. What is material we’re delivering? How did behavioural economics integrate itself? Spinning out into a consultancy.
  o Alberta – decided 3 fundamental needs are: colleagues (other senior people who have foresight appreciation – music/art/food appreciation – a palate that can tell difference
between junk and non-junk); some professionals in every department who are practitioners (but, few of them because community practitioners connected around world where most of the world done; not government based; no such government issue, but societal issues);

- Foresight and design appreciation – how understand how context emerging; how enact change in tangible behaviour in future
- EXAMPLE: Cape Town – world design capital this year; it’s in the thick present; pitched on design to improve lives; prestigious thing they pitched for; “Design Futures Olympics”; about improving lives now
- Ideation is important; how translate realities into something else; how work with it short of complete destruction?
- Need to consider power in community building argument
  - people discount the future
  - people vote against own interests
- (1) Societal survey – what’s going on; (2) what are complexities of systems built to implement it (layers of government have become so complex and interconnected that don’t understand design). How mediate these two complexities?

Summary

- Top-down and bottom-up
- Building literacy and appreciation
- “Design Futures Olympics” – channels brief, intense, periodic energy more feasible
- Strategy versus tactical (can we imagine ourselves as agents who can infiltrate; guerilla futures)
- Reflection/representation versus leadership/vision
- Designing futures should be a spread capability
- How we can use design futures to change/adapt way we see governance structures
- How create new spaces for collaborative action
- What do you do with unintended consequences of the designs you have created?
- Temporalities, scales don’t just preexist and can vary. How to be attentive to those and begin to construct them differently through different cultural practices and organizational systems.
- Governance at a time when just beginning to realize that inherited imaginations don’t work. Governance between dreams. Old model, knowledge certain.
- What is the balance between ambition of a future/governance/change and issue of uncertainty, un-knownness, humility (what could our role even really be and the ways we can act on that ambition)?
- Designing with uncertainty/complexity.
- Massive parallel experimentation. Social organization, design needs to be bubbling all the time. Need mentality to recognize when it is being done. Every nation is a petri dish that is being tested.
- Metrics for experimentation
- Way politicians are rewarded, politics not working – how can politicians get rewarded for doing the right thing long-term?
- Changing dynamics so that victory condition continuously. “No” to final victory conditions as a final solution. There’s no end point. Ability to be adaptive.

Whiteboard Notes

Synthesis:

- Tactics versus strategy + pay attention to different temporalities and scales + what to do with unintended consequences of designs? + massive parallel experimentation + metrics for experimentation
• Windows and doors: How can politicians get rewarded for long term thinking/goodness + governance between dreams + use design futures to reimagine government itself (during elections, require politicians to produce design fictions from their policy platforms)
• Building a literacy and appreciation + capability should be spread
• Tactics and strategy + designing with uncertainty
• The Design Futures Olympics + massive parallel experimentation + designing with uncertainty (high design futures reduce uncertainty through experimentation)
• Representation versus leadership + balance between ambition and humility
• No final victory conditions + balance between ambition and humility + massive parallel experimentation

Why: world too complex, too influential behavior, make desired change happen, learning about scaled change, helping government get unstuck, to help realize democracy, to help realize participation, reconcile diverse aspirations

Themes: opportunism, visionary, desirability/futures, renaming, top down/bottom up, transformative, action-orientation, medium-term (3-5), diverse citizen/experts, tactical timing, public trust, means versus ends, plurality of conversations, difference between democracy and representation, foresight literacy, power matters

Methods: media simulation, stakeholder brainstorming, videos of the future, storytelling, “day in the life”, partnerships, online engagement at scale, participation, deep user research, 3 horizon mapping, structural design, engagement, incubate in government and spin out, design to imperatives, sex appeal, moon shots

Outcomes/impacts: policy changes, credibility, manifesting uncertainties, unintended consequences, structural design change

Worked: engage communities, builds interest, people talk about their concerns, linked with political cycles, copycat projects

Didn’t work: lack of convergence regarding crowdsourced inputs, nothing happens
On Designing Negative Scenarios

- Who gets to say what a “utopia” or “dystopia” truly is? What kind of philosophy starts to inform this, when there is so much morally bankruptcy in the world? What is truly a “worst case scenario” – is it really bad for everyone or only some people? How do these notions of dystopia even start to emerge and interact?

Distributed responsibility – What is the right scale?

- When we talk about distributed responsibility, what is the right scale of authority? Is this the modern project of politics – deciding on which level these decisions get made?
- On which scale is it useful to debate and talk about these things? Can it be too wide? Can this issue be too wide? On what scale will a scenario be meaningful?
- Top-down – thought to be high impact. But then what about from bottom up – crowdsourcing, self-organising, trying to change policy from bottom up. Eg: Open science – building prototypes and creating communities. Decentralised. Eg: using open science and citizen science to debate the question of a post-antibiotic future?
- The issue of governance crosses different scales.
  - Eg: the body is disciplined to a certain norm. There are certain norms of family, gender, etc. but also there are norms of policy and labour.
  - America is built on this myth that each state would be its own government structure. You have a kind of vision there that.
  - Self-organising communities.
  - The city state vision. Singularity state.

“I Know Best” Mindsets, “Good Practice” and Time

- Place-based branding and the “I know best” mindset seems to be a monstrous offensive. Places which were dead now become “flourishing” (economically active), but the communities are affected by many changes because of the process of extracting resources. Why do people fail to consider or ignore the issue of what is going to happen to the communities affected by the movement of resources?
Foucault’s *Discipline* – now we are beyond discipline. We are into control. Everyone is part of this control system. We speak of “learning organisations”, but it is still not clear – with regards to governance and agency, are we going to localise either permanent or dissipating moments of power?

The change is that now everyone can speak for themselves now (eg: with the Internet). The old model was a demand driven model; now it is a supply push model.

Even if you find the right size, and the right scale, what would be the right level within that scale?

On the inherent dystopian nature of large organisations (Kafkaesque?) – depending on where you are, on the step of the process, there are different governance levels?

Are we suspicious enough of the term “good practice”? Good practice is something specific at any one particular time, but it does not necessarily translate to in other times/scales/levels. Can this question of “what is good practice” be a key to understanding scale and level?

100 years ago today the world was ruled by kings and queens and not nation states. When we look back, if we asked the people in the past what they thought would happen in the future, perhaps no one could have really foreseen the future as it is today. This is all work in progress. As with the case with dissolving sovereign powers, can we say for certain that the nation-state will be the construct that will take us further into the future? Or can we design new governance? Through that, we can see new constructs emerge.

**Design is not a thing, it's a process.**

**Hypothetical design scenario briefs**

- Question posed: If scenario design can be applied to politics, what about designing a hypothetical brief to work on? What could a group of people including designers do in order to make Scotland independent, destroy the UK and set London free to become a city-state? (Balkanisation?) Can Scotland’s independence be designed? Can actions or tools be designed to orchestrate political shifts?
  - But, you need to separate the design and politics. What are the tools used by design and how different is it from the tools used in politics? (Eg: considerations would include: n-th factor thinking, examining instruments of governments)
  - What kind of design actions do we need? What scale is appropriate? Should we be organised by scale? What is the design role/design action?
  - Could design thinking be ideology driven? Should it be such that it that a government cannot propose without considering all the possible scenarios now?

- **Shouldn’t the highest priority of design fiction be about how to get it seen by the right people?** (such as by decision makers)

- The importance of Prototyping and iterating: Every start-up goes through a point where they have to reflect upon where they are and see where the problems and see what they doing and redesign the business model. Could every start-up be described as a prototype, even as it also prototypes a business model or product?

- **Prototyping politics?**
  - Methodology? Who writes the brief? How is the brief designed? Who executes the brief? Who is seeing these scenarios?
  - Most of the world has lived in a world of compulsory relationships. But now in the network world, we have new models, such as transformational models. You cannot have a transactional conversation within the same conventional models.
  - Can scenarios of scenarios influence politics?
  - What is scalable and what isn’t? What is the designer’s role? Can we really design new tools of governance? Or are these all dependent on implementation?

The discussion split off into two groups at this point:

**THE SCENARIO DESIGN OF POLITICS**

**THE POLITICS OF SCENARIO DESIGN**
Points to take forward:

- If we don’t write the story, someone will write it for us.
- What should the aesthetics of scenario design be shaped like? Can we determine what is the specific audience we have designed it for? And what will the audience read or understand from the aesthetics of the particular scenario that has been designed?

Other snippets

- Scenario is like a scaffolding – it is handy to create something, but it will not keep us dry. We need to use it to create something robust!
- The importance of pushing through with implementation, testing, iterations. Some say it is ½ design scenario, ½ implementation and iteration. Some say it is a 1/3 to 2/3 ratio instead.
- Neutral scenarios – are they the ideal that scenario designers (in practice)
GROUP: Narratives, Systems, Worlds: Don Quixote
Number of participants: 15
Note taker: Azeem Faraz

Points from Discussion:

- We get meta-narratives all the time and it is good to explore their relationships with stories.
- Don Quixote has been used many times by various artists. The plot stays the same but narrative changes.
- Historical perspective of Don Quixote is also important. How Spanish Christian kings were supposed to bring world to Christian utopia. At the same time, Dutch and other colonial powers had their own “grand narratives”.
- In this current time of failures, we are having our own “grand narratives”.
- The right narrative for the scenario is very important. A story leaves people imagination intact.
- The admonition is not to tell but show. We don’t have to explain everything.
- We give information when people are not willing to take the information. But movies have shown how to do it properly.
- Can we create drama to describe scenarios?
  - There is a tension between narrative and spectative logic of the movies. There are things which novel can do but movie cannot (and vice versa).
- But with all this, we should not forget about emotions. There seems to be a disconnect.
- Depending upon culture, a very specific language is used for narratives. With the language, the narrative or description be different.
  - Germany has the tradition of very good children stories.
- Storytelling is dynamic. But when story becomes a system, it becomes static.
- How to make grids showing that narrative is evolving? What are the pillars of evolving narrative?
  - Current movies show the vacuum of current world. In the 1970’s, we knew what was meant when the movie showed a bank robbery or falling in love ---but today both of these happen as a person sits immobile in front of a computer. These do not give us the visual cues that we had in the past.
  - We need to pick the symbols which can define the story.
- The role of digital (or the internet) on stories:
  - Based on an interview, earlier in India there were thousands of stories of Rama. But once these stories published on the Internet, now only three have been left and popularized.
- Cinderella is now a Disney story. It has become static.
- The way story is told has great impact.
Now symbols and metaphors have become so complex that you cannot tell a story. And another problem is that we have exhausted our metaphors.

- We have forgotten olfactory senses. To tell the story and narrative, we need to use all our senses.
- Facebook has impacted our narratives of current scenario.
  - “Her” movie was the example of narcissistic computer showing technology = uselessness
  - There is a narrative that not everything on the Internet is real and it impacts our narrative.
- There is a tension whether Digital is real?
  - Maybe to children of modern age who are used to technology, it is the reality.
  - It also could be due to generation gap
  - E.g. falling in love in the past meant writing letters and waiting for reply for days. Now people send SMS. Now here is no longing. The technology has changed the custom of love.
  - The tension is how to relate the past to the current. The nature of the world has changed in past 15 years.
- So far discourse on discussion is western. In China WeChat has changed the communication in china. It seems, in china there seems to disconnect from World War II and now. There is forgotten of flat and down part of the history in between. The people remember World War II and amenities of today but nothing in between.
- Advertisement is creating myths. It creates paradoxes but these paradoxes give birth to innovation and creativity.
- We have been missing soft parts from stories and narratives and should remember
  - We should recapture intangibles in narratives (e.g. love)
  - We need to make sense of digital, real and what are new icons/symbols
  - We need to prototype – describe vs prescribe.
- How to prototype? How to create scenarios?
  - We need new tools for scenarios. Storyboard alone is not helping.
- The physics of roller-coaster is a great example.
  - Speed limits have reached.
  - Now to attract people, designers are now building in the only thing left to frighten people, i.e. that the roller-coaster is broken, and this is supplemented with scary scenes at the critical moment.
  - It’s that shock that attracts people to roller coasters.
- Another example is the exhibit of post bird flu world.
- The two related questions are
  - How shock impact people.
  - Is it ethical?
- Rise of extreme sports is also of interest to understand the current situation.
- 200 to 300 years ago, storytelling was great way to communicate and create a shared sense-making about the world. Now we need to evolve and think in different way to tell our stories
- Now there are less constraints and we have to create constraints to make our story narrative interesting.
- Due to the rise of digital (cameras, Facebook etc), we are tourists in our lives. We take photos so we can take another travel in our lives. This has resulted in some losses.
- We have lost fragility in our lives.
  - If we compare past and the current, writing in past could be attributed to record keeping of the ebbs and flows of life, and this is similar to what digital is doing now.
  - Each generation find their own tools to record their present to revisit
  - In other words, the medium depends on the generation. Each generation gets new medium(s) and that’s part of evolution: from letter and telephone to email to instant messaging etc.
  - But we also need to remember that there is an intangible element that helps us share feeling.
Points to Carry Forward:

- How narratives and scenarios can be linked?
- How experimentation can be used in narratives and build worlds.
  - Can we mix real world and narrative?
- In a world of information overload, what to take and what resonates for narratives?
- Can we use game play to help to understand more?
- We know lots of narratives, but today the narrative structure itself is changing. How new narratives can help to improve the current levels of discourse?
- There is a list of things we have lost. We need to find new intangibles.
  - What are the new sensibilities of the realities?
  - And what should be the value system for narratives and stories.
- There are many words and we need to make sure people have same understanding of terms such as narratives, author, audience etc.
  - We need to define metaphors to make sure everyone means the same thing when we used these terms.
GROUP: Worlds / Small breakout group
Note taker: Irina Fedorenko

Worlds

- Dualism, people can’t divide clearly between technology and the real world.
- E.g. virtual reality prototype - 360 degree camera allows for perspective shift. Allows building new worlds.
- How to communicate experiences quickly.
- E.g. reading: to be immersed in a text vs engage with a text.
- There is a danger to be more persuasive than critical.
- There are also workshops that are low-tech and are immersive.
- Some do not accept virtual reality, do not believe in it. How do we create a new language that makes people to accept?
- Second life: simulated computer environment. People can fly there and it is an immersive experience, but is it transformative?
- “Her” movie: Technologies provide a way for a self-analysis and self-reflection.
- Can we make scenarios where technologies are agnostic?
- Through the games you are creating a scenarios, you are entering the world, but the question is scalability.
- It is interesting to watch meta-stories on how people are talking about the game. How people are misinterpreting what the moderator is saying.
- In experiential workshops you feel at risk. You previous life has been taken away and it has consequences.
- As a design object we could develop a alternative reality.
- We hear a lot of pessimism from people in the Forum. Seems like everyone thinks our systems will collapse.
- If you do not incorporate current situation the scenario will be useless (e.g. Ukraine)
GROUP: Methods Framing  
Number of participants: 6  
Note taker: Candy Chan

Points from Discussion:

- The discussion was themed on framing and reframing projects to instigate change. Participants highlight that the predominant method of planning is to have the strategy for change developed upfront. In contrast, a more iterative and agile process is required in order to cater for the uncertainty present in all projects.
  - Therein lies the relevance for the development of new methods of framing (ie. reframing). The debate is on how we can change the structured and linear method of business operations and change processes for greater responsiveness and adaptiveness in all areas of the organisation. Agility can be made to apply to strategy development, organization, and externally-interfacing functions e.g. procurement.
  - Agile practices have become prominent in software development methods, in both commercial and government enterprises.

- Participants noted that different organisations tend to display different degrees of receptiveness to agility.
  - For instance, a small start-up may not have the legacy of structured standard-operating-procedures and have a less visible brand to protect. On the other hand, a conservative large enterprise may have accumulated a burden of protocols so that it tends to resist changes.
  - Cultural background practices may be instrumental in the organisation’s predisposition to be agile or structured. For example, organisations in Western countries treat contractual agreements very differently from those in China. In Western countries, contracts are binding and followed very strictly while the Chinese tend to prioritise long term relationships.

- Boundary objects as a method to frame issues
  - In developing a boundary object, participants sometimes mutually create a tangible artifact (e.g. a document of understanding) in order to articulate common ground.
  - The content of the boundary object can be temporary in nature, evolving when parties gain more mutuality during the exploration process. As the explorative and iterative process reach points of stability, so will the boundary object. The boundary object can become an artefact that aids in change, or anchors continuing evolution.
  - For example, in developing scenarios, participants can agree on the axes of the 2x2 matrix of the scenarios. The axes are then recognized as a frame for the boundary object. However, if participants eventually find that these axes are inadequate, the boundary object would evolve.

- Why do companies have to be more agile?
  - Many companies face a new kind of turbulence due to a change in the contextual environment e.g. globalisation, technology
  - Customers are increasingly empowered by these changes, and companies need to shift their focus on their customers, away from the traditional norm of product orientation. In order to be customer-oriented, organisations aspire to greater ability by reifying linear internal processes mechanisms in favour of greater customer primacy.
o Customer centricity may or may not lead to inclusive and/or consultative visioning. The ways in which scenario planning is engaged can depend on interpersonal and/or inter-organizational relationships.

o An organisation may espouse a desire to change but the internal policies may be so immutable and locked-in that transformation could take years or decades.

- Service system thinking
  o In order to respond to the rise of a service economy, internal processes in organizations with manufacturing mindsets will have to be changed. Changes could include the style of management, standard operating processes, etc.
  o Systems thinking can aid the development of such a dramatic organisational change. As an alternative to (i) contextual scenario design and (ii) solutions designed as sequential and independent steps, systems thinking may provide some insights useful for top organisations.

- Risk vs uncertainty
  o The distinctions between uncertainty and risk should be appreciated.
  o In many cases, uncertainty is repackaged as risks and monetized with another party, ie. uncertainty that is part of the contextual space, is transactionalised.
  o When uncertainty is transactionalised, the entire system is weakened because uncertainty is not being dealt with directly. Transactionalisation also leads to a locking-in of the package (or plan), which in turn mitigates organisational agility. Eventually this could lead to dire consequences for the project.
    - Designing for risk vis-à-vis designing for uncertainty

- Scenarios can be seen either as a framework or as a narrative that organisations can develop. To develop effective solutions to problems involving uncertainty, clarity about the purpose of scenarios may be a virtue.
GROUP: Diverse Mental Models and representation in Scenarios

Number of participants: 6
Note taker: Neena Veeraraghavan

Topic Addressed:
- How people’s diverse mental models/understanding of the world?
- How are models of the public accessed and are represented/included/changed in scenarios and design futures?
- How do you represent the different understandings of the world?

Points from Discussion:
The main points from the discussion include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions/Concerns Raised</th>
<th>Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do people’s mental models really matter?</td>
<td>We treat the “public” as a homogenous block but it is a collection of individuals, who have diverse mental maps and who may or may not be willing to take responsibility. Standard segmentation criteria used rather than viewing individual or group viewpoint. Mental Models – Construct of people’s perception of reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we bring about a change?</td>
<td>Empirical work quoted – Changing the mental models of people is the most significant outcome of and motivation behind scenario designing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we talking about specific groups of people? Or can we build a general mental model?</td>
<td>We are all decision makers within a system; a system brings its own mechanistic constraints. Re-perceiving the nature of how the world might be is important, but re-perceiving your own power and how that power interacts with the rest of the world in equally important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether design in a fictional sense is a model of how groups behave?</td>
<td>Two ways for designers’ ideas of models:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Individual Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Other scales of Publics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two different ways of perceiving objects – Giving a graph vs. giving a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>well-designed object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways does “desire” influence the criteria for “design?”?</td>
<td>Desire is a criteria for the design; Interpretation of desire leads to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to give the public the capability to make informed decisions?</td>
<td>People are active participants in building scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or, is it just about making them understand the decision?</td>
<td>One of the groups of people where mental models need re-design is the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group of people creating scenarios or designs, because they are creating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a process for people to interact with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They are engaged in creating a different future and need both reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and reflexivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designers cannot assume intelligence levels among diverse audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a perfect scenario possible?</td>
<td>Making a perfect scenario involves people with diversity of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually, the best idea in the room is taken – how policies are shaped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you combine mental models with systems that exist?</td>
<td>Research with public needs that process of understanding and iteration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is dynamic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you deal with combined expertise when there are clashing ideas?</td>
<td>Crowd Aspect – Crowds may have some capacity and certain types of design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>techniques can be worked out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crowdsourcing – power of collective knowledge and resources that crowds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have and we don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretically crowds need to be controlled but there are many different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kinds of crowds that have different capacities and they are actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freeing from individual mental models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the emotional relationship with the future fit in with cognition?</td>
<td>Diversity of thought exists in any scenario. Cognition can be theorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in learning and understanding, but within a broader cultural framework;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognition is a start point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does “Design” intersect with the ideas of behaviour and cognition?</td>
<td>Continuous and dynamic process of learning through questioning/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviewing, observing and perfecting an initial solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding contextual and contractual factors—how people see their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>own lives and how they view the world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: A Process of Design
The figure explains how the process starts with a problem, and opinions diverge while generating insights. Commonalities help people converge to ideas, thereby generating divergent thought processes again. Finally, similarities ensure convergence to a generic scenario that can possibly provide solutions. The arrows represent adjustment to the process and feedback mechanisms.

Key Takeaways

1. Are Design and Scenarios the same?

Scenarios are one part of design thinking. Design is a higher up field or discipline. Scenarios are a specific part of thinking and application in the field of design. However, some principles of design can be nested within scenarios. A prototype is a scenario on a smaller scale. Scenarios are a subset of the design process.

2. How can we incorporate this process of generating multiple scenarios to optimize the design strategy?

Optimization can be achieved through the design process, through multiple iterations of divergence and convergence. Once similarities are observed, a combination of intuition and good judgement can help achieve a reasonable solution, even out of diversity. The design process is a catalogue of people’s understandings of world views. However, it may be difficult to communicate scenarios when there are too many similar possibilities. One may also have to deal with uncertainty of looking into the future because of the cognizant need to stand on something solid.

3. Are products designed so people can have their own mental models about them or do they guide mental models?

Products are designed to encourage mental models, whereby people are viewed similar to readers of a book. However, there can be scenarios where people frame their own responses to products.

4. Does the Design Process Model (Figure 1) hold in all scenarios?

Yes, it is a generic model. However, there may be situations where design process simply looks like curves of divergence and convergence. (See Abstract of Mr. Thomas J. Chermack.)
Design of Foresight Communities

Aim
- To help identify emerging risks, aid in experimentation and learning as well as the diffusion of knowledge among scenario practitioners
- Accelerate development of pluralistic change skills for the next generation of strategic foresight practitioners, including scenario thinking, design, complexity, process engineering and change management skills.

Possible Ways Forward
- Network public and private enterprises for mutual gain as foresight communities
- Use design methods and “regional innovation cluster” design principles to develop and network the community of practitioners
- Possibly run joint experiments that can bring knowledge and capabilities in-house, when such experiments are hard to do at one’s own organization
- Exchange wealth of experience for enacting difficult and strategic shifts e.g. global insurance company helping a global public agency to re-think forecasting as a core business

Questions/Challenges:
- Cost of building and maintaining these communities
- Coordination
- Composition/size
- Relevance to core business for stakeholders
- Priority of issues to tackle
- Trust (how to build and maintain it)
- Sharing of “best ideas”, and the ‘costs’ that inhibit this

Practicalities/Considerations that can help enact the community:
- Need ambassadors across the network for the foresight community
- Face-to-face (events)
- Coordinators are needed as self-organizing systems still need some coordination
- Peer-to-peer/exclusive composition (for meaningful perceptions of mutual gain)
- Needs to be grown organically, starting with trusted individuals/organisations, and lead to new collaborations
- Formalize – process, roles, and cadence of activities
- Establish guidelines for collaborative efforts and strategies
- Needs to be useful for the daily job
- Avoid rigid structure and allow community to adjust size/membership given needs
- Three levels of users/members

**How to design and pilot such a community and make it stand apart from similar groups?**

1. Start with a small group of participants who can work effectively and drive to measurable results
2. Work towards development of pluralistic skills among practitioners (especially the next generation of the community)
3. Make the identification of tangible, implementable projects one of the primary goals of the community
4. Carefully select participants from trusted advisers/colleagues
5. Balance network with levels of participants
6. Set a clear purpose
7. Pilot & measure for results
8. Learn and iterate
Group: Scaling Futures for Social Design
Number of Participants: 6
Note Taker: Alice Redfern

Social Design

- Users become part of the design process
  - A bottom up as opposed to a top down approach
  - Avoids problems with users feeling design hasn’t considered them
  - Creates problem of democracy when dealing with large groups of people

Challenges to Social Design

1. Convening
   - How to coordinate stakeholder groups meeting at different points in a project? Who brings the groups together?
   - Requires common language and public sphere
   - Offered by internet?
   - E.g. Arab spring – social media as a common place where large number of people were able to convene
   - Equal privilege given to all groups – empowering individuals, disempowering directors
   - Importance of finding connectors within the communities that already exist, e.g. coffee shop, drug store
     - Need to empower conversations at that point
     - To empower people to be influential within a bigger system

2. Sociocultural issues
   - Idea that ‘smart people’ have all the solutions is completely ingrained, ‘expert’ needs redefining

3. Finance
   - Dealing with the politics of finance
   - Funding constraints on involving and interviewing individuals in the community

4. Engagement
   - Creating a sense of ownership in the community (creating a common enemy)
   - Need to frame the problem appropriately – has to be a ‘we’ problem – then no option of disengaging
   - E.g. Enterprise rocks – engage small business, builds a community of interest – sign up 23,000 influence half a million
• Need positive feedback within the group

5. Meaningful Design

• Fitting an object within its context
• Scenario planning allows exploration of this context,
• But must lead to appropriate design – ‘move from the scenario space to the design space’

• Without meaningful output, disappointment arises, leading to disengagement

---

IDEAL STATE

- Connectedness
- Harmony
- Abundance
- Engagement
- Meaningful Design

---

Typical alliance between They and I

i. E.g. Nestle – deals with public state not to develop water so that they can sell bottles

ii. US government – cutting tax benefits of giving to NGOs – have to do 3 x more work, with half the money – disempowers the relationship between WE and I

• Need to move that to the We

i. Need a reconfiguration of predictable relationships, new stakeholder alliances

1. E.g. Somaliland – Area based community development – doesn’t exist as a governmental entity but exists as a national identity – what can WE do without asking for anything else from anyone else
2. E.g2. Houston Schools – business community aligned with community at expense of government

• How do you create ‘we’

i. Convening, engaging – to what end – meaningful design

ii. Through Influence - in such a complex system, power doesn’t work, can only influence

iii. How influence? – combination of who and how convene, aesthetic quality of the story
GROUP: New Narratives given a story
Number of participants: 8
Note taker: Azeem Faraz

Points from Discussion:

- New generation (Gen z) is used to short messages. It will change the narratives of the stories.
  - How to tell good stories in this scenario?
- From experience, feedback is that many scenarios are too dry to keep people engaged in the discussion.
- To make sense out of the scenarios, we must not set the mindsets or create too tight a structure otherwise people cannot relate their own experience and ideas. We have to set the new rules to make sure new narrative works.
  - E.g. there is no story for EU fishery failure scenario. EU shows that number of fish is dwindling but there is no story that there will be no fish for the children in future. The managers need to tell the story about why we need fish and what is happening to levels of fish in the ocean if they want to engage others and create any form of behavior change.
- What’s the purpose of the story?
  - It helps in decision-making or convey some concerns.
  - But is there any credibility to those stories e.g. Disney’s Cinderella
- For narration of a story, there are two perspectives
  - Modernity and Post-Modernity
- These two perspectives are explained using Museum as a scenario
- There is another dimension to look at things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spectacular</th>
<th>Mimesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diegesis</td>
<td>Dramatic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each of Mimesis (multiple narratives) and Diegesis (single narrative) has their advantages and disadvantages.
- There is currently a large devaluation of diegesis work
- There is great interest in mimesis, but there can be so much detail that the narrative is lost.
- A narrative can be copyrighted. Disney’s Cinderella is an example
- There is a difference between a narrative and a story. A story is a ‘black box’ and cannot be copyrighted. A narrative is a version of this ‘black box’. For example, Boy meets girl from the wrong side of the tracks is a story. Romeo & Juliet is a narrative.
- Symbols last forever. Meanings change.
- The value of scenarios is that they offer the opportunity to create a collective narrative. Scenario planning needs shared meaning.
- If we go back to our two versions of the museum metaphor – the Scenarios as Museum and the Narrative as Museum, the difference between the two is that one is a hierarchy but the other puts the onus on the person and breaks the hierarchy.
- There is a human desire that we want to be heard. Narratives help. When people share story, they co-create narrative.
GROUP: Designing Tarot Cards for 21st Century
Number of participants: 7
Note taker: Azeem Faraz

Points from Discussion:

- Previously there were stories. Now there are individual narratives. For connection, we need to have shared narrative. It’s getting harder to achieve in an era of growing individualisation.
- In this Modernity structure illustrated below if a tour guide is lousy, there is no story.
- But there is someone deciding what the story should be, so the question remains who is responsible for the guidelines?
  - Immersive theatre could be one example
- One analogy could be that you know the territory and you draw any map. Each person will draw a different map depending upon their particular interests.
- If we look to the structure on the right, post-modernity means co-creation.
- What matters is what we are told. There will be two different interpretations for an animal exhibition if the exhibitors say:
  - It’s just an animal exhibition
  - or it’s an exhibition for animals that going to be extinct in 5 years.
- Emotions and feelings are indicators of where survival will be found. It’s also true for to create interest in stories and narratives.
- Every real story will need to relate to this theme. Extreme games are one example of it.
- But you cannot tell shocking story again and again. If you show extreme things, people become desensitized about it.
  - E.g. message about drug abuse. The kids don’t care about drug message anymore.
- There are far less stories in our lives today. There are very few rituals for death and life in modern life.
- We need interface between reality and fiction.
- 30 years ago, black meant death. Various ribbon colors used to represent something. Now that aspect is lost
• This has resulted in loss of shared narrative. Everyone has his/her own narratives of the stories.
  o There are so many narratives that you cannot speak narrative your narrative a loud. Shared culture to understand those narratives is lacking.
• The people have lost the capacity to see pain of individual. Facebook shows only the happy side of the life.
• Following could be one metaphor to explain the situation: We all have iPods but we have our own music in it.
• The people have their own individual space and have lost the sense of connection to others.
• Design is often geared to good thing and Art is towards real feelings (anger, sad). We need a hybrid of the two.
• Designers and artists are taught differently.
• How to create such relationship to have shared narratives?
  o Experiencing and showing vulnerability could be one answer.
• Stories are always there. We don’t share narrative with each other. We have stopped having shared narrative. We need to get back the sharing to have a collective narrative.
• We have gone from stories to narratives and narratives have become individualize and cause the problem.
• Both modernity and post-modernity have issues. Modernity has meaning imposed on us and in post-modernity there are many individualized narrations. We need to find a hybrid that takes the best of Modernity and Post-Modernity
• Tarot card is the system. It gives framing in form of narrative to a story/symbols.
• For scenario planning, we can come up with a “new tarot card set for 21st century” with provocative images to give frame to people to start discussing and give narratives to stories.
6. Plenary Feedback of Round 2

PLENARY: Plenary Feedback (30 May 2014)
Number of participants: All Group
Note taker: Kiely Flanigan

Points from Discussion:

- Dialogue Groups:
  - Political systems, design and futures (10)
  - Scaling/social design (5-6)
  - Designing foresight communities (5)
  - Representing mental models within scenario design (6)
  - Application of scenarios, design thinking in order to solve reoffending problems (2)
  - Politics of design futures – design fiction (5) + designing politics/voting system after fashion shows (6)
  - Worlds (6)
  - Tarot cards for 21st century (8)
  - Scenarios built for design or risk and uncertainty (6)
  - Enabling strategic innovation (4)

- Specific group experiences:
  - Generative sessions
  - Difficulty forming something tangible in timeframe given
  - Futurists wanted to discuss it and come to understanding of what it is before develop; designers wanted to test it
  - Working hands-on generates new ideas
  - Reflection on what things mean, how organize, how design for impact
  - Difficulty converging after diverging with lots of great ideas—have to find tangible output of discussion
  - Design exercises done all the time, want to sometimes sit back and listen.
  - Difficulty dealing with ambiguity—define question or prototype? Designer approach: let’s make something happen to understand question. Analytical approach: let’s understand question before propose solution.

- Broader reflections:
  - Saying “we” but speaking as individuals
  - What these groups could do in just a few hours is amazing! We can really change the world.
  - Don’t like interruptions to ask how’s it going
  - Things get deep, learning something, but then end up exactly where you started. It is the conversation and re-realization that is stimulating.
  - People’s knowledge about design and scenarios is different. Terminology and jargon took time to explicate. Assumptions were made about what it true, what is known—managing that is challenging.
  - Design operates at the specific and person level. Scenarios bigger, strategic level. It’s a different level of thinking. Manifesting these differences is useful.
  - So much knowledge and experience that it takes time to calibrate. Some shared knowledge would be helpful going into groups.
  - Highly enjoyable riffing off one another.

- Futures Library
  - Community
  - Invite people here to Oxford to use resources in library and be a part of this community
  - Began project in early 2000s
  - Bodleian Library sorted books and papers and helped create an astonishing building
- Books have been balanced by collection acquired by similar organization in US. But, do not duplicate although from exact same period. Man who collected them wrote commentary on them.
- Emphasis on scenarios
- Spend time in library—a lot to learn from there
- Hard to find artefacts and interpret them. Missing history of futures that the library helps to correct.
- Multiple histories in this futures space. Shame if we try to impose a single.
SATURDAY

7. Plenary Reflections of the previous day

PLENARY: Reflections of the Previous Day

Number of participants: All

Note taker: Neena Veeraraghavan

Reflections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarkable (R) / Boring (B)</th>
<th>Unexpected (U) / Routine (R)</th>
<th>Clear (C) / Lost (L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R – Understanding the process of design</td>
<td>U - Distance between the approaches and techniques</td>
<td>L – Suppressed differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R – Cross Learning</td>
<td>Analysis of scenarios; cross learning</td>
<td>C – Differences vs. Similarities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R – Instantaneous gelling together</td>
<td>U – Visualization and bringing it together with Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – More structure to experience the multi-disciplinary dialogue</td>
<td>U – Process of talking through stories; speak about the output and actual process observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commonality of story-telling and narratives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Question on Scenario thinkers vs. Design thinkers
- Design is not a practice; Identifying design as a thing is not valid – engaging with multiple disciplines is important.
- When you design, you get scenarios, and with scenarios, you get stories – design is a different process of how you work with stories and dealing with intuition.
- Approach to the problem is very different among scenario thinkers and design thinkers – solutions from the groups might be a start point to work towards integration.
8. Plenary Show of ‘Designs’

Note Taker: Alice Redfern

Group 1: Mental models in design and scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology can save us</th>
<th>We’re all doomed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s impossible to know</td>
<td>God will save us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour change can save us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Group asked to consider climate change – the statements on the left were distributed round the room
  - Members were asked to stand in a place that they felt best represented their point of view
- Ideas do not fall into a simple 2x2 matrix – it’s important to present a problem in a 3D setting in order to acknowledge the diversity of views within the area
- Once recognised all these views – how do we practically move past this point?
  - If you can design for each of the point of view – the total is a more robust design

Group 2: Political Systems and design

- The group presents the meeting of a future Ministry of Designs at which various issues are raised from ministers within the crowd
  - Cyrogenic technology – 0.1% of population retired to cryogenic status – force people to take future into account
  - The strategic future planner suggests we will design the future
  - Another minister suggests we have yet to define the future
  - Yet another suggests the development of the Innovation lab
  - One suggests every party should be compelled to present scenarios to the voters
  - Another suggests scenarios take agency away from the individual voters
  - A final minister would like the government to hire designers but notes there questions where the money comes from
- Presentation capitulates discussions about the place of design within a political system between the group
  - The discussion becomes very open ended and roundabout
  - Hard to narrow down/model/pinpoint key issues in the context of such a complex topic
- Is the future the subject of one ministry? Or everybody?

Group 3: Scaling Futures and Social design

- Designers and scenario planners become part of the community
- Key challenges this process faces
  - Convening
  - Sociocultural Issues
  - Finance
- Engagement
- Meaningful design

- Design can be used to formulate - Connectedness, harmony, abundance, engagement, and meaningful design

- The WEvolution – moving away from government (Them), and business (I) back to civil society with collaboration from all corners

**Group 4 – Design of Foresight Communities**

- Presentation revolved around the creation of a new strategic foresight community

- Areas explored
  - skillsets and processes required to set up this community
  - how to diffuse knowledge – formal networking, certification project use of clustering methodologies
  - Raw notes from Group 4:

- Strategy to design a foresight community
- Who would be the users of this group?
  - Consideration of the extremes
- How would the groups interact over a 12 month period
- What are the specific roles of the different groups
  - Importance of reenganging the older age group noted
- What the pilot project for such a group would involve was then considered
  - ‘inclusive growth’ project
  - Requires pluralistic community in order to direct it in a new direction

**Group 5: Application of scenario and design to the issue of reoffending**

- The scene is set at a future meeting of ministry of justice where a crime reduction initiative is to be discussed
- To begin stories are offered – Janet and John
- In brief they provide narratives for conflicting scenarios
  - Janet – whose father comes out of prison, with no support and is likely to end up ‘behind bars’ again
  - John – Whose neighbour just came out of prison, whose multi-agency plan (MAP) had been developed from the beginning of his prison term, with advance planning for his release including a skills program and a month’s pay for his new job in advance on release

Audio not available
• Comments noted the power of an evocative story/narrative to enliven a scenario
• Example in Houston of where this has been used as a method of community engagement in scenarios through publicly broadcasted short films
• Issue of maintaining neutrality raised – the more one-sided a character used becomes, the more difficult it becomes for the majority to empathise

Group 6: Politics of design scenarios

• Design creates visual representation of different scenarios
  o For example – Philip’s Electronics’ home with smart surfaces, or the depiction of a new idea of urban living
• What’s created is a design fiction
  o What is emitted from the bubble of design fictions?
• Design presented – a toolkit in which you find all the various aspects that are frequently missing from designed scenarios, for example;
  o Ecological risk, off sets of the design
  o Material intensity – manufacturing process, waste processes
  o Tools to question gender roles
  o Overlay data ‘value’
  o Broken technology? Failed screens? – designs are always seamless
  o Clutter, mundane, inefficiencies
  o Religious values, national politics, flags?
  o Credits – what’s the agenda of the designer/client – transparency and accountability
• Can be used in scenario planning, in education, judgement criteria for how to value designs
• Aim to enable now, in the hope that the become default concerns in future
• A renormalisation of critique criteria for scenarios
• Scenario is not a finished thing – it is iterative can be altered quickly into something different using such a toolkit
Group 7: Voting design systems

- Politicians were presented as if fashion models on a catwalk to introduce the idea of a new way of voting
  - Via consumption patterns
- Presents a way to make everyone responsible for their own consumption choices
  - These choices decide election of the candidate
  - Immediate change – ‘autumn/winter collection’ as opposed to 5 yearly voting system
- Idea – take pretence away, politics is a form of consumption already – with politicians essentially striving to buy your vote
  - Example of the type of drink people consume equating to their political orientation
- Feedback from these consumption decisions about where vote lies would make consequences clear
- As added advantages
  - saves money
  - to stay elected candidates must keep in fashion

Group 8: Worlds systems narrative

- The group gave a presentation the envisage at the 2025 Oxford microfutures forum giving a retrospective look at 2014 – what has happened in last 10 years, how might we grow from here
  - Ambitious plans from 2014 have all failed – world systems and narrative,
    - Scoping paper for futures
    - Looked for proposals around theoretical ideas
    - Alternate reality game was created allowing people to generate their own scenarios
- Meanwhile constant disruptions to the presentation were made
  - Symbolises problems that arise in high velocity concepts
  - ‘it’s not velocity its speed, there’s no direction’ – difficulty of maintaining direction in such high speed projects
- Highlighted problem of ‘design friction’ – where projects can fail
• The future changes so fast, it’s important to question the utility/consider the pitfalls of such deep engagement in formulating scenarios of it.

**Group 9: Tarot Cards**

The group was given **Tarot Cards** and asked to turn to the person on the left and tell them a story about global oceans derived from these cards.

• Example: the development of massive volumes of data in Europe the impact of fishing on global oceans – but problems arise in understanding why the data is important – it lacks a narrative
• ‘data on its own is meaningless, unless there’s a story behind it’
• How does this link to scenarios?
  o Scenarios provide a safe space to create a shared story, shared meaning, and to explore taboos
• Problems with each metaphor
  o 1st – too much difference,
  o 2nd - too much detail
  o need a hybrid
• Tarot cards have acted as a metanarrative for centuries – act as polished stones providing the start of a narrative point
  o The equivalent is required in scenarios
How can scenarios and design mutually support each other?

All buildings are predictions. All predictions are wrong.

The product of skilled scenario work is not a plan but a strategy. Where a plan is based on prediction, a strategy is designed to encompass unforeseeably changing conditions. A good strategy ensures that, no matter what happens, you always have maneuvering room [p. 178]

... Following Chris Alexander's formula, there needs to be more money than usual spent on the basic Structure, less on finishing, and more on perpetual adjustment and maintenance. [p. 190]

Structured methods (waterfall) vs. agility

Rechanneling a river?
Design Thinking: Divergent-Convergent, Synthesis-Analysis

Design thinking is different and therefore it feels different. Firstly it is not only convergent. It is a series of divergent and convergent steps. **During divergence we are creating choices and during convergence we are making choices.** The second difference is that design thinking relies on an **interplay between analysis and synthesis, breaking problems apart and putting ideas together.** Synthesis is hard because we are trying to put things together which are often in tension.


Designing with

Designing for

Chatham House Rules
Uncertainty                Risk

We suggested in the 2010 Conference that important aspects of what risk professionals call "systemic risk" is actually not a risk: the probabilities are unknown, and the impacts and their boundaries are unknown, so it cannot be a 'risk'. That term 'risk' is used for a situation in which the impact and probability can be known in advance (labelled, priced, traded (bought and sold) and 'managed' - in other words, risks are domesticated. Treating a situation that is not a risk, as if it were a risk, can contribute to make it real.


Designing with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agility</th>
<th>Betting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>Risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designing for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience / Structured</th>
<th>Hedging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfolding futures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• How can scenarios and design mutually support each other
  o Product of scenario work is not a plan but a strategy
• Structured methods vs Agility
• The waterfall approach – can’t do design work before analysis and couldn’t do analysis before data collection etc
  o Narrative becomes lost
• What is coming through when we combine scenarios and design
• Type 3 problem – are you solving the right problem
  o ‘that’s what I asked for but that’s not what I want’
  o Rechanneling the river
• Designing with vs designing for – combined with uncertainty vs risk
• Iterations of unfolding futures
• Waterfall is an easier approach – need to nag in order to move back to agile approach

**Group 11: Design scenarios to enable strategic Innovation**

• What is strategic innovation:

![Image of handwritten notes]

• Why change?
  o Lack of coherence between identity (need, capability, availability) and context (future)
  o When there is a change in context – identity needs to adapt
What is the role of design in this process:

(Language, content/concept, process)
Framework changes in corporate vs public/governmental context
Framework changes depending on corporate or public context – similarities and differences develop:
9. Round 3 Dialogue

GROUP: Deck Heads

Number of participants: 14

Note taker: Azeem Faraz

Points from Discussion:

- The card game “The Thing From the Future” can be used to imagine future as well as solve current problems. The prompt is in the forms of cards:
  - Arch cards (based on arch theory where each arch present development/decline etc)
  - Terrain cards (it could be concrete or abstract)
  - Object cards (describe specific thing)
  - Mood (describe feeling/emotions)
- It’s a generative game. The playful nature provides scaffolding to people for engagement
- The idea started from intuition and then application in different contexts helped to make it concrete.
  - The experience of card creation has been convergence and divergence of ideas before coming up with a pragmatic design
- The motivation behind card deck “Governance for the future: Inventor’s toolkit” is that government is failing and how we can think with a structure to solve the problems.
  - The card deck helps to modularize political system. These cards help to think through structurally.
  - It provides pedagogy.
  - How it is different from a book?
    - Its modularity helps to come up with solutions
    - Prompts help people to frame
- The card deck “System Mythology Toolkit” provides four generative images of future.
  - It helps the thinking from abstract to concrete and help to create the future scenarios.
  - There are four colors and six categories. Each color present a different type of system.
  - From the colors, you can decide what kind of system you want to create and how you want to transition from one to another.
  - It helps to create neutral scenario of the future world and subsequently, these cards can help to make a decision
  - Why are there categories in “System Mythology Toolkit”?
    - Design background has helped to categories the system
    - Design correlates to manifestation. We can communicate meaning
    - It provides a typology.
    - The idea of the deck is inspired form Joseph Campbell’s work.
- “Designing Policy Toolkit” is a process that helps in co-design for policy making and provides a simplified design process
  - Helps in redesigning and prototyping.
- It has simplified the complex idea into simple toolkit.

- **The Crit-Kit toolkit can be used in**
  - Education market
  - Design museums can use it to create value-oriented design
  - The toolkit with annotation can help to evaluate scenarios critically
    - This toolkit can be improved further if cards are sticky like Post-It
  - The toolkit is not a product. It’s more of an evaluation process.

- This toolkit can help to make design provocation. And help to think on other scenarios. Toolkit will not help to design system from scratch but good to critically analyze exiting systems.
  - The value of this toolkit is in annotation

- The toolkit can be used as “critical” or “crazy” depending upon situation. E.g. at the start of the semester, the educator can use it as “crazy” and towards the end use “critical” to evaluate the students.

- Cards and toolkits help to come up with scenario very easily. They can help in
  - Decision making
  - Communicating the scenarios
  - Evaluating different scenarios
  - Prioritizing
  - Providing bit-sized information
    - Instead of whole syllabus, small ideas matter most.
    - We know people don’t read whole research paper.

- Tonality of design/ experience often determines how people react.
  - The games don’t make sense unless there is some framework. E.g 30,000 ft abstraction view for “System Mythology Toolkit” and arches for rise / decline in “The Thing From the Future” etc

- We’ll need to use these cards and toolkits in many diversified situations such as education, policy design to refine the design and to find new uses.
  - We influence our tools and then tools influence us

- As Problem solver, you can decide how to use cards and decide the process.

- Pick a context and run the game/toolkit. It is one way to evaluate the usage of the toolkits and cards
  - Design is never inclusive no matter how. The play in different scenarios can help to find out missing parts. And help you to think.
  - GitHub (from software industry) can be good analogy for card and toolkit design e.g. fork and create new one rather than just criticize it.
    - It’s difficult to know the use in advance.

- Conceptual scaffolding is an important aspect of toolkits and cards.
  - Cards can help add new information / idea into the already existing understanding/discussed design.
  - The value of cards is in forking. It’s quite possible that e.g. only 4 cards are needed and not the 8 cards (as proposed in an hypothetical card deck). The power is in the logic of game.

**Points to Carry Forward:**

- For card decks, we need to have process around these cards.
- For cards and toolkits, we need to decide
  - What the are the useful contexts
  - What functions are needed for designing cards/toolkits(for example forking)
  - What are the aesthetics?
- What processes are more generative than others to be used with cards and toolkits?
- We need to evaluate further how card decks can help in experimental approach to scenario planning.
- How people can know which toolkit or card deck they need for their purpose?
Big Data Analytics is the opposite of Scenario Planning – with data we just build modelling tools and analyse the big data and determine what is going to happen. There is a strong belief that big data allows you to predict the future, but does it really?

We all have different perceptions or understandings of “Big Data”.

- From the perspective of risk management – if all decisions were based on historical data, we would be lost – because unpredictable things are more easily to predict through going through different probable scenarios.
- From consumer brand operations view – most of the data is trash. How do you find what is this data that you need to measure, which gives you enough information to do that? If you want to do personalised data, when you talk about people – privacy issues come into play.

There is frustration with the power that data has over our decision-making processes. It is sometimes used in policy where maybe it should not be used – how should we connect the use of “big data” with good decision making?

The scary part is that there is a sense of “grandiosity”. Big data has been deified in the media. Yet it has not improved very much, and we often forget that it has everything to do with the human beings who are manipulating and visualising the data. There is a level of complexity that cannot be captured in big data.

There is an assumption that if we know everything about a complex system if we have the data. But scenario planning is in a unique place – we really do need scenario planners in big data! The human element ought to define the parameters of how we use the data.

- Sometimes the best big data analysts are more like artists or designers.

Quantified Self movement – where people collect data about themselves and “quantify” these things into their perception of wellbeing. Does data/information dictate the future, your potential futures? For example, if you read that your sleep was bad according to your device, do you believe its report if you feel fine? You can’t see an algorithm; would you let it change your day?

- We should ask, what is this inscrutability of human consciousness? What is the value of human empathy?
- Do we have misplaced faith in Big Data, in the face of black swan events?

Quantification and collecting data: there are also lots of things you cannot measure because the time frame is either too long for us to measure or perceive.

Qualitative vs quantitative – we like the illusion of control.

Ignorance is a tool. “Big Boring Data” means we lost the ability to understand that we are actually ignorant.
“Here be dragons” – it means we don’t have the data, but proceed with caution. The situation right now however is the opposite – in the area of Big Data we seem to be approaching without caution.

Big data plays into human desire for control.

Power

- How can we give power to the human with experience?
- Who dares to question? Who has the bravery to question? Everyone relies on data – even if you know something intuitively is wrong, can you question the big data? Or is data king?
- **We need to ask the questions first, then look at the data, rather than always look at the data first for all the answers.**
- It seems that it is no longer a question of “why people do why they do” but instead, a question of how much big data you feed in before you find something that works.
- If you look into how much money is being put into 1st world problems… how much does big data dialogue address human issues in these places?
- What is the point of 1st world data analysis? How about how does it affect developing nations? Is big data able to close the economic gap?
- Who owns the data? Does whoever own the data also own the future?
- All the things we get for free, are not free. They are actually information collection, they are collecting us!
- We need to give an awareness that this is not for free.
  - Why are we unhappy about giving away our data?
    - Is it because we are not being paid?
    - Is it because we are losing our privacy?
  - The situation with data is that we have become schizophrenic in concerns – we know that data is beautiful, it can do awesome things, yet it can be manipulated so badly and exploitatively used.
- Certain issues like suicide come with patterns. It gave rise to the idea of governing people through data. We need to have more social conversations about these issues.
- Did data collection start with point-of-sales stations? Permission-based marketing – if you purchase something it is taken as tacit permission to continue selling things to you. Is this ethical?
- Subverting data: Can you scramble the data to make it meaningless?

Points to take forward

- There seem to be two different calls here:
  - Critical use of data
  - Subversive, artistic, radical uses of data
- People do not seem interested in discussing or taking concrete actions with regards to how companies and governments collect and use data today. There is a serious issue here, and that is that people are going to be complacent and not going to act on the issue of data privacy until something negative happens. Yet this is unlikely to happen, so the issue has not come to the fore, although it is very important in a digital age. Critical mass is not enough!
- Futurists need to think about this issue – should we let data and design take over. Why should data/information dictate the future? Where is the human element in all of this?
GROUP: Fight Club
Number of participants: 6
Note taker: Kiely Flanigan

Points from Discussion:

- Can we design spikes? What would those spikes be?
  - Tactical media (might come across as praxis, but interesting tactic used to talk about something undercutting lots of layers in order to raise questions)
- Problematic of design
  - Designers get hired to find solution to something
  - Scenarios sell problems, not solutions
    - When sell problems, the job of designer is psychologically to calm down user/client by creating design.
    - On contrary, when we redirect it is so much more productive. Changes what conversation is about. Brings in further anxiety. Social psychology of the design as applied to designs is different than design applied to making next BMW (or whatever).
    - Very little written up of how to bring design to reframe the issue – not to enable solution, but how do we help users (citizens, teams members, or individual)?
    - What does design bring to sharpen attention to those things not being attended to? Can use cards, theater, presentations, etc. But, must be something deeper.
- Issue of materialization
  - “Design can manifest things foresight often buries with words”
  - Realize questions into words, prototypes, films, ideas. A lot is based on what you know and what I know. Present in many tangible forms. That is another way of presenting same question.
  - EXAMPLE: Future of smart pipes with Thames Water. Made a song. One song was woman in call centre and another was a guy in a white van. People remembered the song. Sensory experiences help. How make story memorable for when it is time for the decision maker to make a decision?
- Design often sits in center of x/y grid. To tease out design and scenario separately probably defeats process. Emotion engages various pieces.
In most organizations, media used to share multidimensional experiences are within a 2x2 medium. A lot of design work tries to escape that. Challenge of bringing multidimensionality of future into sensory experience.

There is a poverty in 2x2 media to re-present something that was much more multidisciplinary for those who were actually in the room.

- **To build scenarios:**
  - Taking sense memory but reversing idea.
  - Sensory foresight enables us to imagine situations based on different combinations of sensory experiences.
    - EXAMPLE: Sound of London in 2025; smells of Singapore.
    - Gets away from textual prompts of scenarios and going into the brain stem to build it out of senses. Construct around sensory envelope rather than playing with trends.
    - EXAMPLE: scenario with blind people. Using sound and smell in order to create future visions of cities.
      - Work we tackle through individual protagonists so complex. That story can be created through so many rich media. May not fit into textual collage of visuals.
      - Enabled the scientists to see a spectrum wouldn’t normally see.
  - Scenario work planning often comes from strategy.
    - Reflects a position of power.
      - Tactical design/media encroaches on this (you don’t have power.)
      - You are infiltrating a system and then you come out. You don’t own that territory.
      - Value is that you can disappear. Can leave behind fragments and traces of questions you want people to keep considering.
      - EXAMPLE: pranksters; idea you can pretend Dow Chemical officer and go on BBC news and apologize for trauma caused. Then, actual employees apologize that not us and we’re not paying.
    - Use design methods to do infiltration.
    - Do you infiltrate because you do not have access or because you want to be an insurgent?
      - Think about messy, complicated futures in order to think about these issues in order to drive conversations, create debate, inspire public imagination, and address issues swept under the carpet.
      - Can the design process provide a method or tool to use to do this?
- **Scenarios are about the context of something and somebody.**
  - Same country could have different users
  - Design scenarios for a purpose and user already
    - How do I make sure intended use is actually used?
    - How do I know use will be valuable?
  - We are designing scenario for a use and a user, but if look at typical budget for a scenario engagement, small proportion of money goes into use.
    - Our scenarios should be an input into the use
    - Investment and value. Usually negotiate on cost rather than value. Assuming use will be 2x2 media dependent.
  - A service to a community of users
    - But, don’t define value to users
  - EXAMPLE: Service design
    - Bank hires them and asks to work out service journey, roles, branding, etc.
    - Rather than turnkey product design, service designer finds all jobs are 2 jobs (have to design service design of implementation process)
  - EXAMPLE: Create health education that raised a lot of questions that were not able to be answered
  - EXAMPLE: Exhibition. Client hiring for a particular value in decision-making process. But, that is economic exchange.
• Question of morals, ethics, and unintended consequences of solutions presented
  o At what point do we think of the unintended consequences of our solutions? Our process provokes questions.
• What value does manifesting in a design way?
  o Outcome we propose could be influenced
  o Critical design
    ▪ Don’t work for clients
    ▪ Unearth critical questions (that’s the point)
    ▪ Methods access: what delivering?
    ▪ Danger of walled off and no return access to the conversation other than stone throwing.
• Museum of the future: what didn’t happen in that experience that in retrospect you would have liked to have built into the design and with what consequences?
  o Aspirational future for class-free society.
  o Critique was “where are the workers?” Not representing future as complete process. Normative visioning exercise. It’s a visionary exercise for positive government trying to take care of its people.
• Making implausible plausible; making plausible implausible. Rather than working for ideal futures.
• What is missing?
  o Good scenarios are just about to be rejected; pushing envelope so can have courageous conversations.
  o How does design help us there?
    ▪ Scenarios can take more risk because seem to happen in a safe space
      • It’s safe because it’s in the future and therefore it’s not real
      • Design can make those scenarios tangible
  o Is there anything design can do in a tactical fashion to enhance the “just about to be rejected” element? Two elements:
    ▪ One is pushing it
    ▪ How do you not push it away
• How keep future attention in the present?
  o EXAMPLES: Application on phone; South African USB key
  o How do I carry that memory of the future?
  o How do I make it discussable?
• Role of design as tactical nudges throughout process. Way to ensure pulsing. Like interruption and keeps us engaged.
  o EXAMPLE: Drone service demo; stimulating thinking about policy through normative exercise. Now, international competition in prototyping.
• Two dimensions: status quo versus challenging status quo; high engagement medium versus abstract medium
  o How determine effectiveness?
    ▪ YouTube hits
    ▪ Political opportunities
    ▪ Action
    ▪ But, outcome seems to be realization of scenario
  o High engagement media (e.g., video) are more palatable
• How can you make an unpalatable idea sticky?
  o Is stickiness affording action?
  o Criteria can be competing rather than complementary
• Three questions: is it memorable? Can you question it (more identify with it, less able to ask critical questions)? Can you enact it?
  o EXAMPLE: Cultural bureau in Toronto; active subversion was being uncomfortable with role of women in society; solution: start when they are little; used highly produced show
    ▪ Artificial scenario
• Time will determine impact

• EXAMPLE: David Eghers, Brooklyn Supply Shop – writing film scripts; façade for fiction; medium for engaging with fantastical world
  o A lot of times work we do is fiction
  o Fiction becomes a medium
  o Ellen at Harvard – how fiction works. If really good fiction, then people more real than people around the table with you. A lot of writing done on importance of good fiction to make it memorable.
  o Does memorizing mean I won’t question it?

• Role playing of being invited to museum scenario. What effect do you expect this to have on the number four person in ministry of education? What was expectation this would do for how planning schools, etc.?
  o EXAMPLE: Smart learning project for UA federal government school system (reform teachers, curriculum, etc.). Failed because no concrete vision or imagined outcomes.
  o Museum – sand – play around with your hands on ecology. Based on hands-on, game-based learning. Smart learning initiative was meant to use this, but failed. Without text, this is what 21st century looks like. Minister said yes, want this. Material expression of whole set of ideas.
  o Telepresence robot (can buy on Amazon). Put sign on it “Support” in Arabic. Guided people. Company used as reception. Gimmick, but reinforces public services to make people’s lives easier and better. Fusion of innovation question around it. But, by making these types of prototypes backed up by research, they are easier to understand and make actionable.

• Book: Fox Keller about genetic engineering. Subtitle: Models, Metaphors, and Machines. Takes apart how scientists design the metaphors, machines and models. How some of the spikes are oxymorons—nonsensical things. How they become generative metaphors.

• How long is the voyage to try out these things without losing trust in each other’s practices?

• Introducing more speed bumps in an intentional way but they are new. Good at creating social convergence for a decision point. In doing that, we’re not very good at the sharp edges of process. We’re good at smoothing the path.
  o How do you design interruptions?

• We need to take into account a new future that goes feral. Now talking about something handed over that makes the future itself go feral.
  o Will be duplicitive as a designer. Know that you’ll accept X, but will put in a Trojan.
  o Is that by design not scalable or replicable?
  o An omnipresent parasite?

• Training people for agility to handle friction—world is not sanitized version of the future; processes tend to erosion of edges
  o This is feral coaching
  o Can it be identified so that can be norms?
  o But, could become prescriptive.
  o Annoyance is intermediary product. But, what does it then afford?
    ▪ “Immune systems only function through strength against infection.”
    ▪ Have to be a level of emotional connection

• “We’ve squeezed humanity out of businesses and now we have to buy it back in.” Coaching – paid to be interrupted in ways not thought about in order to make a better manager or whatever.
  o What are ethics of it?
  o Can’t say you are a feral coach because whole point is to be invisible.

• “Interesting thing about when someone hires a futurist is a capacity to see what you can’t see.”
  o EXAMPLE: Greenwashing example. Aggressive reporters asking questions that he couldn’t answer. Executive not briefed. But, actually were students. Showed executive video and decided not to launch.
  o Where is the performative in futures?
Need measurement in order to determine efficacy of such initiatives.
EXAMPLE: Food chain crisis

Points to Carry Forward:

- Implementation of futures
- How carry platforms forward
- How service the follow-through
- Desire for insurgent version: feral coaching
  - Hiring a consultancy who will ambush you for 18 months with scary futures when you least expect it
- Cover tactical, but get better at engaging divergence first, then convergence
  - Define rough edges and turbulence, so not so smooth
- How weaponize friction so that can apply it as insurgent tactical approach
- Asking question “can it be formalized sufficiently that it becomes an accessible approach?”
- Leaving critical design and futures to outside is not replicable. How find pathways that give critique back into larger processes?
- How can cultures/organizations sustain healthy immune systems?
GROUP: What would a COMBINED process look like?
Number of participants: 12
Note taker: Neena Veeraraghavan

Summary of Discussion
An attempt was made to map out a combined process between Designing and Scenario Planning, and evaluating points of intersection between the two approaches. Visual aids including a whiteboard with illustrations were used to support the discussion.

Points from Discussion:

Framework 1: Please refer to Visual 1

A. Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component from...</th>
<th>Visual Code</th>
<th>Terms Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design World</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Prototyping, user experience, aesthetics, form – put meaning – agile processes, research, context, uncertainty, journeys, lifecycles, Personas, emotion, uncertainty, user experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario World</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Purpose, creativity, Research, External factors identification, outside in, framework, quantification, PARADIGM, internal consistency, implication session, use, dissemination, workshop, story creation, external validation, creativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Points to Note:

- Creating a distinction between people who perform analysis before designing vs. people who generate some solutions early on to help with unfolding analysis.
• Cause first vs. consequence first – The differences in chronology and materialization
• Inductive vs. Abductive approach in scenarios building
• Scenarios need to be in the form of a story to be communicated.
• Producing mental models of story building vs. prototyping and the subsequent process of iteration to reach a final design.
• Breakdowns in the iterative process help to narrow down points to similarities; Can occur in the process in three forms – functional, audience or form
• A challenge is to create scenarios that people can relate to and how to make them more relevant

C. **Similarities and Differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarities</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context, Environment, Action</td>
<td>Prototyping starts right away – part of the creation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualizing starts after requirements</td>
<td>Design is not just about making object “pretty”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiences sometimes into education about scenarios</td>
<td>The zooming in font is the work that design does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No physicality?</td>
<td>Participant Model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The future is already where we start</td>
<td>Scenarios = Means to end (real form)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design is about making things engaging</td>
<td>Its Ok to throw stuff away (Can we move forward with their value)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario is the final product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Framework 2: Please refer to Visual 2**

Placement of design perspective in the wider environmental context:

A. **Components:**
   A – Actions, E – Environment, I – Information, O – Object, U – User

   This is representative of Distributed cognition i.e. Recognition of the system in the brain, the machines we look at and the overall socio cultural context.

B. **Points to Note:**

1. Designers look at the core of this model and try to work from the core to outwards, while Scenario Planners look at the factors influencing the environment.
2. Outcomes may be multiple, because of the dynamism in the environment.
3. Both Design and Scenario planning many be iterative processes. Both divergence and convergence may create sets of similar designs on which scenarios can be based.
4. The basis of filtration is determined by the early requirements of the project, accountability and time frame.
5. Scenario Building has two models: Expert Model – Developing scenarios based on expert feedback and view, and Participative Model – People inside the organization help you develop the scenarios.
6. Scenario building only helps us present different futures to the client. It is up to the client to decide the key drivers influencing his/her set of actions.
Key Takeaways:

1. Visual 2 helps synthesise the two perspectives of design thinking and scenario building.
2. When designing things, keep in mind an awareness of future contexts. Identify the relevant drivers shaping the future and combining in a particular direction.
3. Feedback loops need to be built into the models above. The spirals can also represent Creation and Usage, leading to an iterative process.
4. Scenario API is a bridge to connect different things and turn the model into a highly adaptable platform that can deal with differences.
5. Scenarios is opening up minds to see the context around while design is a way to conceptualize and share in a nice way - both go hand in hand in creating something new.
6. Look at broadening design perspective into designing for the future or designing with the future.

Visual 1: Screen Shot of Board 2 with other models
Visual 2: Screen Shot of the Board with Detailed Map
GROUP: Redesigning Policy
Number of participants: 14
Note taker: Candy Chan and Saba Riaz

Points from Discussion:

- Redesigning policy: Using concepts from design and scenario planning to change policy making
- Desired outcomes:
  - Develop an innovative toolbox that encompasses a collaborative, anticipatory and iterative policy implementation process through
    - The use of narratives that reflect engagement and understanding of stakeholders;
    - Understanding the different political structures around politics, policies, corporate citizens, citizens and the global community to prevent a race to the bottom in policy decisions;
  - Develop a pathway to a clear policy mental model by establishing what the pre- and post-policy conversations should entail.
  - Understand how to organise in order to deliver policies
  - Understand which are the established levers for policy makers and which are emerging policy tools e.g. crowdsourcing and social movements.

Policy Process: Muddle to Model

- There are essentially 4 steps that we can take to develop a clearer mental model of the policy process.

1. Recognise that process is very fragmented and muddled at its current state. There is a need to develop a model for the policy process.
2. Define what a good policy mean and question whether policy is a pathway to something or somewhere.
3. If so, define what a good policy is, the pathway required, and the scope of the policy. This is because we need to recognise that the place we want to be is not the same as the method of getting there.
4. Understand who the target beneficiaries and the outcomes of the policy matters. In the ideal world, policy making requires a systems approach as it entails developing a plan that affects multiple issues and engages multiple stakeholders. The outcomes of which will inevitably involved changed mindsets and conducts.
While the development of a pathway to a policy model may look like a simple linear process, it actually entails an iterative and organic process in order to be successful.

**Creative back casting**

- The development of good policies can be seen as a creative back casting process. This means that policy makers create a vision of the long term future before determining the steps to get there.
- This will require a multi stakeholder process in which stakeholders’ views and scepticism of the future goal(s) is taken into account.
  - Stakeholders will specify the issues they think would be obstacles to achieving the policy goal.
  - In turn, policy makers develop a transitional or stepped process in order to determine the pathway to the final policy goal.

**Impact of policy on corporations**

- In order to understand the impact of policy on global corporations, one can use a model involving 3 key stakeholders: the state, the global corporation and the local community.
- There is scope for corruption and a failed state unless policies cater to the interests of all three stakeholders. This means that good policies will need to result in a value creating system that satisfies all stakeholders in all scenarios of the future world.
- In order to balance the interests of all three stakeholders in policy, the idea of co-creation – through engagements and cooperation among all stakeholders – is crucial to the policy making process.

**Value Creating System**

- Another way of developing a value creating system is to give autonomy to small unions such that multiple communities work together towards a common policy goal.
- In terms of policy making, this concept works especially well in countries, such as Africa, where there exists a local government within a global goal and global governance. The local government experiences a destruction of power if it does not possess any autonomy within the global community.
- In addition, the way policy is seen from the top (in terms of power) is very different from that seen from the bottom. The framing of a policy becomes very important in resolving the potential conflicts seen in policy making which involves multiple stakeholders with different levels of power.
As such, to deal with the challenges of policy e.g. corruption, dominance of elites and foresight is empowerment of small unions, the policy making process will need to focus on the development of a value creating system through enhanced autonomy for small parties.

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS

- Policy Intention
- What kind of anticipatory process is it?
- Engagement and Understanding
- Evidence based policy
- Complexity thinking / policy making by muddling
- Scale/ Interactions/ Integration
- Reorganizing “Back Office”
- Training tools for policy design
- Using scenarios to redesign policy
- Creative back casting
- Problem solving trap
- Where do policies come from?
- Policy Model
- National policy in a world of global business
- Who ends up in policy and why?
  - Politics of policy making – who decides and how?
  - Who makes policy and who for?
- Moving scenarios versus snapshots
- Why does it fail?
  - A failed state
  - Not a systematic instrument
- View policy from an impact perspective
- Innovation in policy tools – new source as emergent tools
- Iterative implementation
- China mental model of policy

Addendum from convener:

We were looking at what is the policy process and whether the issue is that we need better foresight and fit with the existing process and/or whether the process is also evolving in response to the need to use foresight-in-policy. The notion of evidence-based policy is, by nature, retrospective in its learning if the emphasis remains on empirical data and what works.

Foresight-in-policy raises questions:

- what is ‘evidence’ (e.g. can it include disciplined imagination, anticipatory knowledge)
- does the emphasis on ‘what works’ create the risk of policy lock in (old recipes rather than innovative solutions)
- where does design impact: the whole process design (cut across with the waterfalls group), the identification of stakeholders (who represents youth/future generations?), the framing of the policy agenda, the prototyping of solutions/implementation, etc

This group shared interests to map the landscape and then broke into groups to look at different parts of the map.
10. Plenary Feedback of Round 3

GROUPS:
1. New Combined Process
2. The Future of Politics
3. Foresight communities
4. Deckheads
5. Big Boring Data
6. Fight Club

New Combined Process
- What would the new combined process of design people and scenario planners look like?
- We keep going back to designing futures, but if we hone in on designing things for future use – we see that we have a user, an object, and an environment – a designer produces an object for a user in a environment. The “combined process” scenario planner then comes in at this point to work on the project.

The Future of Politics
- There are quite a lot of interests in the politics and future.
- Alchemistic models – we looked at policy and pathways. Are there pathways before policy is a natural answer?
- What is the scope rather than scale that policy should be involved in?
- What does the policy pathway look like?
- How do you generate an understanding of the goal that you are trying to achieve - who are you trying to engage in the process?
- We need to work out how to create pathways that do not privilege one group over another. There is concern that pathways privilege those in power, destroying the place of sidelines for those whose voices are not commonly heard.
- Some feel profound dissatisfaction from how it is currently handled - but how do you even start a conversation about the rethinking of policy – what is the design brief? What is the basis on which you develop this brief?
- How do we engage the policymakers in this debate?
Foresight communities

- How do we design a community where people think, feel and then do? To get the kind of foresight / experiences that we want to collect?
- The point of designing a “foresight community” is to bring the long term picture into the view – in terms of the experience that the community develops and brings to the table, but also in terms

Possible steps on how a foresight community could be formed:

- **Community** (bring the people together)
- **Challenge** (bring some provocations from people from different fields who are doing interesting work)
- **Converge** (the group needs time to converge and bring their ideas together – what do they want to contribute in the end?)
- **Consequences**
- **Continuity**

Deckheads

- The Deck of Cards as a project which allows one to quickly prototype scenarios.
- Decks aren’t new, they are familiar and hence approachable.
- Example of Github: You have lines of code which are your units, and if someone wants to fork your code, they can do that. It is a repository of modular ideas – similar to the Cribkit presentation earlier.
- Example: The Thing of the Future – 108 cards in the deck, with close to a million combinations.
- The Economy of Line refers to how you can draw almost limitless, complex drawings with minimal lines. Generativity matters. The way you can use deck cards is similar.
- The duality of design – design intuitions.
- What can we learn from the Crit Kit? What is the context and what point do you use it? Jury/professional practice standards/etc? When where how who?
- Different ways in which deckcards could be used: Play, Idea generation, evaluation, different types of functionality
- What is the artifact’s look and feel? How does it take the right shape or form.

Big Boring Data

- The business of big data is winning the game of the future.
- What big data cannot predict is uncertainty and emergencies.
- What we don’t like about big data is how we can avoid decision-making, because the data can tell us what to do. Unfortunately, we are not going to act on it until something negative happens.
- We would like to call for more scenarios of using data in unexpected, creative, subversive, disruptive uses.

**Fight Club**

- Implementation of futures. How exactly do futures get taken up (the curve in the diagram above) and how can we design (the spikes) which carry a platform forward.
- Feral coaching (picking up on an earlier point on “feral futures”) – imagine an agency that will ambush you and bombard you with scary futures at some unknown point.
- The goal of this would be to engage more people with the issues.
- Can it be formalised sufficiently that it becomes an accessible approach, without neglecting the process?
- It may not be preferable to lead design to the very extreme radical edge, but some stimulus and discomfort is perhaps useful.

**Plenary Reflections/Discussion:**

- Disruption and continuity:
  - The workplace is a source of disruption. It is not just an intrusion; it is part of the fabric of the workplace.
  - Existential risk – in the face of existential risk we pretend there are schedules which can be met.
  - The waterfall gives an illusion of continuity but actually it can be a lot more turbulent on the inside.
- Jacques-Rousseau describes democracy as disruptive as it gives opportunity to the voices of those who are not in power. How can design give certain voices power?
- Ranciere: The act of instigating a disruption to the dominant hegemonic powers - How do you disrupt? Why and who disrupts? What is the agency behind it? What specific ends are behind it?
- Thinking about future structures from a Rancierean perspective – if you are not doing politics and changing things, you are not doing anything. Are you pushing a particular agenda or trying to avoid a specific threat?
11. Plenary Closure and Initiatives

Proposed Projects and Emerging Ideas

1) Potential Special Issue of *Futures* on Scenarios & Design (edited by Chermack, Selin, Ramirez, +)
   Article Ideas:
   - Scenario & Design Process (Phillip Joe, et al)
   - Scaling Futures for Social Design (Shekhar Pula (lead), Sanae Chriabi, Paul Crook, Todd Gentzel, Karen Regenass, Paul de Ruijter)
   - Scoping the Intersection between Scenarios and Design (Cynthia Selin, Lucy Kimbell, Yasser Bhatti, Rafael Ramirez)
   - Agile Processes: Designing with uncertainty (David Ing, Daniel Gronquist, +)
   - Orchestrating a Creative Learning Environment - Design and Scenario Work as a Coaching Experience (Alexander Steckelberg)
   - Modelling people: Assumptions, Designs and Cybernetics
   - Scenarios and Service Design Capabilities
   - Bamboo Scaffolding for Ecosystems (John Selsky)
   - Scenarios as Fashion Design (Fabrice Roubelat, Denisa Kera, Debbie Ding, Jamie Brassett, Jonas Hoffman, Michael Mcallum).

2) Guerrilla Broadsheet (Anab Jain & Dan Lockton)
   Rather than an academic journal - could we do something like Archizomo

3) More Museums of the Future (Jim Maltby)
   Inspired by Noah Radford’s Museum of the Future; connected to the UK Horizon Scanning Centre

4) New Metaphors
   We’ve got metaphors for certain concepts - as various new things emerge that weren’t previously available, maybe we need some new metaphors for representing these concepts. If it’s decided by a corporate interest then they own that metaphor so we need to challenge that before some of these things become established.

5) Myths of the Present and Near Future
   The idea of looking at what myths are current in society - companies creating myths about their brand - and how does this translate into a future context?
   Suggestion: Hook up with the 21st Century Tarot Cards

6) Feral Futures and Insurgent Design Project

7) 21st Century Tarot Cards (Paul Raven, Anab Jain, Stuart Candy)
   Can we make this into an object that can actually go out in the world rather than stay here in the theoretical futures world? The idea is not just to develop the cards as a publishable design artefact, but to take an opportunity to write at length on the use of tropes, images and metaphors as constructive “units” of narrative, whether in futures workshops, design projects or storytelling.
   Comment: This could be a Harvard Business Case - Tarot is big business.

8) Capetown (or Kenya) Bootcamp Hands on Social Design (Tanja Hichert, Ramia Maze)
   Lots of interesting things happening in futures right now in Cape Town – around the theme of “Design that improves lives”. Really interesting locus right now for talking about urban futures potentially where you can tackle some of the designs for urban futures, in a hands on way.

9) World, narratives and systems (Joost Vervoort)
   A paper will be developed that links theory around futures as narratives, futures as systems (critical systems theory) and futures as worlds (experiential environments/realities) will be developed for the Futures special issue. A game jam – a competition between independent digital game developers – will be organized by the TRANSMANGO FP7 program on European food futures (work led through
ECI Oxford), together with OFF participants. A long-term Pervasive/Alternate Reality Game will be organized around the food/water/energy nexus.

10) Mutating Futures - Innovation and the Grotesque (Joost Vervoort)
Online, dynamic and interactive library for grotesque futures - there is something beautiful in the grotesque - that can trigger creativity by introducing what “should not be” into the future space.

11) Policy futures (Joost Vervoort)
A concept note leading to a paper will be drafted based on a synthesis of multiple dialogues about new understandings of how futures can guide better policy development, focusing on an analysis of the dimensions and challenges of policy, challenges around cross-sector collaboration and adaptive planning using back-casting.

12) Whitepaper on strategic design and foresight communities (Trudi Lang, Angela Wilkinson, Sander van der Leeuw, Prasad Boradkar, Cynthia Selin)

13) List or Survey of Design Educational Programs (Stuart Candy, Ramia Maze, Cynthia Selin)

14) Special issue of Prospective et Stratégie ((Fabrice Roubelat, Rafael Ramirez, Jonas Hoffman, Noah Radford, Karen Regenass, Alain Wouters, Sander van der Leeuw, Shekhar Pula)

15) Designing the Next Meeting (Paul de Ruijter Alexander Steckelberg Shekhar Pula)
Continuing the collaborations and conversations in the near future. Keeping momentum going.

16) Intersections of Design and Futures (Lucy Kimbell +)
Possibly an op-ed piece published in a mainstream newspaper or Wired

17) Emerging Market Design Strategy with Scenarios

18) Crit Kit (Ramia Maze, Laura Forlano, Cameron Tonkinwise, Prasad Boradkar, Cynthia Selin, Noah Radford)
Kit as a critique of the missing political and ethical dimensions of scenarios and design fictions.

19) Developing and Piloting Large Group Methodology for Scenario Planning (Claudia Murphy, (Point person), Cynthia Selin, Thomas Cermak, Shirin Elahi, Stuart Candy, Dick Axelrod (in absentia), Philip Joe)
Large group methodology has been used for years to create visions, strategy, organization design, problem solving. What would the design and methodology look like for large group (100+) participative scenario planning and how would it impact behavioral change as a result?

20) New Narrative Paper (Paul Raven, Shirin Elahi, Claudia Murphy, Caroline Nevejan)
Sometimes the story hides in the narrative - how can we re-find it? This piece would dig much further into the narratological questions, at the very least, establishing a lexicon of definitions for terms like "story", "plot" and "narrative" would be of some benefit for the discipline, but exploring different modalities of narrative construction (and their pros and cons) would also be of value.
Comment: Contact Denisa Kera for more information on Hackathons in Nepal and India – around frugal innovation and futures.

21) Prospective, innovation et design (Foresight, innovation and design), meeting to be organised in France in Spring 2015

--End of Report--

For impact assessment, please acknowledge the Oxford Futures Forum and keep us informed of project outcomes.