

Guidance for WSC Index Benchmarking Workshop Note-takers

Note-takers for the WSC Index benchmarking workshop document information for each indicator relating to the polling scores and final scores, scoring justification, including supporting data and the confidence level of the final score. Indicators will be scored at the beginning of the workshop and during the concurrent sessions. Note-taking sheets with tables, headings and space to capture notes, are available for note-takers. The following details defines and describes the information to be documented in the note-taking sheets.

Justification of scores – the rationale for both the polling and final scores. These include comments and explanations from participants to justify the final scores, as decided as a group following discussion. Participants often refer directly to specific detail within the ratings to validate the scores, and explain why the score couldn't be higher or lower e.g. for indicator 1.1 Knowledge, skills and organisational capacity – the rating 3 states “Integrated water-related skills and knowledge are actively maintained and updated across the key water-related organisation in the region. Engineering skills are complemented by other disciplinary skills (for example, landscape and ecology). Some connection(s)/alliance(s) with knowledge brokering organisation(s) is/are in place”. The justification for a rating 3 may be that there are regular capacity building seminars for the industry in the region, but there is a distinct lack of multi-disciplinary teams in building industry for on-ground and the LGA may be very engineering-dominant.

Data availability – the available data to justify the score. Such data sources could include reports, policies, guides maps, surveys, programs, expert knowledge etc. Specific examples of data could include: GIS mapping of active recreational assets and walking distances, community events, programs and partnerships, statistics on potable water supply to different areas within the council region, sustainability and planning policies, a technical expert's knowledge of the drainage systems, its history and how the system currently works etc.

Polling scores – the initial indicator score that participants select when using the live polling system. This process aims to identify what individual participants believe the indicator scores to be prior to discussions with other participants. The number of votes for each rating score (1,2,3,4,5) should be recorded e.g. rating 1 – 2, rating 2 – 5, rating 3 – 7, rating 4 – 4, rating 5 - 2

Final scores – the final indicator score as decided by the group of participants following the polling score and further in-depth discussion. The final score may also be rated in halves e.g. 3 or 3.5

Confidence – the level of confidence in the final score. Measured as low, medium or high, this captures the confidence in the final score decision based on the data availability. A low confidence level may be if there is insufficient data or little expert knowledge available to rate the indicator, a medium level could be

that there is some data and some expert knowledge while a high level could be that there is a significant amount of data and/or expert knowledge available.

Note-takers should also keep time and maintain contact with each other when in session (via sms or similar) to ensure that the indicators for each goal are completed within the designated time slots. This will also provide an opportunity for participants to swap rooms should they prefer to attend the session for a different goal.

It is recommended that note-takers review and become familiar with the indicators and ratings for which they will recording notes, before the workshop.