

Part 1: Problem and actor analysis – Results interpretation

In the following, a short interpretation and reflection of the results shown in the MiroBoard_results1.pdf file is given.

Textile industries (top left, in blue)

The first two statements point in the right direction, each of them capturing part of the problem from the textile industries' perspective. By combining these two main points, an appropriate problem statement would be

From the perspective of the textile industries, the wastewater treatment and resource recovery problem consists in it being unprofitable to treat the wastewater effluent to the environmental standards. This is due to a high cost of treatment and low profit margins on the textile market as well as the cost of getting away with pollution (fines, bribes) being lower than the cost of treatment.

Several points are mentioned that reflect associations with the information provided, such as beliefs about underlying reasons or absence of something that could solve the problem. They are unfounded, however, and hence not appropriate to include in the problem statement as this information is not provided in the vignette. It is important to base the problem statement as closely as possible to how it is described by the information source, avoiding premature own interpretations.

Civil society (bottom left, in yellow)

The key problems listed on the “sticky notes” to not reflect the description in the vignette. An example of an appropriate problem description would be

From the perspective of the civil society, the wastewater treatment and resource recovery problem consists in the lacking water-related service provision and exposure to filthy surroundings, flooding and health risks with high disparities among Pavipolians.

Farmers (top right, in green)

The result provided is a proper example of a problem statement, reading: “*From the perspective of [the] farmer the problem is the pollution of the crops when using the river water and the sinking of the ground because of the depletion of ground water. [There is] No safe water for irrigation [which leads to] – long – term problems in aspect[s] of health, crops and ground sinking*”.

Government (bottom right, in red)

The proposed problem statement is: “Lack of participation and awareness from various stakeholders resulting in adverse effects on both raw water source and waste water treatment capacity.”. While this may well be one of the underlying root problems, it is not stated in the case vignette. Following the vignette, a better problem statement would be:

From the perspective of the government the wastewater treatment and resource recovery problem consists in increasing political pressure by Pavipolians on local authorities while these struggle to adapt and scale wastewater treatment across the city given lack of funding and personnel for operation and maintenance and unreliable electricity supply.

Actor analysis

In the table below, all “key stakeholders” as mentioned on the MiroBoard are listed alongside with whether they can be considered as actors or not. Please note that the distinction is not always clear-cut as also the definition of what is considered “high” interest and influence is relative and subject to judgement. Generally, an actor will have both high interest and high influence.

Mentioned	High interest?	High influence?	Is actor?
Local authorities/government	Yes	Yes	Yes
Consumer / clients	No	No	No
Workers	Yes	No	No
R&D companies	? not known	Rather not	No
Textile associations, local industry owners	Yes	Yes	Yes
Public/ families	Yes	No	No
Investors	No	?	No
Law makers	No	Yes	Rather not
Technical people / engineers	It depends	It depends	It depends
Technical consulting	?	Yes	Rather not
Farmers	Yes	?	Rather not