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Summary

This project is the fruitful outcome of the partnership between the University of Brighton and GPI Atlantic and aims to demonstrate the usefulness and relevance of values-based approaches to evaluating cultural legacies of projects for asset-based community development. The project has transferred approaches developed in the 'Starting from Values: Evaluating Intangible Legacies' Connected Communities project to GPI Atlantic’s established programme.

The project has embedded values-based approaches to identifying legacies within GPI Atlantic, Bhutan’s Youth Development Fund (YDF), and the Thai Volunteer Service (TVS), as well as the TVS-supported GNH youth movement in Thailand and neighbouring countries in the Mekong, and GNH-aligned community projects in Thailand. These projects have adopted a Gross National Happiness (GNH) -type development agenda. The Gross National Happiness development philosophy, pioneered in Bhutan, seeks to holistically integrate good governance, the preservation and promotion of culture, and environmental conservation, with sustainable and equitable economic development. GPI Atlantic has contributed to a wide range of GNH-focused projects in the Himalayan Kingdom of Bhutan (such as the Happiness Village Project with YDF) and more broadly in the Mekong (with TVS), has worked closely with Bhutan’s National Statistics Bureau and Gross National Happiness Commission on the design and construction of new National Accounts that follow the GNH development principles, and has promoted GNH and disseminated their work in other parts of the world including through GNH conferences held in Thailand (2007) and Canada (2005).

Within this process, we trained youth leaders from Canada, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam, as well as GPI, TVS and YDF staff from Canada, Thailand and Bhutan respectively, most of whom are involved in delivering participatory action research (PAR) projects for community wellbeing. We co-explored and co-developed with GPI Atlantic an adapted, contextualized use of our values-based approach, by integrating the WeValue tools and approaches developed from the AHRC Starting from Values project, with GPI Atlantic’s asset-based youth facilitation processes and PAR training segments on research ethics. We also worked with TVS to ensure our methodological and training approach were culturally and contextually relevant. The result was a co-developed GPI Values approach to evaluating legacies of the afore-mentioned community-based (and youth-led) development projects occurring across the ASEAN region, that are based on principles of Gross National Happiness (GNH). In this way, our collaborative work represents a new application of values-based indicators at the community level.

This initiative serves as a practical demonstration of the usefulness of the values-based approach across diverse regions, cultural contexts, and organizational structures. It has contributed to development of a partnership with GPI Atlantic, a global leader in indicators for development, which is facilitating the transfer of this learning into an established global network of policy-makers, funders and assessors of genuine progress and wellbeing.

To assist with AHRC reporting: some of the intended elements are maintained in round bracketed italics and the corresponding actual information supplied in square brackets in the text below.

Achievement of Aims

1. We have been successful in transferring learning about values-based approaches to a community of practitioners in international development, through co-development, demonstration, confirmation and embedding of these approaches with an important established
member in community-led development, GPI Atlantic.

2. **We have developed a partnership with a specific global leader in indicators for development** who has access to pathways enabling even greater and wider future co-developed uses and impacts of the values-based approaches into an established global network of policy-makers, funders and assessors of genuine progress and wellbeing. We have effectively prepared GPI Atlantic, a leader in indicator development, to integrate values-based approaches into their work and share their learning throughout their network. We will maintain our relationship with them and be prepared to support them fully in their implementation and dissemination efforts.

**Main objectives and outcomes**

1. **To co-explore and co-develop with GPI Atlantic a contextualised use of our values-based approach from the AHRC Starting from Values project, to confirm its distinctive usefulness to assess legacies of asset-based community development projects by:** Identifying and representing cultural legacies of (two flagship Gakidh (Happiness) Village projects led by GPI Atlantic and the Bhutanese Youth Development Fund (YDF)) [two Thai villages where GNH principles are reflected and that are supported by TVS], within four months. Project activities took place in these villages in March 2017.

   [narrative: see sections co-design and outcomes section 1.1, 1.2, 1.3. PLUS VIDEO GNH3 LEGACIES AND STORY FROM AEED and Ying?]

2. **To demonstrate the practical usefulness, scalability and transferability of the values-based approaches by co-training others in (Bhutan) [Thailand] to:** Identify and represent cultural legacies of (the national program of Young Volunteers in Action (Y-VIA) - led by the Bhutanese Youth Development Fund (YDF) and GPI Atlantic) [the GNH youth movement in Thailand and neighbouring countries in the Mekong region supported by TVS], within five months. These legacies were identified (see Annex) and captured on video in February 2017. Trainees have now taken what they have learned into their own contexts and within a year we will be able to see if they have actually integrated the approaches and demonstrated their usefulness within their specific contexts. The fact that we successfully co-designed and co-delivered the training with GPI Atlantic is an important indication of the transferability of the approach.

3. **To embed learning about the values-based approaches into GPI Atlantic practices worldwide by co-training and accompanying learners (in dedicated sessions within the annual extended international training event for their leaders and research directors in Feb/March 2016) [during training and field visits/participatory research in Thailand in Feb/March 2017]; to include co-development of training materials for roll-out in GPI Atlantic projects in the Mekong, Canada and India, within ten months. Co-training with GPI Atlantic staff was particularly important with respect to embedding practices within GPI Altantic’s work. Participants in the February 2017 training in Thailand were provided with an initial set of materials. Further materials were developed and posted on a dedicated Facebook page following the training workshop in Chiang Mai. This resource pack included a letter to participants explaining the documents in the package, a one-page step-by-step guide to applying the GPI Values processes within community-based projects, outlines of the GPI Values tools and processes in powerpoint and pdf formats, and a feedback survey for participants to complete and return to GPI Atlantic.**

   DONE through co-design and co-training, and work with TVS in communities. Activities section

4. **To introduce the demonstrated effectiveness of our approaches to GPI Atlantic’s wider networks,**
including the OECD, UNICEF, UNDP, and Canada Global Affairs, within 12 months. Deliverables produced or underway by GPI Atlantic include:

**Written materials, briefing statements and reports, including:** A policy brief (to be shared with GPI Atlantic’s broader international development networks) that reports on the demonstrated effectiveness of our approaches for asset-based community development projects; Research reports that discuss the transferability, values, and legacy findings elucidated through on-the-ground case studies wherein trained project participants applied our values-based approach to capturing legacies in their own asset-based community development programmes at two Thailand sites; and potentially the inclusion of a section on the GPI Values project in a major writing project currently underway by GPI Atlantic’s Founder and Executive Director.

**Use of the GPI Values tools and approaches in their projects (upcoming):** GPI Atlantic has submitted two grant applications to Global Affairs (formerly CIDA) indicating the intention to train interns to work alongside GPI Atlantic to train partners in Cambodia, Myanmar and Thailand in the use of GPI Values tools/processes for their development programmes. Pending funding from Global Affairs Canada, GPI Atlantic will also use our co-developed values-based indicator development approach to guide their work with interns as part of their ongoing internship program. GPI Atlantic will also use the approaches to ascertain legacies of their heritage-based project called Rediscovery the Roots and Routes of Resilience.

**Peer-reviewed conference and other presentations to funders and international development agencies:** A presentation was delivered at the Atlantic Council for International Development Symposium in June 2017. Attendees included a representative from Global Affairs (formerly CIDA), as well as Atlantic Canadian development agencies and international development organizations; Dr. Ron Colman, GPI Atlantic Founding Director and Gwendolyn Colman, GPI Atlantic Executive Director, have been invited to speak at high-level symposium in May 2018, together with Enrico Giovani, Founder of the Global Progress Project for OECD. GPI Atlantic intends to present on our GPI Values work.

**Project outputs**

- **WeValue and GPI Values training model for youth leadership and community-led development context.**
- **Case study material**
- **Expertise gained through the application of research in a non-academic environment**
- **Materials capturing the new adaptation of the values-based approach co-developed in this application, for communication to other practitioners.**

**Impact Summary**

Staff and interns from GPI Atlantic have been trained in the values-based approach to evaluating the legacies of their projects and programmes. They will use these approaches in related projects that they deliver in Canada and elsewhere in the coming years. Key staff and youth leaders from the Thai Volunteer Service (TVS), staff from youth organisations in the Mekong region, and staff from the Bhutanese Youth Development Fund (YDF) have also been trained, and can now cascade this approach within their youth leaders’ networks and programmes. This has already occurred through training and on-the-ground support provided in Northern and Southern Thailand in early March 2017, with two workshop participants as they applied the GPI Values tools and processes at the community-level within their own contexts.

GPI Atlantic has over a decade of experience working with the Bhutanese government to develop the Gross National Happiness Index, and working with local Bhutanese partners in the delivery of community development programmes focussed on building GNH communities. Likewise, GPI Atlantic is a
long-time partner of the Thai Volunteer Service (TVS), an umbrella organization that works in eight Mekong countries, coordinating community development initiatives and linking partnered NGOs with various essential resources and supports, including the placement of committed and skilled personnel on their GNH-inspired development projects. Since 2005, GPI Atlantic has provided training courses for Thai government officials, academic professionals, youth, and community development practitioners, on developing and using alternative methods for measuring genuine local and national wellbeing. Through their work in Bhutan and Thailand, GPI Atlantic has strong connections with both Bhutanese and Thai government officials, national NGOs and local chapters of international organisations such as UNICEF, the World Bank and UNDP.

GPI Atlantic also had a long-standing collaboration with the International Development Research Council and the Canadian International Development Agency (which has been folded into Global Affairs Canada). GPI Atlantic is well established in the international development community, and are world leaders in developing alternative assessments for community wellbeing and resilience. Since 1997, they have guided federal and provincial governments in New Zealand, Canada and Bhutan in their development of progress indicators and accounts. They led the development of the Nova Scotia Genuine Progress Index and its application at regional and national levels in Canada. Thus, the outcomes of the work delivered by the project will be widely disseminated within these networks and insights will be shared in the later stages of the project.

The project will furthermore provide a platform of work and real case examples that can be further developed into a rigorous and accessible approach that can bridge local to regional indicators for Genuine Progress - an identified gap that exists worldwide. This work will benefit an international community of practitioners and policy-makers engaged in community development and interested in using and further enhancing existing measures of genuine progress (GPI for instance). TVS is disseminating information about the project on its Facebook page and in their magazine. The outcomes from the project, and audio-visual content that we have produced and are continuing to produce, will be used as much needed content in media streams, and examples of successful community development projects.

The partners have carefully considered benefits for all participants and beneficiaries of local communities involved in the project. In particular, the GNH youth movement in Thailand and neighbouring Mekong countries and residents of the villages with which they are working will benefit from clarifying and communicating the legacies for the community development work carried out, and in doing so strengthening these very legacies. In addition, the approach is aligned with existing core principles of equal information sharing which existing community projects are founded upon: community members will have control over the data collected in such evaluation processes, and youth leaders involved in the project have gained new skills in evaluation and values-based approaches which they will be able to apply to a range of project contexts (See Annexe 4).
Background

The AHRC Connected Communities ‘Starting from Values’ project developed an approach for identifying and articulating the legacies of partnership projects – in particular university-community projects. The notion of legacy is based on subjective values of the people identifying it, and legacies of a project are typically viewed using the same values-lens as the project and its outcomes. But they can also be identified and viewed through a variety of different lenses, including those of the participants, and beneficiaries. In this previous AHRC project, University of Brighton (UoB) and its partners showed that by starting from eliciting and articulating local values, using our specialised approaches, it is possible to identify a broader spectrum of outcomes from projects, to open spaces for examining deeply personal and ‘intangible’ aspects, and finally to articulate cultural legacies of projects from these different values perspectives – in a rigorous and systematized way. Our results also indicated that it is necessary to make use of arts and humanities approaches to identify and capture such legacies. With carefully facilitated arts and humanities approaches, and by starting with values, we can elicit, collect – even take measures of – more representative and inclusive legacies. This approach, developed both empirically and theoretically through the Starting from Values project, allows us to go beyond objectively measurable outcomes by capturing measures of legacy that require an explicit recognition of embedded multi-subjectivity and values-judgements. Furthermore, we found that participants in partnership projects who might initially have a difficulty in articulating well-defined indicators of achievements were more easily able to do so after following our values-based approach to legacies. In other words, when partners were facilitated to articulate their legacies with our approach, this proved excellent preparation for them to then develop local appropriate indicators for assessment. This initially subtle point is what stood out as an important innovation to our new partners in international development projects.

University of Brighton developed a partnership with GPI Atlantic, a Canadian NGO with 15 years’ experience in asset-based community development and operationalisation of the Genuine Progress Index (GPI) at an international level. GPI Atlantic are global leaders in the development of GPI, an alternative measure for societal wellbeing which is used by many cities and regional governments worldwide, e.g. in New Zealand and Canada and most notably in Bhutan with the Bhutan Gross National Happiness Index (GNH).

GPI Atlantic expressed a clear need for capturing and evidencing cultural legacies of their projects. Though they have extensive experience developing indicators at programmatic, community, national and international levels, their previous development of community-level wellbeing indicators involved time-consuming, bespoke projects at each location. Previous community-level indicator work required enormous support and research from indicator experts and staff from GPI Atlantic (who collected input from the community through surveys, focus groups and interviews, and developed the indexes themselves). They already used a participatory, contextually-sensitive approach to partnership and program development, and used participatory, asset-based facilitation approaches for developing progress and behavioural indicators for their internship programs. However, GPI Atlantic recognized in our approach, the value of integrating participatory and visually-based elicitation approaches in the collaborative production of values-based indicators for community-level projects. GPI Atlantic thus had a well-defined need which they immediately recognised that our approach could benefit. Our system of developing local indicators for asset-based community development bridges the gap between previous GPI Atlantic projects that support GNH communities (such as the Gakhid Village Project in Bhutan), and
GPI Atlantic’s extensive community profiles for the community GPls in Canada.

UoB and GPI Atlantic discussed possible opportunities to co-develop the approach for GPI’s context, first identifying the possibility of working with GPI Atlantic’s partners in Bhutan. When practical obstacles related to obtaining visas for entry into Bhutan could not be overcome, the focus switched to work with another of GPI Atlantic’s partners, the Thai Volunteer Service (TVS) in Thailand. TVS had been involved in the third Gross National Happiness (GNH) conference and their work continues to be related to a broader – and both implicit and explicit – ‘GNH Youth Movement’ in the region, including long-term connections with work done in Bhutan.
Preamble

Changes to overall project

Collaborative (adaptive) planning involving University of Brighton (UoB) and GPI Atlantic was ongoing from the moment the project funding was approved. However core project activities, which were supposed to begin 1 April 2016, were delayed because of changes to programmed events with which this project was aligned. Fieldwork in Asia began 5 February 2017 and the location was Thailand rather than Bhutan, although the activities did involve participants from Bhutan along with those from Thailand and other countries in the Mekong region. This adjustment was made because UoB and GPI Atlantic participants were unable to obtain visas to enter Bhutan.

Fortunately, it was possible to involve a similar and highly capable NGO which had deep levels of trust and commitment with GPI: the Thai Volunteer Service (TVS) was able to step up to fulfil the role that YDF would have played in the Bhutanese context. Luckily, participants from the primary Bhutanese partner were still able to attend the workshop and site visits in Thailand, (the Youth Development Fund (YDF)) and they can thus transfer what they have learned back to the Bhutanese context. The organisations worked closely together in the context of GNH3 (the 3rd International Conference on Gross National Happiness) which took place in Thailand in 2007. The legacy of the embedding of the Gross National Happiness (GNH) framework within TVS' work meant there was an opportunity to visit and explore the legacies of similar ‘Happiness villages’ in Thailand, including that which served as a model for the Bhutanese Gothkad (Happiness) Village, and also to assess the legacy of a GNH youth movement that grew out of GNH3, and which approximated what might have been expected in relation to the Bhutanese national program of Young Volunteers in Action (Y-VIA). The project could therefore be carried out in a way that reflected its key goals and objectives even though the primary activities took place in a different country.

GPI Atlantic staff and volunteers from Canada participated in the project activities in Thailand, along with participants from the Mekong countries of Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam (and observation of some of the proceedings by a member of GPI’s Indian partner organisation, as well as a student from Fudan University in China). This means that the activities in Thailand created important opportunities for dissemination of values-based approaches—with broader impact than those that would have resulted by carrying out this work solely in Bhutan.
Project activities

1. Preparation and pre-fieldwork

The activities were designed to demonstrate that our values-based approaches were applicable on the ground with an established international development practitioner, transferable for use by local project partners, and possible to incorporate into global programs designed to be localised in different contexts. The successful demonstration needed to be followed by individualised dissemination to other stakeholders. UoB and GPI Atlantic co-designed a twelve month programme incorporating these elements, with field activities integrated into existing opportunities. After initial attempts to work in Bhutan, we seized the opportunity of working with TVS to assess the legacy of the GNH youth movement that emerged from the GNH3 conference ten years earlier and the associated work in community-level projects that reflected GNH principles.

With a few months’ notice, the partners UoB, GPI Atlantic and TVS organised a training programme to be held in northern Thailand with participants from the Mekong region. UoB and GPI Atlantic had virtual meetings in order to prepare for implementing what we called the 'GPI Values Tool', and training workshop participants in the tool. Initially the GPI team collaborated with UoB team members to draft a new values trigger-list (explained below) based on GPI’s previous work in community-based development and GNH measures. Several other training materials were assembled ahead of the intensive co-design on site. GPI Atlantic and TVS led on the organisation and recruitment of participants.

2. Fieldwork in Thailand – co-design and trialling approach

All partners met for several days in Chiang Mai, Thailand to co-design the GPI Values tools, processes, and training programme. The co-designed GPI Values tools integrated: 1) the WeValue tools and approaches (as UoB’s values-based approach has come to be known), which formed the basis of all co-design methods and processes; 2) the new values-list, which consisted of 55 value statements aligning with the holistic principles and pillars of GNH. The UoB We Value approach uses a values-list to ‘trigger’ identification of values by participants. A new values-list was created for the specific purpose of eliciting values from members of asset-based community projects working under the umbrella of GNH. The new values-list was created by drawing from the Bhutan Gross National Happiness Survey and Index, which was developed in partnership by the Centre for Bhutan Studies (CBS) and GPI Atlantic. (The GNH Index copyright is held by CBS); 3) a combination of facilitation and training methods brought to the table by both GPI Atlantic and UoB; and 4) a training segment on research ethics, drawn from GPI Atlantic’s participatory action research training manual. The GPI Values Tools and processes were reviewed and experienced by Thai Volunteer Service leaders, who then helped us make adaptations so that the tool was relevant and appropriate for the Thai/Mekong context. TVS partners also translated materials into Thai for Mekong region participants with limited English. (See co-design schedule in Annexe 1).
We also used this time to introduce the WeValue approach to identifying values and legacies to GPI Atlantic and TVS. Partners from GPI Atlantic (Gwen Colman, Hasta Colman, Nora Didkowsky, Ryan Patey, John Marcucci, and Alana Ziegler) and TVS (Kratae, Samkid, and Netting) took part in two workshops led by the UoB trainers: The first introduced them to the concept of values-based approach to legacies; and the second led participants through a values elicitation and triggering process. The latter was also used to reflect on the triggers developed for the training programme, and gain feedback from all partners in the process.

Part of the purpose of ‘experiencing’ the approach was to also define the most relevant shared context for the partners, and for participants in the training that was to come (given that we were going to have a much more diverse group than originally planned, with participants from diverse organisations and countries). After discussion, we agreed the shared context for discussing values would be being part of a GNH Youth Movement. This values lens was then to be used to examine legacies, so we also needed to redefine which legacies to focus on. The partners decided the initial focus should be on the GNH3 conference, which brought together GPI Atlantic, TVS and YDF (among others), and was identified as the catalyst for continued collaboration 10 years on. The first GNH conference took place in Bhutan and was attended by Dr. Ron Colman, GPI Atlantic’s Founder. Inspired, GPI Atlantic cohosted Rethinking Development, the second international conference on Gross National Happiness (GNH) in Canada in 2005. The conference was attended by Thai activists who partnered with the Thai Volunteer Service to adapt GPI Atlantic’s youth program from the conference, in order to create a new network of youth across the Mekong working on community development with a holistic view based on GNH. This network continues under the overall direction of TVS. In 2007, the Thai Volunteer Service helped organize the third international GNH conference in Thailand, and coordinated a 2-week youth forum and volunteer program in Thailand ahead of the conference. GPI Atlantic brought 26 Canadian youth to participate in the youth forum and conference.
On the final day of the co-design phase, partners from YDF joined the group and took part in a session identifying legacies of the GNH3 conference, starting from values-based statements identified by GPI Atlantic and TVS in the context of the GNH Youth Movement. This was also used as a learning opportunity for GPI Atlantic co-facilitators to use the values-based approach for identifying legacies.

3. Fieldwork – co-training

We piloted this training programme over the course of a week in Chiang Mai with participants from Bhutan, Cambodia, Canada, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam (a number of whom identified as members of the GNH youth movement mentioned above). The training was led by facilitators from UoB and GPI Atlantic with participants accepting the invitation to take the lead on some activities. (See training schedule in Annexe). The training was well received and participants declared their intention to apply it in their own contexts. They provided feedback on how to improve future training, as well as the resources that would be useful to support their future work (see Annexe 4 for full details of feedback from participants). Some resources are already available to them on the WeValue web site and others have been developed and made available to participants on a dedicated ‘GPI Values’ Facebook page.
The training included two day visits to nearby ‘happiness villages’ where community members were engaged in a variety of initiatives that corresponded to their own visions for their community, which aligned with GNH principles either implicitly or explicitly. Participants and workshop leaders were split into two groups with one group visiting Mae-tha known for its organic agriculture, value-added sustainable product development and successful cooperative, which has provided much needed financing and other supports to community members over many years. The other group visited Huai-e-kang where the emphasis was on preserving ‘local wisdom’ and promoting cultural legacies (for example, the community aims to preserve heritage knowledge and skills such as weaving and the use of indigenous, medicinal plants). This community was also known for its sustainable coffee production.
These visits were an excellent addition to the more formal training activities, providing a manifestation of the values and legacies that had been discussed during the training and helping participants to think about how they might work with their own communities.

Near the end of our training activities in Chiang Mai, two participants were asked to apply the GPI Values tools and approaches they learned at the community level, by training local leaders in their community organizations and networks, and then leading a values-based assessment of GNH legacies in their own communities with support from members of the GPI Atlantic research team/GPI volunteers, a TVS translator, and at least one youth community leader who participated in our training. One of these communities (Wiensa, in Southern Thailand) had served as a model for the Bhutanese ‘Gothkad’ (happiness) villages, thus helping to close the loop with respect to the origins of the collaborative work between GPI Atlantic, the Bhutan Youth Development Fund and the Thai Volunteer Service in initiating asset-based community development projects grounded in the holistic principles and aims of GNH. This community-based field work occurred in early March 2017. In the following months, the other local youth leaders who joined the training sessions in Chiang Mai, will use the new concepts and vocabulary in their ongoing work in the villages, and document points of learning to be reported back at various times, ultimately collected before the end of the project in December 2017.

After the training, the UoB and GPI Atlantic team met over a couple of days to de-brief and clarify any issues. They then began to develop the materials to be included in the ‘resource package’ (discussed above, which was provided to participants in addition to the training materials they received during the Chiang Mai workshop). The UoB and GPI Atlantic team also examined case studies and findings, as well as determined initial products to be developed from the extensive video footage collected during the various stages of the project. Discussions also covered how follow-up projects would be undertaken and supported in Bhutan, Thailand, the other Mekong countries and Canada. Plans were made for on-line resources and broader dissemination.

4. Fieldwork in Thailand – Community learning visits

Fieldwork in Thailand involved two types of Community Visits: 1) Community learning visits, discussed below; and 2) Application of the GPI Values tools and processes by trained youth leaders at two case study sites in Thailand, discussed in the following section.

Initially, the community visits were planned as an opportunity for trainees to engage with a local community in implementing the values-based approach. However, representatives from the communities were not able to attend the training and the visits were shortened (from 3 to 1.5 days) due to logistical constraints. Without community members well-versed in the values tool, implementing the tool in the communities was impossible. However, visiting hosts to community-based GNH-style development projects proved an important link between the theory and application of the GPI Values tool, between the training and applying the tool in their own communities.

Despite this change, the community learning visits were an excellent complement to the training because these communities manifest a values-based approach to development, and a vision that included a strong focus on happiness. Visiting these community-based GNH-style development projects proved an important link between understanding the theory and application of the GPI Values tools, as well as providing participants insights into how their training could be used to apply the tools in their own communities. Many of the dynamics and challenges that participants spoke about during the training were visible during the community visits and this allowed us to deepen our understanding of the context and stimulated further discussion about things that had come up during the training:
“The village and local wisdom centre also added value. I have been a good listener in the village, and in the village it is really a GNH village, a happy village, all the pillars are carefully preserved without it formally being a GNH project. We had a good guide who translated and shared the community’s work with us. The weaving centre was very close and similar to what we practice in Bhutan.” Rinchen, YDF

“From the first time in the workshop, I don’t understand everything, but I understood clearly when we went to the communities and saw what we were discussing in practice. I was really impressed by Maeta, strong community leader and research project that led to the development of the community project. It gave me hope and inspiration to continue my own project.” Lea, Laos

5. Fieldwork in Thailand – Community visits and follow-up - Applying the GPI Values tools at the community level

In order to assess the usefulness of the values-based tool in assessing the legacy of two community-based projects, the GPI, TVS and UoB team members worked with two Thai participants (Ying and Aeed) who expressed interest in adapting the values approach to their contexts.

The application of the GPI Values tools and processes was facilitated by Aeed, of the Creative Youth Group (CYG), with one of CYG’s partner communities, Wiensa, in Surat Thani, Southern Thailand. In Lamphun, Northern Thailand, Ying guided use of the GPI Values tools in a workshop that convened representative members from the network she founded, The Young Organic Farmers and Consumers Network for food security in the Maetha River Valley. While Ying’s network is firmly rooted in the Maetha River Valley region, with all its efforts concentrated locally, the network stretches across multiple townships and communities that comprise a wide area. However, while Aeed and CYG work extensively across fourteen provinces of southern Thailand, and have worked most rigorously in Aeed’s home province of Surat Thani, the specific community of Wiensa is where the GPI Values Tools Workshop occurred. The latter community (Wiensa) has the added advantage of having served as a model for the Bhutanese Gothkad Village projects. Hasta, Alana, and Ryan (from GPI Atlantic) and Netting (TVS affiliate) were fortunately able to arrange travel to the relevant communities to support Aeed and Ying in undertaking values-based workshops and legacies work, and to document the process.

Unlike previous applications of WeValue tools, the GPI Values Tools Workshop in Wiensa worked directly with community members to develop a values framework of indicators that can be used to measure the on-going work of the Wiensa community, in its efforts toward holistic development, that is based on principles of local wisdom, similar to the Gross National Happiness (GNH) principles. This opportunity to develop local indicators for asset-based community development bridges the gap between previous GPI Atlantic projects that support GNH & Local Wisdom communities (such as the Gakhid Village Project in Bhutan), and GPI Atlantics extensive community profiles for the community GPIs in Canada, which cannot be done locally without enormous support and research from indicator experts and staff from GPI Atlantic.

Work will continue over the coming months involving UoB and GPI Atlantic in identifying key findings and insights that can be communicated to other organisations and international bodies. GPI Atlantic plans to advertise that they have co-developed a useful tool for a large and defined need.
Values-based legacies of community-led development projects

6. Values-based legacy findings from GNH3 conference

This section outlines initial outcomes from the process of identifying values for GPI Atlantic and TVS in the context of the GNH Youth Movement, and using values statements to identify legacies of the GNH3 conference. This was done in three steps, and the findings presented below are preliminary as not all concerned parties were able to be present throughout the process.

**STEP 1** involved a workshop on 6th February 2017. Participants from GPI: Gwen, Hasta, Nora, Ryan, Alana; Participants from TVS: Kratae, Samkid, Netting

After introducing the concept of values-based legacies, we elicited values through a photo elicitation activity. The facilitators noted down comments from participants during the photo elicitation on orange post-it notes (in photo below) – as the workshop was after a long day, it was decided this would be the best way to encourage maximum input from participants.

After sharing the outcome of the photo elicitation, we moved onto the trigger list. Large cards with already amended triggers from the co-design process were placed on the floor in front of people, and people were invited to select the three that they thought were most important to them in the context of the GNH Youth Movement. The facilitator noted when people wanted to take the same card. Participants then placed all of the statement cards and were invited to choose one to start a discussion (we started with something that we knew would be complex from our previous co-design discussion, i.e. the karma statement). Once the discussion took place, the group was asked to show how important it is for them by moving their hands (high: very important to GNH youth movement, middle for somewhat important and low down for not important).
The group discussed most of the values statements prioritised by the group. One of the important discussions was about the concept of karma which was used in the trigger ‘we consider karma when making community decisions’. In particular, the group first deconstructed what they understood by karma, for instance as the interconnectedness of things, and thus understanding relational interactions of cause and consequence, or ‘ripple effects’. The example of full cost accounting was also used as an example of a ‘karmic’ approach. The group noted that a challenge might be to make the concept of karma understandable to people who might not use it, but that in South East Asia it was likely that people would know this term well. The group also noted that the term is used for two quite opposing purposes, for instance, it is often used as an excuse for not taking action, or for others to be treated poorly: ‘oh it’s because they have bad karma’. As a result of this discussion, we agreed to keep this trigger (proto-indicator) for the menu to be presented to participants.

The group also discussed the wording of some of the triggers around gender, and suggested to make them less gender normative, i.e. ‘all genders’ instead of ‘women’.
Figure 1: Values Statements 1.0 - from GPI Atlantic and TVS in the context of GNH Youth Movement. Shaded boxes represent statements developed from photo elicitation, white ones from ‘triggers’.

- Friendship between youth in the network – creating personal connections can help to act
- GNH comes from a spiritual place – we understand that we are all interdependent
- We consider karma (cause and consequences of actions, ripple effects) when making community decisions
- Other types of literacy are valued, e.g. knowledge of place, local indigenous people, local wisdom, agricultural practices, ecological...
- Village elders pass down their skills to young people (e.g. cooking, craft, farming)
- Youth are powerful and strong, can raise their voice to speak to the rest of the world
- People are encouraged to participate in decisions that affect them or their community
- Promoting and sustaining meaningful and sustainable livelihoods
- People are supported by the community to have a healthy lifestyle

- People inspire each other, and everyone has an important role
- A holistic approach to community development, people can understand through different elements
- Valuing traditional ways of life
- People with disabilities have the support they need

- Community members welcome strangers into their home
- GNH approaches speak to people in the ‘real world’
- Creating self-sustaining livelihoods in one’s own communities
- People of all genders have equal opportunities

- Ecological awareness and environmental protection (e.g. through gardening)
- In our community, we try to reduce waste and recycle as much as possible
- We work to address inequality

- In our community, we respect a diversity of opinions (building mutual understanding to promote peace)
- People treat each other justly

- We respect for others and peaceful relations are promoted
- People feel supported in addressing mental health issues
- People feel largely satisfied with their lives
- People are not anxious about the future
- People are encouraged to participate in decisions that affect them or their community

- In our community, we try to reduce waste and recycle as much as possible
Below is a summary of the Legacies of GNH3 discussed by GPI Atlantic and TVS participants during the workshop.

**GPI staff and ‘youth’ who took part in the GNH3 conference are present at the training event – showing a longstanding commitment to GNH approaches, GPI’s work, and inspiration from the conference event itself.**

Similarly, previous TVS volunteers and staff who took part in the GNH3 conference are present at our training event, and helping with organisation (translation, co-design, meditation retreat section).

A very famous and respected monk is learning about GPI and GNH, and developing a retreat around the concept of happiness – He also rescheduled another retreat and came especially to be here. This was seen as particularly important for the Thai partners, as this monk has a large following in the Thai community nationally and abroad.

Generosity of TVS and their partners, e.g. providing the space and food for a meditation retreat and our meetings, because they believe in the work we are doing. This was seen as legacy of the GNH3 conference in that it was the context in which GPI Atlantic and TVS first collaborated.

**Connection between GPI’s work and Thai work:**

The connection between GPI and TVS really blossomed during the organizing of GNH3. The second GNH3 conference was attended by Thai activists who partnered with the Thai Volunteer Service to adapt GPI Atlantic’s youth program from the conference, in order to create a new network of youth across the Mekong working on community development with a holistic view of wellbeing indicators based on GNH. This network continues under the overall direction of TVS. In 2007, the Thai Volunteer Service helped organize the third international GNH conference in Thailand, and coordinated a 2-week youth forum and volunteer program in Thailand ahead of the conference. GPI Atlantic brought 26 Canadian youth to participate in the youth forum and conference.

GPI youth learned from TVS through community visits, about organic agriculture and worked with farmers in rural villages across Northern Thailand, then attended the 3rd International Gross National Happiness Conference in Bangkok, which was attended by 220 youth from 16 countries as well as 400 other delegates. At the conference, the youth made a public declaration to address the need for greater connection between youth and elders, and the passing-on of local wisdom. In 2009, When GPI Atlantic’s partner, the Bhutan Youth Development Fund (YDF) of Bhutan and Dr. Ron Colman, GPI Atlantic’s founder, went on a Thai Volunteer Service study tour to different community-based development projects, or GNH villages. Visiting one such community in Surat Thani, where Aeed’s Creative Youth Group had been working with the local people to develop sustainable livelihoods, local wisdom and cultural heritage projects, is what inspired Dorji Ohm, of YDF, to partner with GPI Atlantic on the successful ongoing Gakhid (Happiness) Village program in Bhutan. Thus, the work of CYG in Surat Thani contributed greatly to the design of community-based GNH projects for GPI Atlantic and YDF in Bhutan and Canada.

This is all to say that the legacy of the connection between GPI’s and TVS’s work since GNH3 is quite significant. Since that time, both organizations have focused on similar issues in their work - organic agriculture, local wisdom, sustainable and equitable economics, good governance, environmental conservation, education...work which basically aligns with and is guided by the four pillars of GNH.

**Formative development experience for youth who attended the conference – which informed future career choices and studies.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forming of the GNH Youth Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term involvement of Canadian youth who attended the GNH3 conference in GPI work: All who attended are still involved as volunteers or project staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The GNH3 conference brought together youth movements in Thailand and the Mekong, cementing a regional network coordinated by TV (from which TVS drew on to recruit participants) |

| Better awareness of GNH for TVS and their network(s). Becoming more familiar with the GNH approach through the conference helped to link existing practices to it and make them more formal/communicable – from TVS perspective: “GNH is not something new” – “awareness for changing society is growing” |

| Youth started taking part in community work as a result of being inspired by GNH3 |

| Individuals involved in GNH3 mentioned it led to spiritual growth for them personally. For instance, it led to the development of a new world view at a crucial point in one Canadian youth's life. |

| Development of career paths for youth involved in the conference: At least 4 present started working within TVS and GPI following on from the conference (Netting, Alana, Nora, Ryan). |

| This was linked to creating clarity of desired career path and identification of passion for working with youth and environmental education, and being inspired to think that youth can be powerful. |

| Shift in research approach (for academic researcher) to join together research and community development using participatory action research. |

| Concept paper published by the OECD on plan for working on indicators for community wellbeing. |

| As a result of the conference, TVS staff and volunteers went on at least 3 GNH study tours to Bhutan with YDF, and Bhutanese are present at this TVS-hosted training programme. |

| Ron Colman (GPI) worked with TVS and university in Bangkok to develop indicators for Thailand's Sufficiency Economy Approach. |

| Local wisdom, organic agriculture and restauration of the dignity of labour projects were developed with Happy Seeds network. |

| Development of the GNH and Mind training camp in Bhutan (led by YDF in collaboration with GPI Atlantic) as a result of GNH3. |

**STEP 2** involved using the values statements in figure 1, to trigger further legacy stories.
Here, Rinchen, Chimmy and Nariani from the Bhutan Youth Development Fund were able to participate. Although they had not contributed to the development of the values statements, they were at ease when reflecting on the statements, and using the statements to reflect on the legacies of the GNH3 conference and their work since then.

It is important here to point out that activities and developments in Gakhid (Happiness, GNH) Village projects were identified as legacies of the GNH3 conference, as the concept of the Gakhid Village itself was born from YDF’s and GPI Atlantic’s participation in the conference in Thailand and follow-up visits to TVS network communities. Inspired by the work of TVS GNH Villages, in 2010 GPI Atlantic and the Bhutan Youth Development Foundation partnered to foster sustainable youth volunteer projects, poverty alleviation, food security and community-led economic development projects guided by the four pillars of GNH. Canadian interns are trained in participatory action research (PAR) prior to placements in Bhutan, where they then lead PAR training programs with the Bhutan Youth Development Fund’s Young Volunteers in Action (YVIA). Youth volunteers then conduct research in partnership with their Gakhid (Happiness) communities and identify significant assets that can be built upon in action projects. Through this work, GPI Atlantic continues to provide training where requested, and supports youth leaders to build youth and community capacity to create livable incomes. The Bhutanese participants who attended the GPI Values training workshop are coordinators of the Young Volunteers in Action programs in their own communities, and work directly with GPI Atlantic and YDF in the Gakhid (Happiness) Village Program.

**Values statement: “Promoting and sustaining meaningful and sustainable livelihoods”**

This led to YDF identifying a number of legacies from their work with GPI in the Gakhid village projects, the first around ecotourism initiatives:

> “YDF had been involving the youth in that community and trying to promote livelihood. We have come up with projects like ‘ecotourism’: we try to revive the ancient trail that they had. We had a very divine madman, known to the Western world as the ‘Divine Madman’, so YDF revived that trek route and now that has become a kind of livelihood for the community, where all the tourists come for trekking on that route and at the same time they also have an opportunity to develop their own community by making homestay, by growing organic vegetables at home where the tourists come and live there in the community. That is one [legacy].”

Rinchen, YDF, YVIA Coordinator

Further legacies of Gakhid Village work include local agriculture projects and employment opportunities for young people:

> “We also have a tea project, because in that particular locality there are two different types of local tea which can be produced. [The community] harvest the tea, process it and then they sell it to YDF. YDF buy that product, so we do the packaging and everything and then we sell it up in the market. And now what happens is that youth who left the village, who left the community, they started coming back to the village, whereby they could start their own meaningful livelihood in the community because there is opportunity. So we have created some opportunity, that is one [legacy].”

Rinchen, YDF

Other opportunities arise through training offered, on the basis of identified needs, including computer skills and tailoring:
“directly or indirectly this particular training has given an opportunity for these young youth to open their cooperative tailoring unit, where the community can bring their things to this particular cooperative tailoring unit and do their necessary stitching. And youths there, they can now stitch the dress that is worn by men and even the blouse. So they were trained within three months to stitch all these things. And now they are very ready and they are prepared to go to the market and get themselves employed. So this is a very big project, it’s happening now in Punakha district. And we have started with that project. So now we see that these things are becoming very successful, so now we might be taking this to another district where we will be looking at some areas where things can be developed very well for the community. This is one project for the promotion of ‘meaningful livelihoods’, so this is happening just now under our guidance.”

Rinchen, YDF

But these opportunities are beyond just employment, and are about preserving and passing on local wisdom by allowing young people to return to their communities and ask questions:

“So we have given opportunities for the students to go there and explore, and then note some of the dying local wisdoms. In a way it also gives a two-way benefit, and it’s starting to link with our Gross National Happiness”

Chimi, YDF, YVIA Coordinator

In a country where there is massive rural to urban migration, the Rinchen’s Gakhid village project actually sees youth staying on:

“So my Gakhid village has employed many out-of-school youth in that particular community. So this is a very successful story where we can share, and the Gakhid village is becoming very good in that particular community. So I should say that now YDF will be planning for another Gakhid village in the future.”

Rinchen, YDF

Hasta then reflected on how the stories of the Gakhid village projects were inspiring for her, and led her to apply for funding in order to collaborate with YDF and start a new Gakhid village project:

“So in 2013 I got this grant from the Davis Project for Peace, it’s a graduate student grant, and I brought the money to Bhutan and we all went to Gelephu (in Southern Bhutan), Pooja went also, and Roma and I, and we did training with the Y-VIA in participative action research, using the assessment and mapping tools. The project was just starting when I had to leave because I was only there for three months, but the idea was that I would start many of the things that had been successful in other villages”

Hasta, GPIYouth

The values statement promoting sustainable livelihoods led to discussions not only about the legacies of Gakhid village projects in more concrete terms, but also in how the actions taken, projects developed and experience shared led to broader changes and long-term involvement from those involved, for instance seeking to develop further projects.

Values statement: “People inspire each other, and everyone has an important role”

Another legacy identified for YDF in terms of the Y-VIA program is continued inspiration for young people:
“... every year they conduct [the Y-VIA] program, so this is how some of the youth are inspired to become volunteers and that’s how they’re into the community, helping the community, and people are really satisfied with what Y-VIAs are doing at that stage.”

as well as the impact the program has on their ability to engage more fully in their community, to take initiative and broaden their perspectives:

“And they all get involved into, you know, whenever there is a festival some of the Y-VIAs go and help the oldest people to come and visit the festival. They try to give them shelter, they try to give them water, whatever they need. So these are some of the volunteer activities that YVA has been doing now with this program, because their capacity has been built, their leadership qualities. Their minds have been broadened, where they can give more assistance to the community. So this is what it has become, and YVIA has been playing a very important role in our community.”

Rinchen, YDF

This experience is not limited to Bhutanese youth who are trained in the Y-VIA programme, but also to Canadian interns who work alongside YDF and their youth:

“It’s very inspiring for me and others to see that people at young ages are making huge impacts in their community, through the guidance of the leaders. But also what I’ve seen is that the experience that our interns have in the communities has really affected their choice of employment. So they’ve come into this thinking, ‘OK, I’m going to go into this program when I’m done, this is a way to have a year’s experience’, and actually their whole... their interests solidify around helping communities, or working within communities, in participatory ways, and they actually go on to programs or work that’s related to what they’ve experienced.”

Nora, GPI Atlantic

After reflecting on the legacies in relation to the values statements identified by the group, at least one area where missing legacies were identified: **self-determination (of communities)**.

**STEP 3 – preliminary analysis of legacies**

After the field visits, researchers looked thematically across the legacies mentioned and stories told by participants. Five initial legacy themes were identified:

**Individual growth** - personal and professional growth, from attending GNH3 or indirectly through actions taken in community, learning, or development of network activities:

“I was very inspired when I heard the stories of how successful it was, so when I was studying I applied for a funding to bring more partnerships from GPI to YDF and do that program.”

Hasta, GPIYouth
“at that time [GNH3 Conference], I’d just graduated. I was helping TVS just as a translator, I just get the thing done and then finish, I don’t think too much about changing the world or anything. But after this conference, I got a job from TVS and I continued working until seven years. And then along the way, through the seven years... how to say... my awareness for changing society has been rising, and I am clear about what I’m doing.” Netting, ex-TVS

“And now what happens is that youth who left the village, who left the community, they started coming back to the village, whereby they could start their own meaningful livelihood in the community because there is opportunity.” Rinchen, YDF

Community learning – and development of livelihoods, employment and wellbeing. Examples include sections above on developing ecotourism activities, new opportunities for employment through tea plantations, tailoring and other Gakhid village projects activities.

Community learning from the conference itself includes the ongoing networks and connections developed.

Taking action - individual and/or community level or even organizations taking action as a direct result of taking part in the conference, or indirectly through growth and learning that has happened as a result of related activities. The following notes from our conversation on legacies highlights the importance of long-term actions and commitments:

GPI staff and ‘youth’ who took part in the GNH3 conference are present at this training event – showing a longstanding commitment to GNH approaches, GPI’s work, and inspiration from the conference event itself.

Similarly, past TVS volunteers and staff who tookpart in the GNH3 conference are present at our training event, and helping with organisation (translation, co-design, meditation retreat section).

This following section shows how taking action and personal growth were intimately connected legacies from the GNH3 conference:

“I think it’s interesting that we’re coming from two different locations, and maybe have different backgrounds and things, but that the outcomes, the legacies from GNH 3, there’s a lot of similarities for me, as you (Kratae from TVS) said. So it resonates with me what you said about career paths, and working with youth, and feeling a passion for social change and having personal growth in a lot of ways, and working with other people to help develop that too. It’s interesting that even though we haven’t talked for ten years, we’ve had these similar legacies come out of that!” Nora, GPI Atlantic

GNH knowledge - Better understanding of Gross National Happiness concepts, and confidence/ability to connect them with other ‘happiness’ and ‘wellbeing’ approaches to living and/or community development. For instance, projects specifically on local wisdom, organic agriculture and restaurauration of the dignity of labour projects were developed through the TVS Mekong network of projects. The ability to see that, in some cases, “GNH is not something new, it’s something we already practice” (Netting, past TVS staff) is part of that learning process. Another interesting legacy was that a very famous and respected Thai monk started learning about GNH and was interested in collaborating and
developing retreats around the concept of happiness. This was seen as particularly important for the Thai partners, as this monk has a large following in the Thai community nationally and abroad.

Other examples include the publication of a concept paper for the OECD on indicators for community wellbeing.

**Developing connections** - Forming networks is central to projects in Bhutan and Thailand, and is often initiated by conferences through interpersonal connections, and then sustained through networks. The GNH3 conference resulted in **new, wider or stronger networks**, providing space for learning across regional and international borders. For instance, the GNH3 conference brought together youth movements in Thailand and the Mekong, cementing a regional network (which TVS drew on to recruit participants). The generosity of TVS and their partners – e.g. giving the space and food for the meditation retreat and our meetings, because they believe in the work we are doing - was seen as legacy of the GNH3 conference in that it was the context in which GPI Atlantic and TVS first collaborated. The legacy of developing regional and international networks continues:

> “And I think GPI Atlantic and TVS will be working on this issue (of GNH), provide a space for the young people not only in our home countries but in the regions, which is very, very important.”
> Kratae, TVS

7. Exploring values of the GNH Youth Movement with participants

As mentioned above, a lowest common denominator needed to be identified in order to run the training programme with opportunities for experiential learning through group activities and workshops. The common context identified was that all participants could identify themselves as being part of a GNH Youth Movement. Although not everyone was familiar with GNH, this proposal was discussed with the whole group on the first day, and on the understanding that all were working towards community wellbeing, happiness or alternative understandings of progress, this was agreed as a common context.

The process led to outcomes (values statements, proto-indicators, prioritization and clusters), but the whole process was primarily used as a learning tool for training purposes, as part of the action learning cycles. Indeed, although the participants shared a common commitment, not all were familiar with GNH or GPI, and we thus realized it would not have been entirely appropriate to focus on developing an output for this group in itself and the learning process was prioritized over polishing or perfecting the outcome.

Within this context, participants were asked to identify values through the following steps:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A photo elicitation activity (Day 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triggering, using a selection of 30 values statements which facilitators had identified as complementing the statements identified during the elicitation activity (Day 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritisation with a dot-mocracy exercise where participants were asked to vote for their top 5 statements (Day 3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of result and clustering – clustering was done with a subset of the statements in groups, and different ways of clustering were explored (process/outcome; type of stakeholder; values). Clustering of the whole set (as seen in Annexe 2) was led by facilitators (Day 3)

As a result of using the process as part of learning cycles, many of the values statements developed through the elicitation or triggering steps were either too vague or contained too many concepts. This helped, however, because we were able to use these statements to show participants how to identify criteria for developing well-formulated values-based proto-indicator statements (see Annexe 5 for the full list of criteria).

For instance, “Community members feel good/hopeful because they have trusted regulations, education, engagement in looking after (sustainably use + safeguard) their (local) natural environment” was used to show a statement that had too many ideas to be a proto-indicator (let alone an indicator). One of the participants noted ‘it looks like a theory of change’. In contrast, the statement ‘local people have access to nature and use it properly’ was identified as being much closer to a proto-indicator which needed only more definition in the concept of ‘properly’.

The clustering activities were purposefully done as smaller groups, to provide an opportunity for deep engagement with different ways of organizing values-based information (in the form of more or less well formulated proto-indicators). The experience of clustering by values after clustering in other ways was revealing not only of the process of clustering, but of the WeValue approach as a whole:

“When we think about clustering, we need to think about the purpose of doing this and it will influence the way in which we cluster, for instance our demand is to protect the forest” Samin

“When we work sometimes we forget the values of ourselves and also the value of our work, we think we are an NGO and we forgot. But this activity is to emphasize the real meaning of the values, to bring you back to the meaning behind what you are working or what you are fighting for” Ying

The learning from the process was then applied in the last section of the training, as participants were asked to develop values-based proto-indicators and indicators for their own projects or contexts.
8. Values-based legacies of community-led projects: ‘applying the GPI WeValue tool’

Overview

This section presents the findings from two case studies where a co-designed values-based approach developed through the training delivered by Genuine Progress Index Atlantic (GPI Atlantic), The University of Brighton (UoB) and the Thai Volunteer Service (TVS), was used by young leaders in order to develop values-based indicators of progress for, and to identify cultural legacies from, their asset-based community development projects in Thailand.

This was done by inviting two participants in the co-training workshop to transforming their learning to their own community projects. One process was facilitated by Ratthana Chusaeng (Aeed) of the Creative Youth Group (CYG) and Wiensa, one of their partner communities, in Surat Thani, Southern Thailand. Aeed and CYG work extensively across fourteen provinces of southern Thailand, and have worked in many communities, and the values-based legacies workshop focused only on the specific community of Wiensa. The other process was facilitated by Ying, founder of the Young Organic Farmers and Consumers Network (YOFCN) in Lamphun province, in Northern Thailand. Their network aims to promote food safety and security in the Maetha River Valley region by reducing pesticide use, spreading awareness, providing access to safe food, and protecting the Maetha River Watershed – the source of nourishment for the whole region and much of Thailand. The workshop took place almost entirely on one farm, but the network’s members stretch across the whole region and include other member organisations from Northern Thailand.

Both Ying and Aeed received training in the GPI Values tools, along with 30 some other young community change-makers from the Mekong region, during a one-week training program in Chiang Mai. Following the GPI Values Training Workshop, GPI Atlantic researchers Hasta, Alana, and Ryan followed up with two of the workshop participants, Ying and Aeed. These Thai participants organized their own workshops with their organizations in their communities to implement the tools they learned in Chiang Mai. The GPI Atlantic team served as resource people and documented the on-the-ground application of the GPI Value Tools.
The workshops in Wiensa worked directly with community members to develop a values framework of indicators that can be used to measure the on-going work of the Wiensa community, in its efforts toward holistic development based on principles of local wisdom, similar to the Gross National Happiness (GNH) principles. This opportunity to develop local indicators for asset-based community development bridges the gap between previous GPI Atlantic projects that support GNH and Local Wisdom communities (such as the Gakhid Village Project in Bhutan), and GPI Atlantic’s extensive community profiles for the community GPIs in Canada, which cannot be done locally without enormous support and research from indicator experts and staff from GPI Atlantic (who collect input from the community and develop the indicator frameworks themselves).

In this way, the community visit report for Aeed/ CYG/ Wiensa represents a new application of values-based indicators. The unique adaptations of the tool that happened at the community level are presented and analyzed in the following report. In addition, looking at legacies through a values lens at the community level presents new findings for multiple uses of legacies, such as evaluating community progress and planning future development.

Preliminary findings on the diverse cultural legacy themes identified at each site are highlighted and illustrated using examples. The Annexes to the report provide further detail and links to the raw video data, as well as transcriptions and codebook used.
Thematic analysis of legacies

After the field visits, GPI Atlantic researchers examined the data generated during the workshops to identify further tangible and intangible legacy themes.

This was done in addition to the legacies information generated during the workshops by and for the local youth leaders in order to further understand the relevance of the GPI WeValue approach for identifying and representing legacies.

Data from each site included: audio-visual recordings of group discussions by participants as they were engaged by Ying and Aeed to understand and apply the GPI Values tools and processes in their contexts; photographs and videos of cultural events and community resources deemed important program legacies by each community, CSO and network; artifacts representing cultural legacies, such as maps and drawings; and fieldnotes with observations at each site from GPI Atlantic researchers. Analysis focused on integrating and analyzing all of the data sources for the project, including the visual and textual narratives.

Following the field visits, notes from the visits were transcribed and relevant sections of audio-visual material were identified by two GPI Atlantic researchers. Specifically, we identified segments that contained: (i) interactions between facilitators and participants (as participants learned how to use the GPI Values tools and worked together to apply them within their contexts); (ii) information related to context, cultural artifacts, and project outcomes of each asset-based community development program; (iii) emergent processes and themes relating to both tangible and intangible legacies; (iv) and instances of interest for later exploring issues of transferability of the GPI Values tools and processes in diverse community contexts.

The data was analysed thematically using a priori codes from the codebook developed for the GNH3-legacies thematic analysis (by UoB researcher). The GPI Atlantic team used and built upon the GNH3 legacy codes for two reasons: 1) It would enable us to later be able to cross-reference GNH3 legacies identified by participants during the Chiang Mai training workshop, with those identified in the community visit (since many GNH3 legacies exist within Aeed’s work); and 2) We found many of the community specific codes fit the same criteria as the pre-developed GNH3 legacy codes, or represented more specific legacies that fit under those broad definitions.

This codebook was also modified using open coding from the community context as we wanted to ensure that the legacy analysis was grounded in the data. More specifically: 1) for community-specific codes that related to the same criteria as GNH3 legacy codes, but represented more specific legacies that fit under those broader definitions, we created "subcodes." The reader will note these "subcodes" under the broader GNH3 codes; and 2) For new legacy themes that emerged specifically from the community workshop findings, we created "additional codes." (the final codebook can be found in Annex 9)

The observation and field notes enabled researchers to recall and pinpoint potential areas of interest in the video footage, and to include as research data any important cultural artifacts, scenes and interactions that occurred outside the view of the video camera. Clips of the data depicting these contexts, interactions and themes were shared with other members of the GPI Atlantic research team, who made comments and helped develop a coding structure for analyzing the footage. The selected segments of video footage were then transcribed, noting what occurred in each video clip, what was said, where, and by whom. Simultaneous translation from Thai into English of conversations between participants as they engaged in the workshop activities occurred at each location. These English translations, provided by Jaruwan Supolrai (Netting, of TVS), were transcribed.
A template was used to organize transcriptions and translations, and to enable systematic coding for the purpose of identifying legacy themes elucidated through use of the GPI Values tools and processes at each site (see Annexes 10 and 11). The video coding template included 7 columns:

- **In column 1, (Line #),** each segment of relevant video data was given a number, so that research team members can easily compare coding contents with other team members;

- **In column 2 (Video Clip Segment),** the title/number of each video clip was inserted, including important time stamps within a clip for when a relevant interaction or response occurred related to the determination of values-based indicator statements by the groups, legacies discussions, etc.

- **In column 3 (Description),** the description of what was occurring, when, where and with whom, in the associated video segment was noted.

- **In column 4,** an overview of what observed on the video clip and what was said, as translated into English by Jaruwan Supolrai (Netting) (re: values, tool and process, legacies, etc) was inserted.

- **In column 5,** selected quotes illustrating the values-based indicator statements co-developed by each group, as well as those that portrayed legacies, were inserted.

- **In column 6,** thematic legacies identified in each video clip were noted using the codes.

- **Column 7 (Comments/ Notes),** was used to insert stated individual and group values, to contemplate new or emergent codes for legacies, and to identify areas for future analysis of transferability of the tools.
CASE STUDY 1 – Creative Youth Group and Local Wisdom Community, Wiensa, Surat Thani

Aeed, Netting, and Hasta near the end of our workshop together. Background: Temple where workshop was conducted, and draft fuzzy framework drawn up.

Introduction and Background

In partnership with P’Aeed, director of The Creative Youth Group (CYG) in southern Thailand, the GPI Atlantic team visited one of her partner communities in Surat Thani. This community, Wiensa, and many of its residents have been actively pursuing local-wisdom oriented development projects and the preservation and promotion of their cultural heritage for nearly fifteen years. CYG, as a major advocate for local wisdom and cultural promotion in southern Thailand, has been supporting community members in many of their projects around these issues. The community of Wiensa has adopted a Gross National Happiness (GNH) type development agenda, focusing on good governance, the preservation and promotion of culture, environmental conservation, and sustainable and equitable economic development. Local wisdom has been identified as the key connector between all of these goals as well as between youth and older generations.

THE CREATIVE YOUTH GROUP

The Creative Youth Group (CYG) is part of a consortium of youth groups stretching across 14 provinces in Southern Thailand. Aeed heads up the cultural division of this consortium. She is originally from Surat Thani and very familiar with the varied cultural and socio-economic landscape of the region. The Wiensa community has been a major partner of CYG since 2008.

When GPI Atlantic’s partner, the Youth Development Fund (YDF) of Bhutan and Dr. Ron Colman, GPI Atlantic’s founder, were working in Thailand in 2009, they went on a Thai Volunteer Service study tour to different community-based development projects, or GNH villages. Visiting one such community in Surat Thani, where Aeed’s Creative Youth Group had been working with the local people to develop sustainable livelihoods, local wisdom and cultural heritage projects, is what inspired Dorji Ohm, of YDF, to partner with GPI Atlantic on the successful ongoing Gakhid (Happiness) Village program in Bhutan. Thus, the work of CYG in Surat Thani contributed greatly to the design of community-based GNH projects for GPI Atlantic and YDF in Bhutan and Canada.
In fact, Aeed has been involved in the GNH youth movement since prior to 2007 and attended the Third International Conference on Gross National Happiness, Towards Global Transformation: World Views Make a Difference, held in Nongkai and Bangkok, November 2007 (GNH3). GPI Atlantic brought 26 Canadian youth and helped arrange with YDF and UNICEF for 18 Bhutanese youth to attend the conference and a study tour, completed by a total of 220 youth who then presented to the full conference of 660 delegates in Bangkok. For a full explanation of the history of GPI Atlantic and TVS involvement with GNH, please see the dissemination notes and the report on the main workshop. Aeed also attended pre-GNH3 youth workshops. In fact, many of the participants in the community workshop in Wiensa had met the GPI/YDF team or were familiar with GPI, GNH or the Late King of Thailand’s similar philosophy, Sufficiency Economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIENSA: COMMUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Households:</strong> 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary livelihood stream:</strong> Rubber tree plantations, farming, aquaculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History:</strong> the community was a hub on an ancient trade route connecting the Andaman Sea to the South China Sea. Archaeologists have unearthed ancient artifacts in the community from 300 A.D., predating the Kingdom of Siam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locations:</strong> Wiensa, in Surat Thani province, Southern Thailand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The central aim of the community, according to the community leaders present at the workshop, is to address the rich cultural heritage of their place and traditions. They aim to not only preserve traditional art-forms, such as Manora spiritual dance and shadow-puppetry, but also to make their traditions accessible to young people, and create interesting and sustainable livelihoods for young people to be able to stay in the community. Additionally, they hope to preserve the ancient relics and artifacts and reinvigorate festivals of the past by creating a living museum in the community. They are not interested in generating the mass tourism that has taken over so many beautiful places in Thailand, but in creating a learning center where local people, young people, and outsiders can learn about local wisdom, cultural forms, and traditional ways of life, such as sustainable farming practices.

Overview of the legacies workshop with the CYG

The legacies workshop took place over 3 days including both ‘workshop-style’ activities as well as visits to sites of importance to the project and organizing cultural events to celebrate the work that has been done in the community. For a full description of the workshop activities including detailed notes, see Annex 7: ‘CYG Case study detailed workshop sequence’.

The participants of the GPI Values workshop engage in meaningful community work all of the time. Having the GPI Atlantic team experience the outcomes of that community work was an important component of the workshop. As such, the entire workshop made site visits to important sites of project outcomes, referred to in the Workshop Sequence as ‘legacy sites’. These legacy sites added richness to the workshop by a) stimulating values discussions, b) showcasing the outcomes of community work/legacies, c) including views and input from community members who could not attend the workshop, such as the herbal clinic healthcare practitioners and school children, and, d), putting the community values to work in the workshop itself. Thus, the workshop activities took place in three different sites:
Workshop Sessions held at the Temple: located on the site of ancient city ruins, near the unearthed statues of Buddhas and Hindu gods and goddesses, the temple is the spiritual and social center of the community. In addition to the central temple and pagoda, the temple grounds include huts for monks, a large educational center, and a traditional “scripture house” on stilts.

Anjan Ratawan’s Farm: the GPI/TVS/CYG team stayed in Anjan Ratawan’s house and the community dinner was hosted there on his land, as was our last morning session. He is the spokesperson for the community. His farm hosts many important legacies in the community, as he often pilots agricultural and other projects that are later taken up by other community members.

Legacy Sites and Cultural Events/Legacies: meaningful legacy sites that were included as part of the workshop in Wiensa include: The Local School; Temple Grounds/Forest/Ancient City; Manora Dance Center; Shadow Puppetry School; Herbal Medicine Center, and Seniors Center.

Participants

Workshop participants consisted mainly of the leadership of the community from different sectors of governance, as well as the cultural teachers of the community, an important group for the community work on local wisdom and culture, CYG representatives (who are also from Wiensa), and youth leaders.

Initially, Aeed also planned for us to hold a separate session with the youth of the community. But, due to changes in the school schedule and their involvement in the Annual Manora Dance Ceremony, this session couldn't take place during our time there. Aeed held a session with youth a couple of weeks later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main workshop participants (total of 30 over the full 3 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Community Spokesperson, and our host \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjan Rathawan \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manora Dance Teacher \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-Sufficiency Economy Leader \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nui - CYG Staff, from Wiensa \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shadow Puppet Teacher and Local \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth representative \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Director \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Head of the Village \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Local Municipality Official \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Manora Dance Youth Leader \</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aeed made use of expert facilitation skills to deliver the workshop – perhaps one of the most important factors in transferring the values-based approach to legacies from a workplace, conference, or academic setting, to a community setting. She was able to seamlessly translate the storytelling of community elders into a history of community projects and future work plans. Likewise, she easily facilitated the process of transforming an organic discussion of values into value statements and proto-indicators. Most importantly for the community context, she was able to facilitate the process of crystalizing values into value statements in an organic and non-academic way. Through her method of moving from oral histories to values discussions to photo elicitation to proto indicators, she utilized the GPI Values Tool in a way that maximized richness and minimized jargon that could have been challenging for people with differing levels of formal education. In this way, Aeed valued different types of knowledge and honored the wisdom of elders in the manner they expressed themselves. Still, she wrote their statements down quickly and in such a way that they formed the building blocks of a values-based indicator framework.

Challenges to Facilitation in the Community Context

The GPI Atlantic team noted some unique challenges for local facilitators in applying the GPI Values tools in this community context. Firstly, the importance of respecting cultural norms was very apparent. For example, in this cultural context, a young facilitator would never interrupt an elder in a community, regardless of how long they had been speaking. Doing so would not bode well for the reputation of the process and might inhibit others from feeling comfortable participating. Secondly, in order to make young people, women, or members of other groups feel more comfortable, the workshop was introduced in separated groups. It is often necessary to break into small groups, but it is interesting and important to note that Aeed held workshops with the youth and the elders and teachers separately, even though some sessions involved interchanging. In this way, facilitation of the process must
acknowledge preexisting norms within the community and also work with the cultural context to create space for individuals and groups that may not share freely in a context where the whole community is present. They also reflect the value of the role of the facilitator in making people feel comfortable expressing their values, and adjusting in whatever way necessary to get the most accurate values statements from participants.

**Storytelling in the Community Context: Eliciting Values**

In the community context, storytelling was key to both eliciting values and assessing legacies. Through the process of sharing oral histories and allowing significant time for that sharing process, participants utilized forms of communication that felt meaningful to them in their cultural context, such as analogy and metaphor, but were still able to articulate their community values, i.e. through examples, in ways that the facilitator could jot down as values and value statements.

**Storytelling in the Community Context: Legacies**

Storytelling enabled participants to express their values within the context of their own personal and communal histories. In this way, the elders, leaders, and cultural stewards and teachers of the community were able to look at the outcomes of their community work through a values lens to reveal significant legacies that would be amiss from simply listing outcomes. For example, self-reliance was identified as a value early on, and stories about their work to set up a vocational school, teach farming and forestry, and create youth employment through eco-tourism, as well as transitioning from cultural events into an ongoing living museum, all contribute to the broader value-based legacy of a sustainable and self-reliant community.

**The Usefulness of the GPI Values Tools for Revealing Legacies of Asset-based Community Development through a Values Lens**

Community members, workshop participants, Aeed, and Creative Youth Group volunteers and staff, as well as the GPI Atlantic/TVS team, were all astounded at the impact the GPI Values tools had on community members’ view of their work. While local wisdom had long been identified as a guiding principle and goal for community work in Wiensa, the values workshop enabled community members to unpack that term and discuss what it meant to them in their community work, and consequently crystalize their values and community goals and aspirations in the process. In this way, the local wisdom legacy was disaggregated into more specific guiding principles for planning future work in the community.

Looking at legacies through a values lens did not only impact the future of the community but also how community members reflected on the past. Creating a framework of shared values and looking at past outcomes and ongoing work through a values lens showed how the legacy of their values and work extend beyond individual projects - that their aspiration for holistic development based on local wisdom was being realized collectively. Despite continuous collaboration and communication within the community, their values and legacies beyond specific projects went unexamined prior to the GPI Values workshop in Wiensa. By drawing diagrams, writing up values statements from oral histories, and looking at the shared and not-shared values of the community for all the stakeholders present, an already cohesive group was able to see just how unified they are in their values and aspirations for the community. Participants felt validated and inspired by the process.
Outcomes: Community Values and Value Statements/ Proto Indicators:

Considerable segments of this report have already addressed the importance of facilitation in the community context for moving from a discussion around values into value statements in the form of proto-indicators. However, the quotes below show just how closely the finalized (though roughly translated) values statements follow the trajectory of community values that began in the storytelling and sharing with community elders on the workshop’s first day.

**Values from Storytelling and Initial Values Elicitation**

*“We give knowledge. We educate the drug user(s) who are the youth. To talk to them, listen to them, give them opportunity. Return them to society”*

The word in Thai has this meaning: “Bringing all the hearts of the people together, many, many, hearts, hundreds of hearts being in one place. So, this community has become like the role model community”

*“To give the knowledge to the student and at the same time to give the love to the student”*

*“The youth and adult help together. It’s also the space of the young people to come and learn and have this volunteer spirit. Start by giving small thing. Helping.”*

*I want to conserve the local wisdom from the ancestor - the older generation”*

**List of Prioritized Value Statements (translated) (result of dotmocracy exercise)**
1. Parents, community leaders, participate to cultivate the communities [with the goal that]: Everyone feel power for themselves and power for the community

2. Elders and Teachers pass on local wisdom knowledge and pass on the wisdom of the land to the younger generation

3. Young people conserve and continue the culture of local wisdom

4. Everyone in the community helps each other to save the culture, continue to preserve the culture, arts, local way of life

5. Community members help each other to build a community of happiness

6. Cooperation—help each other to conserve, to take care of the natural resources, environmental sustainability, and also collaborate among friends, brothers, sisters, to save the environment

7. The local wisdom teachers are powerful to be able to pass on the knowledge and the philosophy of the ancestor to the young generations, next, next, and next generation

8. To be able to draw the potential and the value and the good things from the community and to apply [those good things] to the learning process for the younger generation

9. The learning center for happiness as a (“one stop shop”) holistic learning space

10. “River of life” - river is the origin of the life, which is the center of the way of life, cultures. Taking care of the river. The river is the lifeline and also where our cultural roots come from.

11. To use media to be able to share the story of the community to the outsiders, to the larger scale community/society

Outcomes: Tangible and intangible legacies

The focus of the workshop in Wiensa was to identify legacies from the last ten years of efforts to revitalize local wisdom in the community. Ten years ago, a group of cultural teachers/local wisdom leaders formed and partnered with the leadership at various levels of governance in the community. Together, they have striven to develop their community in accord with local wisdom and revitalize the culture and traditional knowledge of Wiensa. The movement and reach of the projects has grown and grown and is now influencing many other communities in Southern Thailand as Wiensa becomes recognized as a model community. Aeed has been involved with this community since its early work to promote local wisdom. As the head of culture for a consortium of CSOs and youth groups in the fourteen provinces of Southern Thailand, The Creative Youth Group (CYG) has been the ideal partner for Wiensa as it has grown its local wisdom community.

The “Tangible Outcomes” section below outlines most of their initiatives in the last ten years. These legacies, as well as further, intangible, legacies were identified during the workshop as well as through additional data analysis through the thematic coding of legacies.

Tangible Outcomes and Legacies

In preparing the workshop, the CYG and Wiensa community had identified a number of legacies sites and activities that offered insight into the many tangible outcomes and legacies from community work. These were thus integrated these as part of the activities. The table below summarizes legacy activities that were identified prior to the workshop, and then additional ‘tangible legacies’ identified from the workshop.
**Legacy sites identified and integrated into workshop:**

- The Temple and Temple Grounds/ Forest/Ancient City
- Manora Dance Center and related activities. Dance curriculum to be spread to schools in other communities and the learning center (more than 50 locations in last two years)
- Shadow Puppetry School and Arts centre, and related activities
- Herbal Medicine Center

**Local School:** changes to local school curriculum and practice: incorporating local wisdom into traditional curriculum from the state, so that local students know their own community's culture and history (i.e. on medicinal plants, making Manora dress outfits, beading), learning to make Manora dress outfits. Dance curriculum to be spread to schools in other communities and the learning center (more than 50 locations in last two years)

**Local School Farm:** students learn aquaculture, farming, forestry techniques at elementary and middle school level

**Seniors Center:** health classes and activities for seniors in the community

**Other tangible legacies identified from Wiensa work:**

- Fostering of Livelihood development through farm, forestry, and tourist training programs
- Fostering of community self-sufficiency: i.e. Goat farming, organic farming training, aquaculture
- Starting cultural learning programs – where youth and local people more generally, learn local wisdom and local history, such as the history of the relics
- Community learning center
- Grants, (community/ government financial support)
- Festival place (building and improving historic site)
- Holding frequent festivals and large annual festivals
- Learning garden/ Farm - pilot projects around the farm.
- Vocational Training Institute
- Learning spaces throughout community
- (Ongoing) Living Museum Project
- PAR and other Research Projects, PAR/ Community-based research training in Community from CYG
- Youth Sports Activities
- Youth drug rehab facilities/ activities
- Shadow puppetry spreading to other schools across south Thailand (25 schools last year)
- Poetry workshops spreading to other regions across south Thailand (15 schools last year)
- Local Wisdom Botany encyclopedia
- Creating outcomes and reporting to give provincial government, encourage funding of similar community-lead initiatives

**Less tangible cultural legacies**

In preparation for the workshop, Aeed produced an *illustration of the Wiensa community and its work*. This was used to inspire storytelling, and mapping values and legacies onto actual activities or places. This was a tangible
artefact produced through the workshop process and kept by the community, as well as a way to ground less ‘tangible’ legacies in relation to actual programs, activities, places and feelings.

While participant recognition and discussion of legacies was a focus in the workshop and site visits, the identification and thematic grouping of more intangible legacies occurred through a later analysis of the rich data the workshop generated. What follows is a categorized list of thematic legacy codes based on the findings from the community visits, and, where applicable, the GNH3 legacies identified throughout the workshop in Chiang Mai.

Varying levels of tangibility are present in a broad spectrum of legacies. For example, direct community project outcomes listed as ‘legacy sites’ are at the highly tangible end of the spectrum. The Manora Dance Center is highly tangible as an actual physical center where you can visit and local youth can come to learn the ancient art of Manora Spiritual Dance. However, there are many less tangible legacies that extend beyond the creation of the center. During one photo elicitation session, an eighteen-year-old woman, the Manora Dance youth leader, expressed the pride she felt for herself from learning Manora and the opportunities it had afforded her. Holding a photograph from a performance of the Wiensa Manora Dance Troupe at the Local Wisdom Center in Chiang Mai, she said:

“Starting from myself as a small girl, learning the Manora dance until now, I have learned a lot and become proud of myself. In this photo, I performed in Chiang Mai, and I never thought in my life I would have the chance to go to Chiang Mai. So, I feel happy and I feel proud.” Legacy code #48 - (IMG_0401.MOV)
Youth feeling pride in their community and culture, and having the option to continue to have opportunities while living at home, in the community, was consistently cited as both a value and legacy of the work of the community throughout the findings. For this reason, the thematic legacy code, YTH-STAY, was developed to code for this legacy throughout the data. The outcomes from the workshop, legacy sites, and field notes were coded for many other legacies as well. Additional legacies will undoubtedly reveal themselves as the rich outcomes of the community visits are reviewed further. The quote above reveals how one phrase can contain multiple legacies. Another possible legacy code that has emerged from the findings and is worth exploring further is the legacy of Pride in one’s identity and community.

A further review of the legacy coding for CYG and Wiensa community done by GPI Atlantic researchers shows that Community Growth (COM-GROW), Knowledge of Local Wisdom (LW-KNOW), and Intergenerational exchange, communication and learning (Inter-GEN) are the most important legacies from the community project. Below are a few quotes to illustrate these:

“The youth and the network here work to support the local community, the culture. So, they support the young people to work on supporting the local wisdom. And they have the plan to do more. And getting the funds. (laughter, muffled discussion in Thai). Translation: “plan and budget” Local Government Official

“The youth and adult help together. It’s also the space of the young people to come and learn and have this volunteer spirit. Start by giving small thing. Helping.” Manora Dance Teacher

“The idea of the project is to keep the herbal medicines, plants, in this area. Which is very interesting and related to the work that they do (in the community). To bring back what we have in the community. We did the research together. We look for (plants) and go to find community healer.”

Member of Herbal Medicine Centre

“They raised the idea of urban planning for Wiensa. For this community, no factory. If someone want to build a house, no more than 3 floors and no shopping mall and no 7/11, like that. Because they want people to eat their own food, to maintain the environment, culture, the way of life.” Head of Village

Other materials include footage of young men perform lyrical comedic poetry and dance during Manora ceremony in the forest (IMG_0320.MOV).

Other evidence of legacies in relation to these themes includes ancient relics of Wiensa: Shiva and Buddha statues, ancient pottery, old river port, old festival site and where next festivals will occur and living history project. These relics and the living history of the town was very important to workshop participants: related to the value of local wisdom and cultural heritage, this is a legacy of their own efforts to revitalize the community, teach traditions, and increase awareness of history of the community. Most of the relics in best condition were taken to Bangkok by the Department of Culture to be displayed in a national museum. The community has done its best to self-organize and preserve the ancient ruins that remain and hope to do much more in this regard in the future.
Preliminary Example: Mapping of Values onto Legacies for Community Work of Wiensa (& CYG):

Below, we provide an example of how the values elicited in the community workshop using the GPI Values tools and processes, can be mapped onto the asset-based community development outcomes and legacies identified by Wiensa community members, and facilitated by CYG. In the workshop, and during the site visits to important development projects and community resources, participants discussed and related the following values, tangible outcomes and legacies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Young people conserve and continue the culture of local wisdom in Wiensa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manora Dance Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shadow Puppetry School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local School Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legacies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTH-STAY</td>
<td>Youth feel empowered to stay in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-GEN</td>
<td>Intergenerational exchange/communication/learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIDE</td>
<td>Youth and people of all ages feel proud of themselves and their community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value, *Young people conserve and continue the culture of local wisdom in Wiensa*, was expressed by community members of all ages and highly prioritized as a shared value. As such, it is unsurprising that several concrete outcomes (i.e. the development of the Manora Dance Center, Shadow Puppetry School, and Local School Project) are geared specifically at putting that value into practice.

The value itself goes deeper than any of those specific outcomes, yet those outcomes are actions that fulfill that value. It also became clear how the value leads and follows on not only certain tangible outcomes, but also
intangible legacies that extend beyond specific outcomes. Participants suggested that the Manora Dance Center, Shadow Puppetry School, and Local School Project not only offered youth opportunities to learn about and preserve forms of local wisdom; These opportunities empowered youth to want to stay in their community (YTH-STAY), created strong and ongoing learning connections between generations (INTER-GEN), and fostered a sense of community pride in youth (Pride).

Is there a way to measure the broad impact of that value? And, can we look at the impact of outcomes in the community beyond their immediately tangible impact? The answer is yes. Starting from values enables community members to assess both the outcomes and legacies of their shared community values. Using a values lens to assess legacies results in findings that go beyond immediately tangible outcomes. For example there may be many reasons that the Wiensa community values young people continuing the culture of local wisdom, but many of those reasons may be hard to identify or articulate in a tangible way. Just as many of the Manora Dancers know that the Dance Center helps them in more ways than teaching them steps. By assessing legacies of the community work through a values lens, those broader, less tangible impacts, can be revealed, such as, youth feeling proud of their culture and identity, or youth staying in the community. Intangible legacies, such as these, have been identified through the community workshop and data analysis that followed, and can be seen in the “Examples of Legacies” Table above as well as Annexe 1: Coding of data from Aeed’s community visit.

Mapping Values onto Legacies graphic:

The image below illustrates another way of looking at the relationships between values, tangible outcomes and legacies, and intangible legacies in the Wiensa asset-based community development context.
CASE STUDY 2 – The Young Organic Farmers and Consumers Network, Maetha River Valley, Lamphun Province, Northern Thailand

Introduction and Background

Ying Prenttiporn Jim (hereinafter referred to as Ying) attended the GPI Values and Legacies Workshop in Chiang Mai as well as the meditation retreat ahead of the main program. She volunteered to host a workshop at her farm for the network of young farmers she founded three years ago. An alumnus of TVS’ Youth Return Home program, Ying worked extensively on TVS and partner projects related to sustainable food and farming before returning home to Mae Tha to start her own farm. She networked with other young farmers and formed a powerful force to fight unwanted developments, like a proposed incinerator that would pollute the river, and spread awareness of sustainable food. Her network founded the first organic market in the province early last year in Lamphun town, the provincial capital.

Ying organized and facilitated the workshop with assistance from P’Oun of the Northern Development Fund. She implemented GPI Values tools in a workshop that convened representative members from the network she founded, The Young Organic Farmers and Consumers Network (YOFCN) for food security in the Maetha River Valley. Ying’s network aims to promote food safety and security in the Maetha River Valley region by reducing pesticide use, spreading awareness, providing access to safe food, and protecting the Maetha River Watershed – the source of water for farms in the region. The network consists of 14 farms and 5 consultant organizations.

Overview of the legacies workshop with the YOFCN

The workshop took place on Ying’s farm near Tha Khum Ngoen village in Mae Tha District, Lamphun Province, about one hour from Lamphun town. Named after the river, Mae Tha is also the name of the district within Lamphun province where Ying’s farm is.
Ying and her network, with the help of a GPI Volunteer who went to her farm at the end of the Chiang Mai workshop, built a mud house, roofed outdoor space, outdoor kitchen, and toilets to serve as the hub of the network. Ying actually lives with her family on a farm about half an hour away. But she grows many of her crops on this land and it is the meeting place for young farmers.

Workshop participants visited a local school in Mae Tha district – a legacy site - to see the work they are doing with their students, teachers, parents, and neighbors to promote organic farming, learning about local food, and reviving local wisdom traditions.

There was a total of 18 participants: consisting of 6 farmers, 4 mothers and 2 volunteer graduates.

Adapting the workshop to the community context

In Ying’s network and community of the Maetha River Valley, mapping was an essential tool for both articulating values and assessing legacies. While Ying’s workshop was different from Aeed’s in that she was conducting the values workshop with the members of her network, rather than community members from a village or township. Ying’s network is still locally embedded in the Maetha River Valley. The network also has a couple of members from regional organizations, such as The Agrarian Reform and Rural Development Organization and The Northern Thailand Development Fund.

Ying points to locations of farms and activities of the network on a hand drawn map of the Maetha River Valley
Many of the activities, from introductions, to reflecting on legacies, began with looking at a topographical map of the Maetha River Valley. Participants first identified themselves as from upstream, downstream, near or far from the riverbanks, and then proceeded to explain their background or their work with the network. The network’s focus is on creating food security in the region and supporting safe (organic) food production and consumption throughout the river valley. The shared values of the network were all related to the welfare of the river valley. In this way, both personally and professionally, workshop participants seamlessly integrated environmental and social values and goals. The way that they framed their values as a network, assessed legacies, and planned future work were all oriented around the geography of their community: The Maetha River Valley.

As mentioned in the section on Aeed’s community visit, in order to make young people, women, or other groups feel more comfortable the facilitators in both community visits sometimes separated them into groups. Ying held one gender-segregated session: even though both the female and male groups came back to present to everyone, Ying and the participants felt it was important to let men and women look at the values separately, so that they could allow their different views to emerge and count toward the outcome of the workshop.

In this way, facilitation of the process must acknowledge preexisting norms within the community and also work with the cultural context to create space for individuals and groups that may not share freely in a context where the whole community is present. This example underscores the importance of skilled facilitators in community workshops, where a deep understanding of the local cultural context is key to successful values elicitation.

In this way, the facilitator acts as a bridge between people and groups with different identities, backgrounds, or experiences. Ying facilitated communication between CSOs, farmers, academics, and indigenous elders with different lexicons, languages, and manners of expression. She encouraged them to express the values in their heart, and together they created a framework, which truly reflects their shared values as a network.

The Usefulness of the GPI Values Tools for Revealing Legacies of Asset-based Community Development through a Values Lens in Lamphun

Network members, additional workshop participants, Ying and the organizing staff, as well as the GPI Atlantic/TVS team, were all astounded at the impact the GPI Values tools had on how the network conceived of their past and future work. While they had all been working toward the same basic goals of food safety and security and protecting the Maetha River Valley, until the workshop, they hadn’t seen the connections between their projects, or the impact of the network. The GPI Values Tool enabled network members to review the timeline of past work and see how each activity from one member related to related actions both past and present and the values of the network as a whole. Seeing the connectedness of all the projects and activities revealed less tangible legacies, such as independence for young farmers, pride in their home and heritage, and the ability to stay in their home and not be forced to work in the cities, far away from their families and nature. They felt proud at all they had accomplished in just three short years and it provided some relief in the face of the many obstacles still ahead of them.

However, looking at legacies through a values lens not only affected also how members of the network reflected on the past. Reviewing the past legacy helped to identify how past projects flow into future streams of work and creating a framework of shared values greatly assisted them in planning and prioritizing future work. In fact, despite continuous collaboration and communication within the network, the GPI Values workshop at Ying’s was the first multi-day meeting they had with a full host of members. By drawing diagrams, writing up values statements from oral histories, and looking at their timeline, members realized just how important this network is to their continued work and both their personal goals. The workshop really gelled this relatively young network into a stronger and more cohesive working group. Many participants intended to just attend the first day but stayed for the entire three day workshop because they were so inspired by the tool and excited to strengthen their network.
In fact, the GPI team stayed five extra hours to help complete their natural mud meeting house – a tangible legacy for the network, and this workshop.

Outcome: Community values

Values of the Network and Value Statements/Proto Indicators

Value statements from the workshop are listed below. The first list is from an earlier session (the Timeline Activity) and are demonstrable examples of the value that emerge in conjunction with legacies. The second list is the outcome of a clustering exercise following the prioritization of value statements on the third day. These two lists illustrate the way the values of the network became more specific and measurable but still reflect the shared values present in their work.

Values from Timeline Activity in Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People working on different initiatives come together to form the movement</td>
<td>Combine research body of knowledge with locally generated knowledge- knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our space and market are a place for sharing and to learn about food security</td>
<td>Apply research methods to common social problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We build relationships between producers and consumers (of organic local food)</td>
<td>Collective action for the community (which is based in wisdom/local wisdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give awareness to consumers about food, including supporting the Thai governments health promotion and wellbeing initiative, So SO SO (in Thai)</td>
<td>Restore local culture and support local food system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[we are] a network of people who care about their health</td>
<td>Support youth to come home/ stay in local communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be watchdogs for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage the media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Values after Prioritizing and Clustering:

- Value of Producing organic vegetables: creating safe food
- Saving seeds: saving money and preserving local seeds
- River and Soil Management: Enough water and enough good soil for production. Good food production base
- Promoting No chemical use: good for the grower, consumer and no harm to environment
- Advocacy Campaigning, i.e. on GMOs and Chemical Pesticides and Climate Change.
- (Supporting) Good Policy: the policy from the government which responds to the needs of the organic farmers in the community
- Food Processing – You have to find a market
- Promoting knowledge about local seasonal food in the community. Including Creating a Seasonal Food Calendar in the community
- Marketing to inform consumers where they can buy organic food (at the Lamphun Market)
Market prices reflect Fair trade and social justice: Sharing the benefit according to the rules of the people in the community

Benefit Sharing System: Starting from the costs of production. How much you invest in your food production. Then the price from the product that you sell. Than the consumer can buy and the producer can get enough profit. Different from capitalist market where profit only goes to investor

Not only benefit but also knowledge is shared between consumers and farmers Building relationships between producers and consumers

Sharing and Caring: creating merit and sharing it with others. Sharing healthy food with others.

Social Awareness: being an active citizen for social awareness

Outcome: Tangible and intangible legacies:

Starting from Values and looking at Legacies of the Network

Timeline Activity: Mapping Values onto Legacies and Legacies from Values

Ying and her team took a unique and innovative approach to assessing legacies in her network. She introduced an activity that combined many elements of what she had learned at the GPI Values and Legacies Workshop in Chiang
Mai and also added new components based on the needs of her network. The following section describes the unique method Ying used to look back at the legacies of her network.

In the image above, the centerline is a timeline from the founding of the network in 2015 through present day 2017 (with the year according to the Thai calendar also denoted). The white cards above are placeholders for the members’ shared values in their activities/work of the network. The colored cards below are placeholders for the actual activities they carried out – the network’s projects and initiatives. The arrows and placement of the colored cards below the timeline indicate when in the last three years of the network’s history those activities took place.

This activity was specifically geared toward revealing values that emerged from their work together and may not have been represented in the earlier values-elicitation activities.

Ying introduced the timeline activity and then asked the participants to split into groups, according to the work they do with the network. Group 1 consisted of farmers/producers and Group 2 consisted of members working on the research, policy, and advocacy side.

**Legacies from Timeline Activity in Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Market</td>
<td>1. Advocacy for no-GMO law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Community-based research</td>
<td>2. Community-Based Research projects on food security and sustainable agriculture with farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Integrated research which includes principles of</td>
<td>3. Food security based natural resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Local wisdom</td>
<td>4. Community Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Buddhism</td>
<td>a. Land bill/rights policy and land bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Local Agriculture</td>
<td>Some protesters that supported land title bill have been jailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Movement to create food safety zone (in Maetha River Valley)</td>
<td>5. Youth Return Home = Agents for Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. New market in Lamphun (organic market)</td>
<td>6. Networking with other Networks and Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Youth Return Home</td>
<td>a. Working with communities across Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. More steps taken on research</td>
<td>b. Encouraging agricultural enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Little Chefs Program</td>
<td>c. Encouraging organic farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Teaching youth and children gardening, cooking etc. as part of local organic market</td>
<td>7. Agency and NGO partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Provincial arbitration organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Published Encyclopedia of Local Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Collecting Knowledge from Each village (for this encyclopedia and after for future work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. More Safe Foods in Community</td>
<td>10. Innovation for social enterprise Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Awareness of those foods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Working with local school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lists above demonstrate the tight relationship between values and legacies, cultural legacies and tangible actions. In this way, Ying, and her network, mapped their values onto legacies in the timeline activity. But earlier sessions in the workshop focused on eliciting and discussing shared values. In this way, the network started from their values and then looked at legacies of the network through a values lens.

The shared values of the network are undoubtedly reflected in the tangible outcomes of their work. But using a values lens to assess legacies results in findings that go beyond immediately tangible outcomes. Varying levels of tangibility are present in a broad spectrum of legacies. Concrete projects carried out by the network, such as the creation of a weekly organic market are at the highly tangible end of the spectrum.

The thematic analysis of the workshop data helped to identify further less tangible legacies. For example, Youth Stay is the code for the legacy of youth being able to stay in their home communities. In some ways, Ying’s network is the perfect example of this legacy code as she was able to start the network through first returning to Lamphun with the Youth Return Home Program under TVS. The market is one example of the many ways the network is making it possible for young people to live in rural areas and be self reliant. In fact, they have created safe, fulfilling livelihoods through farming, food processing, and other efforts to restore the local food system and protect the Maetha River from pesticide pollutants. Changing the cultural norm of moving to the city is difficult as a young person. The lack of jobs in rural areas and the cultural stigma of farm labor are big obstacles to overcome. Ying’s network is changing perceptions and creating a new labor market for educated young people in her rural region. She has made it possible for more and more young people to return home and help their communities. Changing perceptions is a difficult outcome to capture. By starting from the shared values of the network it is possible to identify important intangible legacies, like youth feeling empowered to stay or return to their community. When reflecting on the legacies of the network, one participant remarked:

“2016 was the start of the project of brave Youth Who Returned Home. They opened a local market. They started a research project about the young people in the program. They started a research project with the cooks from restaurants for the Lampun market. They started a movement of protecting the safety of food sold in the community.” Ying

The above quote illustrates the broad ripple effects of youth returning home, and the severe importance of this issue to the people of Lamphun Province, and rural Thailand more broadly.

By assessing legacies of the network through a values lens, those broader, less tangible impacts, can be revealed. Another example is the cultural legacy of putting a higher value on local wisdom knowledge. In other words, increasing understanding of local wisdom traditions, e.g. farming in a sustainable way, saving local seeds of native species, or learning about cultural heritage, i.e. the meaning of the names of local dishes. This is just one example of the relationships that can be easily seen between values, legacies, and the tangible outcomes they encompass.

An additional theme that was important for the YOFCN was sharing: the sharing of food, knowledge, merit, and the promotion of the culture of sharing

“Maetha is the food producer, meaning people who find the foods from the forest, the farmers, the food processors and the food production process. In a local market, trading and sharing to other people. Once food from the production base arrives in the market, it arrives to the consumers. The last one is the coordination center for their work to coordinate to influence policy. The above one is common value, our shared values, food chain security in our communities.” Ying

“The culture of charity and exchange is connected to all four parts (of our work).” Pho (farmer)

Further legacies include the building of Networks and Community Resilience, for instance:
“We are dealing with revolving funds, by linking with NGO and funding agencies to support in the form of revolving funds for the rural communities. We have cooperated with higher organizations, SA networks of Thailand, sustainable agriculture foundation.” Network member

“In 2017 we started to build a strategy plan, a 3 year strategy plan, for the health (assembly) and seeking assistance from other agencies for strengthening our effort to do the job. So we hope our 3 year strategy plan will be fruitful. We are dealing with Provincial Ethnic organization (PEO). We have worked with PEO on a directory of local wisdom to become an encyclopedia of local wisdom in this village.” Network member

The list below illustrates one method of viewing legacies through a values lens:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Restore local culture and support local food system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Tangible Outcomes** | Local Wisdom Encyclopedia  
Community-Based Research projects on food security and sustainable agriculture with farmers  
Integrated research which includes principles of  
- Local wisdom  
- Buddhism  
- Local Agriculture |
| **Legacies** | LW-KNOW Knowledge of local wisdoms - increased understanding of cultural heritage, local art forms, knowledge of place/local environment |
Notes on usefulness, scalability and transferability of the values-based approach

9. Materials developed to adapt the values-based approach to the context of community-led development for wellbeing (GNH)

In addition to the notes on co-design above, specific outcomes for adapting the approach include the co-design of a participatory training approach co-designed by GPI Atlantic, University of Brighton and TVS. This included deliberate space for participants to contribute, learn from each other, and learn from local community projects (see Annexe 1 for programme).

Materials were adapted from previous activities with WeValue and the Starting from Values project, and collated into a resource pack for participants (see project website resources section). This included a newly co-developed list of triggers developed from the WeValue approach, but specifically for the context of GNH and their use in the Mekong (initially) (see Annex 6 for 3 successive versions, including the latest one, version 3).

Further materials were developed following the workshops (see Annex 12) – further materials may still be developed in conversation with participants and based on need.

10. Expertise gained by community partners and participants

The participatory and action-based learning approach applied to the training program revealed some expertise gained by community partners and participants.

Phase 1

The table below summarises different expertise gained by all project partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expertise gained</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using photo-elicitation</td>
<td>GPI Atlantic co-facilitators</td>
<td>GPI Atlantic partners and 2-3 participants had extensive experience using photo elicitation in their youth facilitation work and research projects, but not in the context of developing values-based indicators. At least 4 participants reported that they already had ideas of how to integrate this method into their activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical considerations in research and community-led evaluation processes</td>
<td>Participants, University of Brighton co-facilitators</td>
<td>Such a detailed and systematic consideration of ethical issues was new to nearly all participants. While some already consider ethical issues due to the nature of their work, they had not reflected on this in the context of research or data collection. Adding a substantial component on Research Ethics before conducting the rest of the training with participants was a new addition to previous training provided by U of B partners on the We Value tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing values-based proto-indicators</td>
<td>GPI Atlantic co-facilitators, Participants</td>
<td>Statements developed were used as examples for identifying criteria for the formulation and development of values-based proto-indicator statements by the participants (see Annexe 5 for the full list of criteria). This learning was then applied when participants were asked to develop values-based indicators for their own projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritisation methods</td>
<td>UoB and GPI Atlantic co-facilitators, Participants</td>
<td>The workshop gave participants an opportunity to learn from each other. While some participants offered methods or had used some, none had done so in a context of conversations around values, and most participants said that these methods were new for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustering</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing legacies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with values in South-East Asian context</td>
<td>UoB and GPI Atlantic co-facilitators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness-based approach to WeValue indicator development (GNH inspired)</td>
<td>UoB and GPI Atlantic co-facilitators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering WeValue approach in a youth/community-development context</td>
<td>UoB and GPI Atlantic co-facilitators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A systemic understanding of values</td>
<td>GPI Atlantic co-facilitators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By deconstructing the meaning of values into separate statements, the participants also started to see the connections between the different values, and how the separation into statements is in fact a tool, something to facilitate discussion and measurement rather than a way to define values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It should be noted that GPI Atlantic has a long history of basing their community indicator work off of community values (See for example, their community GPI work in Kings County and Glace Bay, Nova Scotia). However, these values were elicited from communities by having almost every community member fill in an extensive survey. It is the use of the face-to-face, collaborative, values elicitation processes in the We Value approach that will affect our community indicator development methods in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 2
The research team received **post-workshop feedback from 5 participants.** 4 said they were already using the training in their own work:

- Values and legacies/ Planning Legacies Work and Organic Agriculture village (Maeta village)
- I used similar tool to formulate the common and shared vision and values of one local youth group during my facilitation. And I have to share with my senior staff whenever we come across staff's performance issues with our core value to practices it practically.
- Eliciting Values ..Dot Mercury..Photo Eliciting...Share value

All respondents mentioned they would like **further support** to develop the methods they learned in the workshop, specifically:
• Develop fuzzy framework(s)
• Our organizational core value and shared values and set the practice indicator.
• Fuzzy Frame work
• Given an opportunity, I would like to slowly apply all the methods that I have learned during the workshop in the programs/activities that I am involved in. During the whole workshop, I was more interested in value elicitation methods that we learned such as photo elicitation, storytelling, drawing, fuzzy framework, etc. I would like to have more information on this method if possible and try and implement it in the projects/programs.

Further training was identified for the following areas:
• peace building and negotiation
• Value into practices.
• And GPI orientation and ways to develop index and indicators.
• any topic which would help in training Youth and creating Gakidh Village in the community
• As I have mentioned above, I would like to know more on the values elicitation methods

In relation to networking, 4 of the 5 respondents said they thought it was useful to meet other people and were still in touch:

I connect with Netting and Maetha village because I want to bring the Lao young organic farmer to visit there and learn from their farm

meeting and sharing with other friends had added new ideas and confidence in my project back at home,...

Through this workshop, I got to meet many new people and learned about their work. I also got to learn some of the similar activities we all were doing as a NGO/social worker. Even after the workshop was over, I keep in touch with some of the participants and get updates on the activities/events they are doing through Facebook. We also share each others Facebook pages and create awareness.
Impact

- This project is enhancing and extending internationally the pathways to impact identified in the ‘Starting from Values: Evaluating Intangible legacies’ project by working with a new partner to demonstrate the relevance of the values-based approach to capturing legacies in the context of asset-based community development based in principles of action research.

- The project is taking place in a context where multiple languages co-exist and translation and transposing have been needed, which has demonstrated the usefulness of the approach in a most challenging environment.

- The project was designed to take advantage of the networked structure of GPI Atlantic as an organisation as well as of the projects that they deliver, ensuring the work delivered through this project has a broader international reach than the specific case of Thailand.

Collaborators and participants have benefitted from the project in the following ways:

- TVS youth leaders and key staff have a new approach to evaluating legacies of their projects.

- The workshop gave participants a common vocabulary to speak about values and values-based processes and has given them new tools to integrate into their work.

- A number of participants noted that the tools they acquired in the workshop would be very relevant to their work with youth and intended to apply them in their contexts.

- Participants appreciated the discussion of ethics in participatory research and said that this would influence how they carried out research in future.

- Participants stated that they had been very inspired by the workshop and field visits and this would provide additional motivation and food for thought in their personal lives and their work.

- Both workshop and field visits stimulated reflection about the role of values within participants’ own work and that of their organisations. One leader of an organisation (Myanmar 2) expressed the intention to use what he had learned to work with the staff of his organisation to rethink their overall approach.

- The workshop and field visits allowed participants to explore the concept of ‘happiness’ in some depth, noting its encapsulation of wellbeing, simplicity, self-determination, relationships and spirituality. Several people said that they would incorporate happiness more explicitly into their work and noted that the GNH framework integrated with the value-based approaches would serve to effectively implement this objective. Participants from one organisation (Myanmar) expressed an intention to use GNH domains to frame their forthcoming assembly.

- Bhutanese participants who work with GNH as a national strategy said that the workshop and field visits had stimulated them to think more deeply about GNH. The values lens served as a vehicle to reinvigorate the concept.
Longer-term benefits:

- Project beneficiaries and participants within villages may gain insights into their values and the legacies of these projects.

- GPI Atlantic research staff and volunteers, as well as TVS youth leaders, will develop expertise in using a new values-based tool for community-level assessment of their projects.

- GPI Atlantic and TVS may be able to demonstrate the cultural legacies of the GNH youth movement and GNH aligned community initiatives to other organisations, funders, governments by lending authority to different forms of knowledge.

- GPI Atlantic has the ingredients for developing a new approach that can bridge community and regional-level assessments of community wellbeing.

- The University of Brighton will benefit from wider impacts of their work and insights into the usefulness of this approach for practitioners in community-led development.

- The benefits for GPI Atlantic and their partners in Bhutan, Thailand and other countries is key to enhancing the impact of the work by ensuring continued and further use of values-based approaches in their own projects in these and other regions as well as dissemination to key development agencies and organisations. This is key to potentially transforming current approaches to assessing progress at the community level globally and community partners adopting a new mechanism for evidencing the benefits of asset-based community development approaches and helping to move towards such approaches being standard ‘development’ practice in future. In addition, ensuring real benefit for all community partners and participants in their programmes is an important dimension of our ethical commitment to doing research with communities for mutual benefit. Furthermore, it speaks to an ethical question which the original research on legacies seeks to address, namely shifting authority so that communities themselves can take charge of evaluating the cultural legacies of their programmes and collect their own data.
Learning from project team

This section summarises some of the learning from the project team after reflecting on the training process.

a) Legacies vs. evaluation. Legacies as difficult to translate.

b) GNH values framework? Works best from perspective of GNH lens (more general and directly relevant to community context) Problem of ‘cultural preservation’ (note: rephrased in lens)… GNH coming from Bhutan, very specific view of development and cultural identity.

c) Efficiency? Not the best for youth leadership context. Values take time, don’t want to rush.

d) We’ve learned indirectly where slow learning and happening over and in-between other events. Similar to ARN. Meditation.

e) Usefulness of the triggers?? Vs elicitation. How people use or interact with trigger statements, challenges of wording.

f) Community standards >> elicitation to trigger statements. Reflections from Hasta and Alana. Importance of trying to lead a bit first before leading a group.

g) Making values statements: easy in English language, separation of concepts rather than systemic way of telling things (like Chinese).

h) Integrating participatory learning – co-design and co-delivery.

i) Completeness – need for facilitation.

j) Clarity of process; need for more information upfront and a guide to the process.

   a. This relates to the context of working with community development leaders – they are familiar with many of the methods employed in eliciting and refining value statements. It’s important to tailor the experience to their expertise for them to stay engaged.
Integration and dissemination

Dr. Rebecca Elmhirst from the University of Brighton and Professor Bao from Fudan University are two project advisors. In conversation with the co-investigators they have made recommendations on the relevance and usefulness of the approach for future work in their expertise areas of Southeast Asia (and Indonesia in particular), and mainland China.

Comments and recommendations from Dr Elmhirst

Dr Elmhirst’s research focuses on the links between environmental change, migration and natural resource governance, with a particular emphasis on gender. She has experience working with various communities in Indonesia and Malaysia, including complex contexts relating to intensive oil palm cultivation.

- **Cultural and religious contexts – Buddhism**

  The context of everyday religious practices in a broad, cultural, sense seems important to the success and outcomes of this project. The Thai context also has a broadly Buddhist cultural context which is a point of connection with the work on values (and particularly those relating to GNH and genuine progress) which might not be present if we were to develop this in Indonesia or Malaysia. This is not religion in a formal sense, but everyday embodied ways of being.

  It would be very interesting to do this in a culturally Muslim context. Indonesia is fascinating for that, it has a Buddhist heritage, but Islam is incredibly strong and there has been a resurgence recently. This also comes through in the way in which community processes are facilitated, for instance when it is done by people from one religious persuasion with groups who are not Muslim. For instance, when looking at values, ‘a god’ is very present and there’s almost a sense of that being the bottom line of values. Also, values are often scripted and there are many references to the Koran. Facilitation of a values process like this would need to be conducted by somebody that is really immersed if not practicing Muslim, as it would mean working through religious leaders as well as other members of the community. Here elements of Aeed’s approach is interesting and important – this is often how gender-related work is facilitated, as long as the separate groups then come together to build some shared language and understanding.

  **Recommendation:** to explore how values-based approaches would work in a culturally Muslim context – but with people from different religious backgrounds and indigenous communities. This would be particularly interesting in relation to facilitation approaches, vocabulary and language.

  Continue to use a model of training + facilitation through local facilitators, having trusted parties be a bridge, help with facilitation and also translate approaches and ways of working.

- **Grounded and community-led indicator development**

  From the comments on the workshop, it seems the elements of the tool and potential training that allows communities and/or organisations to develop and work with these kinds of indicators is very valuable. This is the direction of travel for the sustainable development goals, but this is the kind of work that might allow those SD goals do some good and connect with actual values of people on the ground.

  There is a huge appetite for this kind of work for large number of organisations, for instance working with indigenous groups in Indonesia.
Practical recommendations: to integrate this kind of work into festivities, make it fun and joyful as people often don’t have much time – especially where lots of precarious work is being done.

- Creating shared understanding across groups and in situations of conflict

Although it’s nice to work with communities or organisations that already have shared context and values (even if not articulated), it might be interesting to think about how this could be useful in working in situations of conflict - not necessarily open, can be structural conflicts around land tenure, resources etc. A particular challenge they might have is how to work through hierarchical relationships embedded through contact with corporate structures or governmental institutions that are detached or alien. Work through specific contexts where the community isn’t defined in a geographic or social/ethnic sense but through vertical relationships.

These are contexts that need long-term engagements (over months if not years), finding ways to integrate the sort or work done here with other practices of conflict resolution and finding common language. This echoes comments from several participants in the training in Thailand mentioned that they would be interested to know how this would help in longer-term situations of conflict or where communities, governments and external organisations are trying to resolve issues.

There are tools and approaches that exist, but in the context of Indonesia – and particularly oil palm communities - these are not well used (community development work has been much more mechanistic and focused on building community resilience and empowering communities to know their rights which doesn’t always connect with values because established systems of rights might not value community values; consumer and shareholder-driven actions focus on building Corporate Social Responsibility; and government work is often detached and more of a ‘show and tell’ approach to workshops, not much around building something that can address problems).

This is where the creating common language might be interesting, but as you mentioned this needs good facilitation, which is often undervalued and under-recognised.

Recommendation: to connect with organisations that are already trying to engage in this way, across groups/institutional contexts, putting some big P politics as well as small p politics into the process. Explore what methods are used in structural conflict situations and how the values ‘tool’ here can add to that. Develop and integrate facilitation methods around conflict resolution and creating shared language across very different types of groups.

- Re-introducing conversations around values and working with youth

This kind of work might be particularly important in contexts where so much is driven by money, thinking through values can change people’s mindsets: “one of the things I've found hard in oil palm landscapes people can't think past oil palm anymore and communities are really spiritually damaged”. This kind of work could give space for these sorts of things to be talked about.

Working with young people is a great way to do this, perhaps more open to it and able to be critical – e.g. the ‘youth returning home’. Having learned and been socialised, they are perhaps ready to unlearn some of the things that they have learned. Although they can gain insights from elders, their context is also different (e.g. with the financialization of agriculture and commodification of resources), but working through values might help to see where new values in communities might link to and/or differ from values of elders or certain traditions.
**Recommendation:** to speak with organisations actually doing community organizing in Indonesia and Malaysia, find out what kinds of tools they use...