**Lessons Learned Document**

Comments in these tables were shared by the organizers, instructors, design facilitators at the debrief meeting after the Summit

**Community**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Very interested in the projects | 2nd community visit:  The second scheduled community visit did not happen for several teams, or was different than we had originally planned. However, community feedback is important. We should try to ensure that the 2nd visit is incorporated into each teams’ design cycle but happens when they are ready for it |
| Involve comm central in product design | Short time |
| Great community participants + | Community visits not relevant for all teams |
| Was great to have flexibility of who/when to visit for second visit | Not seeing working sessions  No formal post survey on how they felt? Their feedback and views |
| Community visits enabled teams to get user feedback that enable projects to take shape |  |
| Well prepared! Homes well informed |  |
| Great job engaging community members and communities. Worked really well |  |
|  |  |

**Projects**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Each team had a prototype by end of IDDS | Distractions during team work + |
| Relevant and well scoped, participants interested | Some project material was not available in time & this slowed down the team work |
| DF coordinated well with their teams to achieve the targets | Project-community connection could have been stronger |
| Access to testing labs ++ | Some unclear roles of DFs and guests |
| If participents were targeted, great innovation would have come out | Overall IDDS goal got muddled 1/2way through – back on track for week 3, but felt we lost time |
| Extra sessions created by Ranyee, Amy & Dan helped the teams to stay focused | Some participants kept leaving their teams to attend to personal needs & this slowed down work |
| Check ins with Dan, Ranyee & Amy helped team solidify goals / vision for project | Wish we had more time to test prototype / find a solution |
| It was a struggle but each had a prototype somehow | Stove production project seemed less framed than the others – took a lot of time narrowing rather than iterating / idea gen was hard until more narrowed |
| The wide range of projects seemed to help people learn a lot from each other | More emphasis on how projects were chosen so participants understood the starting point |
| Projects were well scoped and relevant | Clearer explanation of what each organizing body envisions for projects  Projects not framed in a way to encourage innovation |
| An all round coverage from field to lab | Noticed pulling side between wanting to leave something for community but also moving sector forward |
|  | Poll participants to ask their current stove challenges & create projects incorporating those  Space for projects on distribution, adoption, marketing, finance |
|  | Help DFs prepare for projects w/ relevant background & tools |

**Curriculum**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Great job adapting curriculum to be flexible for teams | Some felt it was too long (duration) |
| Very well organized and structured for week 1 – covered lots of grd effectively | Allow for time in the evenings to unwind before dinner |
| Good mix of content and team time | Not enough unstructured team time – interruptions, even 1 – 2 hours, would throw off whole work day |
| Lots of life demos of stoves  Participants loved test-its/build-its  Hands on activities  Schedule seemed good: not too packed | Having more emphasis on trying innovative ideas from start + discussion about innovativeness of ideas from experts |
| Good balance of theory & practical | More down time to have conversations and collaborations |
| Great community involvement – Good lectures and group prep on this | Little incorporation of design notebook +  More on stove design theory, current research topic, things done before  More on user research techniques |
| Continuity discussion was great and well-timed | More shorter design check-ins to encourage new ideas |
| Sketch modeling & build-it was very good $ a foundation to design process | Could have made better use of stove r&d / design principles |
| Liked the technical emphasis | Too many “teams” at start – design activity, build-its, real teams |
| Build-its were awesome + | Not sure the community participants fully understood the theoretical part |
| Small breakout sessions (i.e. design for X) were very popular & seemed effective | Timing of women-centered design seemed a little off |
| Test-its are good model & should be explored further | More free time – team was really burnt out at the end of the weeks |
| Hands on demos really helped community participants learn | Could be more tech instruction – make it creative |
| Lots of hands-on activities | Needed more time for testing & effective community interaction… but time is limited |
|  | Little on the business sector + |
|  | Women-centered design seemed “late” in the summit |
|  | Hard to carry on Amy’s enthusiasm |
|  | Visitors/guests could have been better utilized |
|  |  |

**Participants**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Good mix of people – professions & backgrounds | Disappearing acts through not frequent ++ |
| Great group of participants – right mix of skills, backgrounds | Try to get comm members to stay all summit |
| Diversity matched with good teamwork | Having community participants away for many of the activities |
| Target people with stove prod skills | Finding a way to keep locals 100% engaged all summit |
| Good mix of people & expertise | Fatigue along the way & prepare & manage this better |
| Fun group | Target people who are ready 2 stay 4 the entire summit & committed to the projects |
| Good mix of strengths among the teams | More diversity could bring more innovative projects (?) |
| Evening activities fun | Language was a bit of a difficulty |
| Many great future organizers & facilitators | Participants said they wanted mid-day breaks or activities  Community participants feeling left out of separate  On boarding participants too last minute/close to summit  Quicker ways to get “real-time” feelings of participants  More diverse background |
| Great mix | But less diverse than other summits More non-sector ppl? |
| How/who will keep momentum and engagement moving forward? | Not enough tapping into knowledge & expertise of individual participants |
| A good mix of participants & committed:  there was a mix of different professionals ( stove manufacturers, stove testing experts, researchers, students, etc) and each had a contribution and  different ways to look at project ideas and a unique contribution to the success of the projects. Majority of the participants were committed to their project work |  |
| Participants were accomodative of each other |  |

**Logistics**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Very well organized & supported | First aid preparedness could be improved |
| Transport seemed smooth & timely | Didn’t expect so many people falling sick |
| Great venue ☺ | Testing center underutilized |
| Food 10 / 10 | No welder onsite |
| Very well run! | Power shortage was a big challenge and inconveniencing at times |
| Sufficient resources | Not enough pre-coordination among organizers on specific budget info |
| Good organisation | Participants falling sick was a set back but thank God all recovered |
| Safe comfortable space | Getting supplies difficult/far  Communication w/ kitchen |
| Perfect venue |  |
| Great team of organisers ☺ |  |
| No complaints |  |
| Organisers worked hard to facilitate all the activities taking place |  |
| Transport \* overall. Organization was great |  |
| Kulika great campus & space to work |  |
| Great transport & community visit support |  |
| Good food provisions throughout the day but though less fruits were provided at b/f |  |

Sher:

* Working with well-oiled partners who have a good reputation and track record in the communities as well as sectoral expertise is key.  It really was a big relief to work with GACC, CREEC and CIRCODU.
* IDDS could offer more towards organizations like GACC and others if we had documented curriculum with a curriculum framework, documented session plans, PPT templates, and take-aways people could use to share activities and ideas back home.  (We’re making an offer today to an IDDS Curriculum Consultant to help us produce just that.)
* Google Hangout videos are helpful, but too long.  Would love to have 5-10 minute versions available for people who join late or just need quick refreshers. (the IDDS curriculum consultant will help with this).
* Having the Lead Instructor available as a mentor and support to all DFs (instead of being a DF themselves) is a plus.  Something Dan did really well was calling and consulting with each DF before the summit - this really helped them feel included when they were on-boarded, but also made it more helpful to know what to train them on
* DF folders with instruction are a plus!  Good to have these ready before the summit and then can spend more time during organizer orientation going over each activity.
* Kulika is an ideal training venue - has the housing, food, workshop, and meeting spaces needed, but most importantly and VERY accommodating staff who understands IDDS
* A lead organizer who knows the content, the cultural context, has good communication skills and facilitation skills, and strong program management skills is necessary.  Ranyee was a great example of this.  It makes it a more organized and peaceful experience for organizers, participants, and even the communities.
* Good leadership and consistent and clear communication increases organizer proactivity and satisfaction.  Ranyee was intentional to select a very skilled team and then very purposeful in re -communicating the vision and each of their roles.  Because people knew the larger vision and their role in it, they felt more freedom to be proactive and more confident to lead things on their own.
* Working with communities and then selecting projects based on community needs *before* selecting organizers and participants is ideal if possible.
* Ensure there is a translator per group or that each participant is comfortable speaking the same language in the group.  Factor time to slow down and translate main sessions if not everyone speaks the lesson of instruction.
* Have a Janet!! Someone who is skilled in the sector, takes initiative, passionate about the cause, fun, creative, makes people feel welcomed, available, pleasant to be around, communicates consistently with participants and shares the important info with organizers and DFs.  Both leads and supports well!

On a side note, I don’t think your summit struggled with it too much, but knowing how to best mitigate overbooked organizers and also be mindful of their schedules.

Ranyee:

* More specifically design curriculum elements to target changing mindset from feeling like things are impossible to being possible, and evaluate this mindset change throughout. For example, people can’t afford innovative technologies, entrepreneurs can’t afford innovative technologies.
* Focus on communities as representative of more people. Supporting one home or one village should not be the only end goal of the design.
* Support from IDDS/IDIN and Sher on planning is great, especially during pre-IDDS organizer training. As IDDS scales up, this would be good to continue.
* Greater focus on potential for scale, ideas that are riskier, iterating through ideas. Participants seemed reluctant to think about these ideas, and it would be good to have participants be more open to scale, risk and iteration
* We need clearer expectations for what community participants can expect. There will not be a finished and completely tested prototype in all homes.
* Kulika’s distance from Kampala was beneficial in that it forced organizers and participants to bond and focus on each other more, but it made logistics harder for finding supplies.