

Ethics Application

Application ID : ETH22-7211
Application Title : Co-designing Transitions to Bioregionally-Adapted Regenerative Economies
Date of Submission :
Primary Investigator : Prof Cameron Tonkinwise (Chief Investigator)
Other Personnel : Mr Kiran Kashyap (5Research Student)
A/Prof Abby Arwen Mellick Lopes (Co-Supervisor)

Section 1: Ethics Portal

Select your application type

What type of application are you looking for?

Please **do not** change your application type without first consulting with the Ethics Secretariat (9514 9772).*

- New application (including scope-checking for nil/negligible risk research)
- Ratification of existing approval
- Transfer of existing approval
- Evaluation of teaching and learning activities
- Amendment to existing approval
- Program approval

You have selected "new application (including scope checking for nil/negligible risk research)". This option allows you to create a new form. The system will check if your application can be approved by the Faculty or whether it requires full ethics approval by the HREC. Please click "save" before continuing.

What should I know before I start?

Would you like more information on:

- This system
- The ethics process
- Purpose of the ethics review process

Purpose of the Human Research Ethics Review Process

The ethical review process is valuable as it:

- Provides the opportunity to reflect on the research methodology;
- Ensures the research integrity of the work and
- Increases the trust levels of the research participants and the publishers about the output of the research project.

The online ethics application simplifies the process:

- The form is intuitive so you won't need to answer every question just those that are applicable to your research
- Some parts of the form are auto-populated
- You can save the form and return to it later to complete and submit it
- Guidelines and instructions are incorporated into the form
- Reduced paper handling.

Importance of ethics procedures

Regardless of the level of risk, all staff and students are expected to abide by the standards outlined in the National Statement, the Australian Code, and guidelines established by the UTS Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC). It is the responsibility of researchers, both staff and students, to familiarise themselves with these.

Section 1A: Risk evaluation

Risk A

Determining the level of risk and review

- Please answer each question carefully **and consecutively**.
- For assistance with answering these questions please refer to the [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research](#) as per the chapters listed below.
- If you need to contact the [Research Ethics Officer](#) you can call (02) 9514 9772
- Click on the help buttons (?) for more information
- You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button on the left hand side in the toolbar. For further information and help in completing your application go to [our website](#).

Does your research involve:

Projects involving covert observation, active concealment, or planned deception of participants

e.g. covert observation of the hand-washing behaviour of hospital employees, undisclosed role-playing by a researcher, etc. Does NOT include observation in a public place WITHOUT the use of photographs, images, video or audio footage (Chapter 2.3, p.19)

*

- Yes
- No

Targeted recruitment or analysis of data(?) from any of the groups listed below (or where any of these groups are likely to be significantly over-represented in the group being studied)

- Women who are pregnant and the human fetus (Chapter 4.1, p. 61)
- Children and young people (under 18 years) (Chapter 4.2, p. 65)
- People in dependent or unequal relationships (e.g. lecturer/student [except T&L], doctor/patient, employer/employee) (Chapter 4.3, p.68)
- People highly dependent on medical care who may be unable to give consent Chapter 4.4, p.68)
- People with a cognitive impairment, an intellectual disability, or a mental illness (may include the disadvantaged/homeless) (Chapter 4.5, p. 70)
- People who may be involved in illegal activities (including those affected e.g. victims of domestic violence) (Chapter 4.6, p.73)
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples (Chapter 4.7, p.77)

*

- Yes
 No

Targeted recruitment of people in / from countries that score <50 on the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) (check [here](#))

This includes any cohorts from these countries, i.e. it is not restricted to marginalised groups within these countries*

- Yes
 No

Collection, use or disclosure of personal information without consent of the participant(?)

- a record which may include your name, address and other details about the participant (e.g. date of birth, financial information etc.)
- photographs, images, video or audio footage
- fingerprints, blood or DNA samples

*

- Yes
 No

Collection, use or disclosure of health information(?)

- personal information that is information or an opinion about
 - the physical or mental health or a disability (at any time) of an individual; or
 - an individual's expressed wishes about the future provision of health services to him or her, or
 - a health service provided, or to be provided, to an individual or
- other personal information collected to provide, or in providing, a health service, or
- other personal information about an individual collected in connection with the donation, or intended donation, of a individual's body parts, organs, body substances, or
- other personal information that is genetic information about an individual arising from a health service provided to the individual in a form that is or could be predictive of the health (at any time) of the individual or of a genetic relative of the individual, or
- healthcare identifiers

N.B Includes information collected through physiological testing or assessment. Examples include but are not limited to EEG, EMG, BMI, blood pressure, DEXA, etc.*

- Yes
 No

Collection, use or disclosure of sensitive information

Racial, ethnic information, political, religious and philosophical beliefs, sexual activity or identity, and trade union membership

*

- Yes
 No

Activity that potentially infringes the privacy or professional reputation of participants, providers or organisations

e.g. observation in the workplace, collection of commercially confidential information, etc.

Commercially confidential information = Any information which is not in the public domain or publicly available, and where disclosure may undermine the economic interest or competitive position of the owner of the information (TGA adopted definition from European Medicines Agency (EMA)).

N.B. if canvassing opinion via consensus methods i.e. Delphi (?), answer "No" here

*

- Yes
 No

Establishment of a register or databank of identifiable data for possible use in future research projects (Chapter 3.2, p.27) (?)

*

- Yes
 No

Collection, transfer(?) and/or banking of human biospecimens.

e.g. tissue, blood, urine, sputum etc.(?)

*

- Yes
 No

Any significant alteration to routine care or service provided to participants

e.g. deviation from standard care or usual practice

*

- Yes
 No

Prospective assignment of human participants or groups of humans to one or more [health-related interventions](#) to evaluate the effects on health outcomes(?) (Chapter 3.14-3.17) *

- Yes
 No

Potential for participants to experience harm (i.e. anything more than discomfort)(?)

e.g. physical, psychological, devaluation of personal worth, social, economic and/or legal (Chapter 2.1, p.12)

*

- Yes
 No

Risks B

For assistance with answering these questions please refer to the [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research](#) as per the chapters listed below.

Collection, use or disclosure of personal information (?) WITH consent of the participant

e.g. surveys, interviews, focus groups, publication, etc.

N.B. if administering anonymous surveys and you have the participant's contact information, answer "Yes" here

N.B. if canvassing opinion via consensus methods i.e. Delphi (?), answer "No" here

*

- Yes
 No

Involves direct communication or contact with participants (e.g. UTS staff/students, patients, consumers, professionals, industry partners or members of the public, etc.)

e.g. interviews or focus groups, etc (face-to-face, via phone, email, online etc.)

N.B. if canvassing opinion via consensus methods i.e. Delphi (?), answer "No" here

*

- Yes
 No

Involves participants who have a pre-existing relationship with the researcher(s) and/or those involved with recruitment and/or consent

e.g. relative, friend, co-worker, lecturer/student [T&L].

N.B. if canvassing opinion via consensus methods i.e. Delphi (?), answer "No" here

*

- Yes
 No

People unable to give free informed consent due to difficulties in understanding the Information Sheet or Consent Form.

e.g. language difficulties

*

- Yes
 No

People in other countries that score >50 on the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) (check [here](#))

Chapter 4.8, p.80

N.B. if canvassing opinion via consensus methods i.e. Delphi (?), answer "No" here

*

- Yes
 No

Low Risk

Section 2: Project information

Project title

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Application ID (automatically generated):

ETH22-7211

Application Title:*

Co-designing Transitions to Bioregionally-Adapted Regenerative Economies

Please note that the HREC is now granting a standard approval period for the research proposals.

The approval period for your project will be specified in your approval letter. Please also note that research should not commence until ethics approval has been granted. The Committee cannot grant retrospective approval for data that has already been collected.

Ethics category code (automatically selected):*

Human

Is this a resubmission of a previous application?*

- Yes
 No

Is this a pilot study? *

- Yes
 No

Has a pilot study been conducted as part of this project? *

- Yes
 No

Please save and continue to the next page

Consultation

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Have you undertaken any consultation in preparing this application?*

- Yes
 No

Please describe*

I have consulted with my supervisors as well as with colleagues at Regen Sydney and Coalition of Everyone where my research will be conducted.

Please save and continue to the next page

Section 3: Personnel

Investigators

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Are there external investigators or personnel listed on this protocol?*

- Yes
 No

Is this application for a student project?*

- Yes
 No

Student applicants:

1. Please note that once your application is submitted it will go directly to your supervisor and not to the Committee.
2. We **strongly** recommend notifying your supervisor that you have submitted your application in case of any technical issues, to avoid potential delays in the review process.
3. Once your supervisor endorses your application it will go to your Local Research Office for endorsement before coming to the Ethics Secretariat for review.
4. Your electronic application must be endorsed by your supervisor by the [Local Research Office \(LRO\) submission deadline](#).
5. Please also ensure that the Primary AOU at the end of this page is updated to your supervisor's AOU. This will show in the table under 'Internal personnel listed below', once you add them. If you need any assistance with this please contact Research.Ethics@uts.edu.au or call 9514 9772. Please note that this is particularly important if you have a dual role as a staff/student as your application could go to the wrong faculty for review through the automated process.

Positions in the personnel table

Position type:	In the personnel table use the following positions from the drop-down list:
Chief Investigator/Supervisor	1Chief Investigator (students must not be listed as Chief Investigator)
Co Investigator	3Assoc. Investigator
Co Supervisor	Co-Supervisor
Research Student	5Research Student
Project Administrator	7Project Administrator

Note: Further options are available in the drop down list.

Instructions on how to add a person to the personnel table:

1. Click on "Add"
 2. Start typing the details (first name, last name or Staff ID) in the search bar.
 3. Click on "Add selected"
 4. The extra information panel will open, select their position from the drop-down list. If they are the primary contact (e.g. Chief Investigator/Supervisor), tick "Yes" under 'Primary contact' and then select "OK"
- **Student research:** Students must add their supervisors to their application and must mark their primary supervisor as a Chief Investigator and as a primary contact. Students must be listed as "5Research student" under the column 'Position' to ensure the application is properly submitted to their supervisor.
 - **Ratifications/Transfers:** If this list differs from that of the original application, you must provide evidence that any additional investigators have been added via amendment to the lead/external HREC [attach relevant amendments and evidence of approval].

Internal personnel listed on this ethics protocol:*

1	Primary	No
	ID	125218
	Surname	Kashyap
	Given Name	Kiran
	Full Name	Mr Kiran Kashyap
	Position	5Research Student
	Type	External
	AOU	DAB.DIRC (Design Innovation Research Centre)
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Kiran.Kashyap@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	
2	Primary	No
	ID	997061
	Surname	Mellick Lopes
	Given Name	Abby
	Full Name	A/Prof Abby Arwen Mellick Lopes
	Position	Co-Supervisor
	Type	Internal
	AOU	DAB.School of Design
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Abby.MellickLopes@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	
3	Primary	Yes
	ID	020476
	Surname	Tonkinwise
	Given Name	Cameron
	Full Name	Prof Cameron Tonkinwise
	Position	Chief Investigator
	Type	Internal
	AOU	DAB.School of Design
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Cameron.Tonkinwise@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	+61 2 95148366

If any details are incorrect or missing please contact the Ethics Secretariat on (02) 9514 9772 or by [email](#).

Please provide additional (or preferred) contact details of any of the people listed on the project if necessary (4000 character limit)

The details for Kiran Kashyap are incorrect - the staff ID 125218 is no longer in use as the staff contract has expired. This has come up even though this ethics application is being placed through the student account (13789502) on Research Master.
Contact email: kiran@kirankashyap.com OR kiran.kashyap@student.uts.edu.au

Please provide details of any formal qualifications ([REF NS 1.1\(e\)](#)) of each person listed on the project (4000 character limit)*

Cameron Tonkinwise
PhD in Philosophy, Art History and Theory

Abby Mellick Lopes
PhD

Kiran Kashyap
Bachelor of Design
Graduate Certificate in Permaculture Design

Please outline the experience of each person listed on this project relevant to this application (4000 character limit)*

Cameron is an international expert in Design Studies and Transition Design and the Research Director of the Design Innovation Research Centre at UTS. He writes and speaks extensively on the power of design to drive systems-level change to achieve more sustainable and equitable futures. His expertise has reshaped traditional thinking around how designers should be educated, and he has established Design Studies programs at the Parsons School of Design (New York), Carnegie Mellon University (CMU) and UTS, among others, that have transformed international design curricula. More recently, Cameron has emerged as a leading voice in the field of Transition Design, as part of his long-standing research and teaching around Sustainable Design. He was an early champion of the Sharing Economy while taking over the leadership of the EcoDesign Foundation from its founders, Tony Fry & Anne-Marie Willis. He has been on the editorial board of Design Philosophy Papers since 2003 and Design and Culture since 2009; he is also a regular reviewer of articles for Design Studies and book manuscripts for Bloomsbury.

Abby is a design studies scholar whose research advances the critical role of design in addressing the impacts of climate change and promoting the transition to more sustainable cultures and economies. Abby works in applied research contexts with a range of industry partners. Her research practice brings design into relation with a vast range of disciplines that includes cultural studies, geography, urban studies and sociology. She is a Chief Investigator on an ARC Discovery project led by Western Sydney titled Investigating Innovative Waste Economies: redrawing the circular economy (2021-2024). Abby has contributed book chapters to a range of design and transdisciplinary publications and has been published in highly ranked journals such as Design Studies, ACME and Human Ecology Review. She has produced a range of reports for industry, government and academia, including Cooling Common Spaces in Densifying Urban Environments for Landcom, Closing the Loop on Waste for City of Canterbury Bankstown, and a white paper on enacting the United Nations SDGs in Lithgow through the development of a Just Transitions Hub in collaboration with industry, community, government and education stakeholders.

Kiran (they/them) is a strategic designer who has experience leading co-design projects for regenerative systems transformation, with skillsets spanning systemic design, participatory research, workshop design and illustration. They have worked for over 7 years at the Design Innovation Research Centre at UTS where they conducted practice-based research through multi-stakeholder co-design projects spanning various areas of focus including circular economy, distributed energy, justice and corrections. Through these projects Kiran has developed a broad ranging toolkit of participatory research and systemic design that draw from Frame Creation and Transition Design methodologies. Kiran has since been a co-convenor for Regen Sydney for almost 2 years contributing to the emergence of a nascent network of regenerative practitioners through strategic design, facilitation and research, with a focus on employing collaborative methods part of Doughnut Economics. Kiran has also harnessed their strategic design skillset to help shape the emerging deliberative democracy organisation Coalition of Everyone which applies citizens' assemblies and public participation towards systems transitions for bioregionally-adapted societies, in particular drawing from the Greenprints approach.

Primary AOU*

DAB.DIRC (Design Innovation Research Centre)

Managing Unit

Design, Architecture and Building

Please save and continue to the next page

Student details

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Degree being undertaken (500 character limit)*

C02001 Doctor of Philosophy
Faculty of Design, Architecture and Building

Have you been successful in your doctoral/masters assessment? *

- Yes
 No

Please make sure you attach a copy of your Stage 1 confirmation (or the stage 1 panel's report) in the attachments section.

Students, please read carefully: Once you have completed this application and followed the submission instructions, your application will go to your supervisor for review. Once your supervisor has reviewed and endorsed your application it will come to the Ethics Secretariat for a pre-review. This pre-review process helps ensure that your application is complete, has all necessary attachments, and that the quality of responses to the questions meets the Committee's expectations. Your application should therefore be submitted as early as possible. If you do not submit your application in time, it may be delayed and held off until the next closing date.

Section 4: Funding and Disclosure of interests

Funding details

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Have you received funding in relation to this research?*

- Yes
 No

Do you intend to apply for funding in the future?*

- Yes
 No

Please provide details of your intentions for applying for funding in the future*

I will not apply for funding myself in relation to the research conducted, however both RS and COE are considering applying for funding through WWF's Innovate to Regenerate program, through which (a small amount of) funding will be allocated to the general operations of both organisations. This funding is not guaranteed, though if successful, it is likely that some of it will be received by me.

Please save and continue to the next page

Disclosure of Interests

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Do any members of the research team (including persons not listed in this application), have any financial or non-financial interests related to this research?*

- Yes
 No

Explain the nature and extent of the interests and to which member of the team they apply*

As a member of the organising team at both Regen Sydney and Coalition of Everyone I have unique access to the co-design processes that make this research even possible. However this creates opportunity for an inherent bias in my research and the way that I convey my findings. Willow Berzin, while not a member of the research team, is CEO of Coalition of Everyone and has interests in that the findings could affect the nature of service provision by COE.

Most work at RS and COE is unpaid and voluntary, however small amounts of grant funding might support the work of the teams. No funding has been applied for or received yet, however there is a chance this might occur through the period of my research. There is a risk that this could influence my data collection and data analysis, if funding partners place requirements on deliverables.

Explain how you intend to manage these interests and any potential conflicts that may arise*

I aim to minimise bias by harnessing the interviews as a way to cross-reference my participant observation findings with key experts outside of the two organisations.

My data collection and data analysis methods will be clearly articulated prior to research, hence minimising the risk of being co-opted by any funding partners.

Please save and continue to the next page

Section 5: Methodology

Description

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

The purpose of this section is to place your research in context for the HREC and demonstrate your ability to conduct the research. The HREC may only approve research which is methodologically sound. Remember to use simple language that can be understood by people from a variety of backgrounds. Avoid jargon and acronyms.

What are the hypotheses/goals/aims/objectives of your research? Please include a brief description using plain English explaining your research aims (approximately 100 words) (4000 character limit)*

This research aims to analyse the practise of collaborative design in the context of enabling transitions towards bioregionally-adapted regenerative economies. Through this research I will study the novel co-design processes and methods of engagement that are being trialed and tested as a part of the work at Regen Sydney (RS) and Coalition of Everyone (COE). The co-design in these two sites of research draws from the approaches of Transition Design, Doughnut Economics and Greenprints.

As a core team member in both RS and COE, I will conduct my study as an insider researcher in order to gain insights about the co-design processes of engagement in both these organisations. RS has a focus on developing regenerative economics in Sydney through various forms of collaboration, while COE has a focus on piloting a novel deliberative process to foster bioregional governance.

Note: Clinical Trials, Recruitment of Participants and Data Collection are dealt with later in the application so you do not need to describe them in detail below

Please provide a brief description of the research design including research questions and proposed methods for conducting the research (approximately 250 words) (4000 character limit)*

The research questions are as follows:

Primary question: What kinds of co-design best enable transitions to bioregionally-adapted regenerative economies?

Second tier question: What processes help to collectively articulate place-based visions and strategies?

Second tier question: What processes encourage an emergent engagement with the interconnected needs and thresholds of all Earth citizens?

The organising teams at both Regen Sydney and Coalition of Everyone are conducting various instances of novel co-design processes, drawing from a range of approaches including Transition Design, Doughnut Economics and Greenprints. Through my research I aim to leverage my role as a team member in both of these organisations to study the co-design processes being used. I aim to conduct this qualitative research (1) from a post-constructivist paradigm, (2) as an insider research, (3) using a critical design ethnography methodology with (4) participant observation data collection methods.

My position as an insider researcher is valuable because the co-design processes being observed and analysed are both place-specific and responsive to the professional expertise of participants. Participant observation methods are appropriate to answer these research questions as I am already deeply embedded in the co-design forums of RS and COE in an ongoing manner, and I seek to enact change through these organisations whilst simultaneously reflecting and iterating on their co-design to further the practice. Each of the instances of data collection through participant observation build upon the findings of the previous research such that there is an ongoing reframed understanding of co-design processes that catalyse bioregionally-adapted regenerative economics in Sydney.

What do you hope the outcome(s) of this research will be? (4000 character limit)*

Co-design, otherwise known as collaborative design brings together participants from across personal and professional backgrounds in order to address and respond to complex problem contexts which cannot be otherwise attended to in silos. The transition to bioregionally-adapted regenerative economies is one such complex multi-stakeholder context which requires input from across diverse sectors.

The insights drawn through this practice-based research will help to clarify the role of co-design in encouraging the transition to bioregionally-adapted regenerative economies. Various facets of co-design to be investigated through the lenses of the aforementioned research questions include the intent and arc, workshop design, activity templates, facilitator positionality, diversity of stakeholder engagement, navigation of tensions and manner of emergent discussions. Specifically, these co-design elements will be analysed with regards to their ability to (1) help to collectively articulate place-based visions and strategies, and (2) encourage engagement with the interconnected needs and thresholds of all Earth citizens. This research to be conducted with RS and COE will seek to show how consideration may be made of non-human needs and ecological limits along with regular consideration of diverse human needs when shaping place-based economic strategy. Co-design processes will attempt to achieve these outcomes, with subsequent analysis and reflection to allow for insights to also be drawn as to the limitations faced by co-design in this context.

The research will also provide greater understanding of the ways in which the Transition Design, Doughnut Economics and Greenprints methodologies are complementary yet distinct. Literature research and practical experience with these methodologies has shown that they are each valuable for different reasons in the context of co-designing transitions towards bioregionally-adapted regenerative economies. My research presents an opportunity to document, analyse and synthesis the insights gained as both RS and COE draw from these three methodologies in curating various instances of co-design. Testing the varied elements of these co-design processes through novel assemblages can help to draw out the ways they are each valuable in context. None of these three methodologies purport to provide perfect, conclusive processes through which to collaborate, and so this research will aim to highlight the benefits and drawbacks of each, whilst also providing methodological insights that could be applicable in building upon and improving the practise of each.

Who do you think will benefit from this research? (4000 character limit)*

There are two primary groups of practitioners will benefit from this research. (1) The first are co-designers looking to harness techniques to cultivate systemic transitions towards bioregionally-adapted regenerative economies, and (2) the second cohort are professionals, academics and experts in regenerative economics and bioregional governance who do not yet see the full value of collaborative approaches. The following paragraphs provide further description.

Co-design practitioners have over the last few decades been working in various fields including product testing, user experience, service design, health, community development, transport planning, financial management and justice amongst others. Broadly speaking the co-design processes used in each of these contexts is distinct, however they have one thing in common which is that the co-design is largely a reformist force that seeks to recalibrate social practices, services and infrastructures within the constraints of existing systems. A recent development in co-design theory and practice is systemic design (of which Transition Design is one version) which is a nascent approach to using co-design not only as a reformist force but to actually shift systems. The approach is aligned with work on transitions towards sustainable and equitable futures as developed by professionals in Transition Management theory. Co-designers in this space are acutely aware of the contested and still emerging nature of their work and the processes that they use, and they are constantly learning and evolving their practice towards principles of regeneration.

This research is also valuable as it will be able to test and show the worth of using co-design processes in the context of regenerative economics and bioregional governance to those who are not otherwise wholly familiar with them. Many professionals working towards regeneration recognise the value of collaboration as a way to model the interactions they would like to see in an economy underpinned by principles of care and reciprocity, however they often do not specifically know how this intent might manifest in co-design forums. Others still, often continue to work in silos, whether that be in environmental law, First Nations advocacy, supply chains, biomaterial manufacture, or otherwise. All of these professionals are valuable allies in building bioregionally-adapted regenerative economies, and this research could help to prove the value of co-design as well as to provide benefit to these professionals in their community engagement practises.

Please provide a brief description of the significance of your research (approximately 100 words)
(4000 character limit)*

This is a precarious time in which we live, when action on climate change, biodiversity loss and wealth inequality (among other issues of eco-social injustice) has been grossly inadequate, especially when considering the corruption and toxicity of Australia's federal politics, which has at least in part led to disenfranchisement amongst the populace. My research is fundamentally rooted as a response to these dynamics and has emerged from my participation in organisations and networks that are already working towards alternative models. Citizen-led processes and centring the needs of communities (human and non-human) are central to these alternatives as ways to activate the political engagement of citizenry but to also simultaneously reorient measures of economic progress (and hence the economy itself) away from GDP towards alternatives which are ecological and socially holistic.

When people come together and engage with one another to creatively and critically formulate their collective vision of a regenerative economy, the co-design process is crucial in determining the types of discussions that participants are guided through and hence the manner of insights that can emerge. It is of utmost importance to test and develop best practice processes for collaboration in the regenerative economics context with an approach that is both pragmatic and radical. The research would be significant to not only design practitioners and academics but also to professionals working towards regenerative economics and bioregional governance.

Please save and continue to the next page

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Please give a brief literature review. The aim is to explain how your research fits into the context of other research in the area ([REF NS 1.1\(c\)](#)) (4000 character limit with spaces)
Please note that you cannot paste links into the online form

*

The redesign of economies to be regenerative is an idea whose time has come due to both mounting ecological pressures as well as novel socio-material capacities. The movement for regenerative economics captures the need to internalise social and environmental costs as a response to the degenerative externalisation that occurs through prevailing neoliberal patterns of production (Girardet 2010). Co-design approaches in this context take a systemic view of material flows, human activity and ecological impact, whilst focusing on the emergence of economies that are largely defined by local production coupled with a global knowledge commons (Read 2015). Nascent forms of co-design in this field attempt to move beyond human-centred forms of strategic design towards collaboration that more explicitly considers the economy as situated in nested social and ecological systems (Kossoff 2019; Mignolo 2010).

Complementing the regenerative economic movement, bioregionalists argue for a renewed emphasis in on living in reciprocity with local places, their ecosystems and bio-geo-physical realities (Thackara 2019; Wahl 2020a). The emergence of networks of distributed human systems that are contextually situated within their bioregional ecological systems would be a fundamental shift to the way industrial economies are presently organised. Adapting to the bioregional realities of any given place would require communities to have a greater understanding of both the opportunities and limitations present, with which to shape their local economy.

Bioregional governance plays a key role in catalysing regenerative economies through its ability to shape both policy and socio-material interventions. Localised decision-making aims to bring increased economic self-determination to citizens and communities, through processes that are guided by collectively-developed context-specific strategic visions (Carlisle & Gruby 2017; Shiva 2005). There is no one-size-fits-all model or blueprint for what a localised economy looks like in any given bioregion (Liaros 2019). Rather, the opportunity lies in forming a deeper understanding of local bioregions in conjunction with the dynamics of meeting human needs.

This ongoing process of realigning the activities of a community to the qualities of its local bioregions requires the input of diverse perspectives from across traditional disciplinary silos – hence the necessity for participatory multi-stakeholder governance (Dietz, Ostrom & Stern 2003). Multi-stakeholder governance taking place in a distributed manner would provide the means for a diversity citizens and experts to directly shape their local economies.

A wide array of actors including from social enterprise, public policy, planning and climate adaptation have begun to converge around initiatives aimed at supporting systemic change that would underpin a bioregionally-adapted regenerative economy (Wahl 2016). The three key examples of Transition Design, Doughnut Economics, and Greenprints exemplify this research and practice.

- Transition Design discourse explores methods of incorporating the perspectives of non-human, non-living and human stakeholders during collaboration in order to gain a greater understanding of the relationships between all stakeholders in the problem context (Irwin & Kossoff 2017).
- The framework elaborated by Kate Raworth in Doughnut Economics (2018) is now being investigated in peer-reviewed academic research to evaluate the cross-national capacity of different countries to integrate adequate social foundations for all without destabilising critical ecological thresholds (O'Neill et al 2018; Fanning et al 2022).
- Lawyer and national convener of AELA, Michelle Maloney describes Greenprints as an alternative to an "anthropocentric, 'top down', pro-growth governance system [instead building] ecological governance approaches that are uniquely suitable for the Australian continent" (Maloney 2020, p. 314).

Please list the references only used in the literature review and cited in your application

NOTE: Do not include references you have not used in this application (4000 character limit)

*

Carlisle, K. & Gruby, R.L. 2017, 'Polycentric Systems of Governance: A Theoretical Model for the Commons', *Policy Studies Journal*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 927-52.

Dietz, T., Ostrom, E. & Stern, P.C. 2003, 'The Struggle to Govern the Commons', *Science*, vol. 302, no. 5652, pp. 1907-12.

Fanning, Andrew, D.W. O'Neill, Jason Hickel, and Nicholas Roux. 2022. "The Social Shortfall and Ecological Overshoot of Nations". *Nature Sustainability* 5 (January 2022): 26–36

Girardet, H. 2010, *Regenerative Cities*, World Future Council.

Irwin, T. & Kossoff, G. 2017, 'Transition Design Workshops - Seeding and catalyzing systems-level change'.

Kossoff, G. 2019, 'Cosmopolitan Localism: The Planetary Networking of Everyday Life in Place', *Cuaderno*, vol. 73, pp. 51-66, <https://fido.palermo.edu/servicios_dyc/publicacionesdc/archivos/702_libro.pdf>.

Liaros, S. 2019, 'Implementing a new human settlement theory', *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 258-71.

Maloney, M. 2020, 'Greenprints and bioregional governance – ecological economics in practice?', in Washington, H. (ed.), *Ecological Economics: Solutions for the Future*, Self-published, pp. 310-327.

Mignolo, W. 2010, 'Cosmopolitanism and the De-colonial Option', *Studies in philosophy and education*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 111-27.

O'Neill, D. Daniel W., Andrew L. Fanning, William F. Lamb, and Julia K. Steinberger. 2018. "A Good Life for All within Planetary Boundaries." *Nature Sustainability* 1 (2): 88–95

Raworth, Kate. 2018. *Doughnut Economics*. Cornerstone Press

Read, R. 2015, 'The more you talk about economic growth, the less you talk about sharing', *One People, One World, Share the World's Resources*.

Shiva, V. 2005, *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability and Peace*, South End Press, Cambridge.

Thackara, J. 2019, 'Bioregioning: Pathways to Urban-Rural Reconnection', *She Ji: The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 15-28.

Wahl, Daniel Christian. 2016. *Designing Regenerative Cultures*. Triarchy Press

Wahl, D.C. 2020a, 'Bioregional Regeneration for Planetary Health: Scale-linking human systems back into the pattern of health', <<https://designforsustainability.medium.com/bioregional-regeneration-for-planetary-health-6b28e5e14e21>>.</></></>

Please save and continue to the next page

Methods and methodologies

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

In order to consider your research, the HREC will need to know what it will involve for your participants (REF NS 3.1)

What kinds of methods and methodologies will you use in your research? (More than one box may be checked)*

- Quantitative
 Qualitative

Does your research involve collection and/or use of secondary data? (e.g. existing / routinely collected data etc.)*

- Yes
 No

Please save and continue to the next page

Qualitative

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

What **qualitative** methodology and methods will be using in this research?

Section 1: Qualitative methodology*

- Auto-ethnography
 Historical research
 Action research
 Narrative enquiry
 Biographical research
 Case study
 Phenomenology
 Indigenous research paradigm
 Discourse analysis
 Grounded theory
 Other *(Please describe below)

Please describe other methodologies*

Critical Design Ethnography (CDE) methodology:

Barab et al. (2004, p. 254) describe CDE as "an ethnographic process involving participatory design work aimed at transforming a local context while producing an instructional design that can be used in multiple contexts". Researchers employing this methodology could be seen as agents of change similar to those using Participatory Action Research (PAR), however with a key difference that with CDE, researchers seek to provide insights for scaling out application into other contexts with local considerations (Reason 2004).

CDE is often conducted over extended periods through which change processes can be observed by the researcher as an insider in context. As a co-design team member in both sites of research (Regen Sydney and Coalition of Everyone), I embrace the position of insider researcher such that I can harness my unique position within the context of my professional practice (Costley et al. 2010). As an insider researcher conducting CDE I will be able to continue to deeply engage with my colleagues on ongoing co-design programmes, while seeking to harness research methods that suitably capture the complexity and messiness of my area of focus – the discursive and transdisciplinary forums of co-design (specifically those that enable transitions to bioregionally-adapted regenerative economies).

The participatory methods of CDE, primarily involving participant observation, workshops and interviews are suitable to answer my research questions as through these I will be able to make judgements about the nature of collaboration, with the subjective processes of co-design revealing implicit power imbalances, unheard voices, axiological shifts, stakeholders tensions and many other aspects.

Post-constructivist paradigm:

I approach this research from a post-constructivist paradigm, with the intent to move past the dichotomy between social constructivist and realism, as well as to recognise that the complex interconnections between social interactions and material reality are of interest in my study (Acreman 2014; Knol 2011). Through my research I intend to study both the objects, materials and artefacts of co-design as well as the patterns of meanings emerging through the social interactions involved (Lippert 2015). Various aspects of co-design, including workshops, strategies, reports, diagrams, infographics, maps, roadmaps are all hybrid arrangements of both material reality and social interactions, and call for a systemic paradigm such as that offered by post-constructivism.

Section 2: Qualitative methods*

- Participants observation
- Covert observation
- On-line research
- Psychological testing/assessment
- Verbal protocol
- Journaling
- Artifact analysis
- Document/Policy analysis
- Access to records
- Audio/video recording
- Life story or oral history
- Focus groups
- Structured interviews
- Semi-structured interviews
- Unstructured interviews
- Other * (Please describe below)

Please describe how participant observation will be conducted, including how many participants will be involved (from each participant group (if there is more than one group/cohort), the amount of time required of participants for this, whether it will be recorded, and any other information applicable (4000 character limit)*

Participant observation will be conducted over two sites of research - Regen Sydney and Coalition of Everyone - both of which are organisations that I am already involved with as a core team member. This places me in an effective position from which to observe and analyse the intricacies of co-design dynamics that would be difficult to research otherwise. Harnessing participant observation research methods, I intend to continue to contribute to co-designing change processes through RS and COE whilst simultaneously observing, analysing and reflecting on the processes undertaken. Through this research method I can help to co-evolve the impact of the organisations in question whilst also reflexively observing the nature of key discursive co-design forums in emergence.

The primary forms of data collection in both sites of research will be note-taking and diagramming. Participants include the organising team at both RS and COE which are numbered at 10 each. The research will contribute to an extended period of ethnography over 6 months during which participants are not expected to contribute any time to my research outside of how they would already be contributing to the organisations.

Please see attached document titled 'Research Sites Timeline-01'

Please describe how interviews will be conducted, including how many participants will be involved (from each participant group if there is more than one group/cohort), the amount of time required of participants for this, whether it will be recorded, and any other information applicable (4000 character limit)*

Interviews will be semi-structured and conducted with 10 experts in each of the two sites of research (RS and COE). The interviews will be conducted either in-person or online depending on the state of COVID restrictions and they will run for a maximum of one hour. The interviews will be recorded however the data collected will be de-identified as the focus of these interviews is to synthesise common themes across interviews and draw out reflective insights about co-design rather than focus on the individuals themselves.

The attached interview guide will be used, with questions focusing on previous co-design, opportunities for experimentation and improvement, as well as context specific questions about regenerative economic and bioregional governance expertise.

Please describe how audio/video recording will be used in the research, including how many participants will be involved (from each participant group if there is more than one group/cohort), the amount of time required of participants for this, whether it will be recorded, and any other information applicable (4000 character limit)*

Some instances of co-design in both sites of research will be recorded, however the participants will be de-identified in the data as the research interest is in the nature of collaborative sensemaking not on the individuals themselves.

Please save and continue to the next page

Section 6: Research participants/subjects part 1

Participant involvement

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

What time commitment will the research involve for your participants?

NOTE: This information must be included in any information to participants
(4000 character limit)*

There are 10 people on each of the RS and COE organising teams who will take part in the participant observation. They are not expected to commit any additional time for the purposes of my participant observation research than they already intend to contribute towards the work of the organisations. I will observe the co-design activities that entail the normal operation of these organisations over a 6 month period.

The interviews with 10 experts (for each RS and COE) will require a maximum of 1 hour per participant.

In what location will the research/data collection take place?

NOTE: This information must be included in any information to participants
(4000 character limit)*

The participant observation will largely take place online - using Zoom for video conferencing and Miro for collaborative whiteboarding. Some in person sessions may take place at Digital Storytellers (RS) and at Wararack Initiatives (COE).

What travel, if any, does the research involve for your participants?

NOTE: This information must be included in any information to participants
(4000 character limit)*

No travel is required when co-design takes place over Zoom. Minor travel might be required when meetings take place in person.

Please include any additional information relating to participants that you think relevant

NOTE: This information must be included in any information to participants
(4000 character limit)*

All data collection, including note-taking and diagramming will be de-identified of any participants.

Describe and justify any benefit, payment or compensation the participants will receive. For research being conducted with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People, the described benefits from research should have been discussed with and agreed to by the Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander research stakeholders. (REF NS 2.1) and 4.7.8 & 4.7.9)
(4000 character limit)*

Participants will receive no monetary payment. They are team members of organisations that are largely voluntary and unpaid (including myself), and see the potential benefit of my research to the operations of the organisations.

Please save and continue to the next page

Recruitment of participants

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

In line with the National Statement, the definition of participants includes not only those humans who are the primary focus of the research but also those who will be affected by the research. The HREC regards the principle of respect for persons as of paramount importance.
[\(REF NS 1.1 \(d\), 1.6-1.9, 1.10, 2.1\)](#).

How will you initially select and contact your participants? More than one box may be checked, if appropriate*

- Advertisement/flyer
- E-mail
- Telephone
- Internet
- Organisation
- Personal contact
- Letter
- Other contact method to be used

Outline how you will obtain participants' contact details*

The participant groups across both RS and COE who will form the focus of research observation are the organising team members. This cohort of participants are those who I will observe, interview and engage in ongoing co-design as a part of the organisations' work. I already have all of these participants' contact details through ongoing communications - including email addresses and phone numbers.

Please describe your recruitment plan/strategy*

I will outline my research aims and methods to the organising team members at both RS and COE, and ask each person individually if they consent to having their co-design contributions form a part of my research data collection. It will be emphasised that data will be de-identified.

Participant Observation

At a biweekly 'stand up' meeting (at both RS and COE) I will raise with team members my intention to conduct research and to seek their support and consent. I will follow up this conversation with an email to each team member to organise a Zoom meeting. During this one-on-one chat I will outline the intent of my research, their contributions, risks and ask them if they have any questions. Finally, I will provide them with an information sheet and obtain signed consent if they agree.

Semi-structured interviews

For the semi-structured interviews, I will follow a similar recruitment plan to that described above - starting with reaching out to each potential participant via email to seek their support and consent and to organise a Zoom meeting. During this one-on-one chat I will outline the intent of my research, their contributions, risks and ask them if they have any questions. Finally, I will provide them with an information sheet and obtain signed consent if they agree.

How many participants do you intend to recruit? (If you are intending to recruit different groups of participants, please answer all relevant questions for each group, e.g. control group, test group, etc)
(4000 character limit)*

Participant Observation
RS organising team - 10 participants
COE organising team - 10 participants

Semi-structured interviews
RS network - 10 participants
COE network - 10 participants

Explain how and why you have chosen this number. If the research is quantitative, explain the power calculations; if the research is qualitative, explain why the proposed number is likely to result in adequate data based on evidence/literature. For guidance, check our [Fact Sheets](#).*

The number of people chosen to be a part of my participant observation are a co-incidence of the number of staff that are acting as organising team members in each respective organisation. The question about the suitability of sample size to answer my research questions could more accurately be asked about the number of sites of research that I am conducting research in - namely that of Regen Sydney and Coalition of Everyone. I believe that any additional sites of research would require an extended period of research that would not be feasible considering the time restrictions and duration of my PhD. It is worth mentioning also that these two sites of research have been included due to their complementary contexts of operation and potential contribution to answering my research questions - namely that of regenerative economics and bioregional governance. The two sites of research in question can provide rich data for my Critical Design Ethnography with the aim of producing an instructional design that could be used in other co-design contexts - something that has previously been conducted through such research even in just one context (Barab et al. 2004).

The number of people chosen to be a part of the semi-structured interviews derives from an initial appraisal of the networks of professionals linked to the two sites of research. Having 10 interviewees for each site of research is indicative of the number of relevant experts in each site of research. This number will allow for critique and discussion from enough perspectives to acquire diverse feedback, whilst not relinquishing a level of expertise in the subject matter.

Describe your inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants*

All organising team members will be sought to be participants as long as they consent. No one outside of the organising team participates in the ongoing co-design activities of each respective organisation and hence they do not need to be included in my Critical Design Ethnographic research.

Please save and continue to the next page

Consent

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Will you be obtaining written consent?*

- Yes
 No

Please provide sample documents in attachments list at the end of the application form

Please use the following HREC templates when creating an information sheet and consent form: [HREC templates](#)

Do you believe there will be any special issues relating to consent in your research? ([REF NS 1.13, 2.2, 2.3, Chapter 4](#))*

- Yes
 No

Are the participants able to consent fully? ([REF NS Chapter 2, 4.4, 4.5](#))*

- Yes
 No

Please save and continue to the next page

Limited disclosure

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Does this research involve limited disclosure to participants? ([REF NS 2.3](#))*

- Yes
 No

Please save and continue to the next page

Ethical considerations specific to participants

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Indicate if your research will involve the following populations (as per the National Statement) other than as incidental participants (i.e. they are not included in the design of the project but may be participants) ([REF NS Chapter 4](#))

*

- Women who are pregnant and the human foetus
- Children and young people
- People in dependent or unequal relationships
- People highly dependent upon medical care who may be unable to give consent
- People with a cognitive impairment, an intellectual disability or a mental illness
- People who may be involved in illegal activities
- People who are incarcerated
- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples
- People in other countries
- None of the above

If your research is being conducted in Australia, does it involve Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) People (other than incidentally)?*

- Yes
- No

Does your research involve Defence or the Department of Veteran Affairs in any way?*

- Yes
- No

Please save and continue to the next page

Section 7: Research participants/subjects part 2

Risk/harm

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Risk or harm could be described as damage or hurt to the wellbeing, interests or welfare of an individual, institution or group. Harm could range from physical hurt or damage such as illness or injury, to psychological or emotional hurt or damage, such as embarrassment or distress. Please note that as a researcher, you are not necessarily immune from risk yourself and should give careful consideration to this question (REF NS 2.1).

NOTE:

It is **really** important that you carefully consider all **potential** risks that could occur, even if they seem negligible. Please **do not** provide one-word answers to any of the questions below.

Describe, as best as you can, any possible risks to research participants, subjects and related groups

NOTE: This information must be included in any information to participants (4000 character limit)*

1. Distress

My research is largely focused on co-design processes and does not seek to explicitly revisit personal experiences of abuse, inequality or injustice. In practice this is communicated upfront to participants as part of negotiating informed consent. It is still possible however for participation in the research to result in distress during or after a research activity for both participants and myself as the researcher.

2. Disclosure

It is possible that participants would find themselves disclosing sensitive information to the researcher that is indirectly relevant to the research aims. Additionally, the researcher may be subject to unwanted disclosure either through

- witnessing an incident,
- voluntary disclosure by a research participant or
- research participants trying to elicit information about other members of their organization e.g. a supervisor asking about the activity of their reporting staff

Such disclosures may or may not be related to the problem context of the research project. These scenarios are considered unlikely; however if they were to occur, they would potentially place the researcher and/or participants under significant stress.

3. Stigmatisation and disempowerment

Some participants may be in disempowered situations, some of which stem from a long and complicated history. It is possible for research to be conducted in a way that reinforces these power imbalances and inequities, leading to greater stigmatisation of the participants in question and further ingraining of their disempowered situation. Participants may also restrict their involvement if they feel unsafe in the research environment.

4. Negative impact on participant's reputation

Participants may suffer negative impacts to their professional or personal reputation from public knowledge of their participating in the research. Potential participants may also be disinclined to participate due to perceived impacts on their reputation.

5. Perceived obligation to participate because of a dependent relationship e.g. students obligated to participate where referred by a teacher.

Where participants feel obligated to participate for fear of negative consequences, they may suffer the burden of inconvenience, stress from participating under pressure, and lack of control. Where participants have been over consulted / researched, they may feel commoditised and taken advantage of. As a result they may also feel distrustful of researchers in general.

6. Exclusion

Where the opportunities to participate do not suit potential participants and their circumstances, particularly ones outside their choosing such as due to health challenges or disability, potential participants may feel excluded and unrepresented, even inadequate.

7. Dependency on the researcher

Some participants may be socially isolated in their day to day lives. The conclusion of a research project which in contrast has been socially intensive, may for these participants feel abrupt and disruptive. They might feel taken advantage of as a result.

How would you categorise the magnitude of potential risk? (e.g. inconvenience, discomfort, harmful, painful)

Explain why you believe this is so (4000 character limit)*

1. Distress

In the case of triggered experiences of distress, the risk can range from discomfort to harmful depending on the circumstances. The same applies for any trauma that may develop in researchers carrying out the research. Distress that arises due to misalignments in interpersonal communications will likely range between inconvenience and discomfort.

2. Disclosure

In the unlikely chance that a breach of disclosure occurs it is possible that both the participants and the researcher involved will experience discomfort, harm or pain. The unexpected nature of such an event can act to increase its impact.

3. Stigmatisation and disempowerment

Lack of fair inclusion and exclusion might reinforce existing inequities and stigmatisation - causing discomfort in the short term but not acute. The inclusive and relational culture of both sites of research acts to minimise the level of impact of such occurrences.

4. Negative impact on participant's reputation

Should privacy details be breached, participants might feel embarrassment and discomfort at being identified, and/or might affect relationships with others. Inconvenience would be the biggest risk if participant rights are not clearly defined, as research results might not reflect the intentions of the research. Impacts on reputation are hard to qualify but could range from negligible to harmful.

5. Perceived obligation to participate because of a dependent relationship

This potential risk could be categorised to have a low magnitude of inconvenience. The nature of participation in this research does not ask participants to conduct their business in any different manner hence the low magnitude of risk.

6. Exclusion

This risk presents a challenge as sometimes the full extent of a participant's incapability to participate might be unknown to the researcher. The ramifications to the participant can be quite harmful or painful, and perhaps long-lasting in an ongoing relationship.

7. Dependency on the researcher

Similar to the response to #5, the almost imperceptible participation in my research study means there is a low magnitude of risk here. The nature of participation in this research does not ask participants to conduct their business in any different manner.

How would you categorise the likelihood of risk? (i.e. slight, possible, likely, probable, unavoidable)

Explain why you believe this is so (4000 characters)*

1. Distress

It is likely that distress is triggered in participants through their ongoing involvement in the discursive co-design forums at both RS and COE. This likelihood is due in part to the extended period for which my participant observation research is to be conducted. My role as an insider researcher and participant means that this risk would be likely even if I was not researching in these contexts.

2. Disclosure

The extended nature of my involvement as an insider researcher creates makes such occurrences probable. The evolving and nuanced nature of each personal relationship in the organising teams will likely create many opportunities for voluntary disclosure of sensitive information.

3. Stigmatisation and disempowerment

The nature of the complex contexts within which RS and COE operate, in particular with regards to stakeholder tensions and strategic decisions means that participants might question their efficacy, worldview or be confronted with opposition. The role that my research might play is in highlighting and drawing attention to the processes and their consequences - and in doing so exacerbating the likelihood of risk - making it possible or likely.

4. Negative impact on participant's reputation

This risk is negligible to slight - due to the fact that my position as insider researcher and participants' involvement is (1) not intending to change operational conduct at RS and COE, (2) and the impacts of the research are likely to act as constructive analysis with which the individuals and organisations involved can both grow their professional practice.

5. Perceived obligation to participate because of a dependent relationship

The participants and researcher in question have a mutually respectful collegiate relationship devoid of explicit power hierarchies. Any organising team member can choose to participate or to withdraw without ramifications professionally or interpersonally and hence this risk is negligible to slight.

6. Exclusion

Due to the intricacies of sensitivity involved in divulging personal incapacities amongst organising team members this risk is possible to likely. The voluntary nature of work at RS and COE means that the organising team is often working asynchronously with different schedules, hence organising group sessions is an ongoing hindrance being managed.

7. Dependency on the researcher

This potential risk could be categorised to have a negligible to slight likelihood. As mentioned in the 'magnitudes' section the nature of participation in this research does not ask participants to conduct their business in any different manner hence their rhythms of working together will not change from already existing patterns in the two sites of research.

What strategies will you use to minimise and/or manage the risks? (4000 character limit)*

1. Setting participant expectations

This strategy addresses: Risks 1 & 2. The researcher will maintain clarity of information provided to participants concerning:

- the research topic.
- topics that are out of scope
- options for consent
- what data will be captured, how it will be used, and by whom.
- the options for support at hand.

2. Designing research that is inclusive and accessible; seeking out and addressing opportunities for exclusion.

This strategy addresses: Risks 3, 4, 5 & 6

The researcher will provide ways for people to participate safely, and remove barriers that discourage participation. This may also involve helping sustain involvement where impairment, disability or illness is temporary or episodic. Where possible I will seek to conduct my research in an inclusive manner that allows for participation from the diversity of participants that make up the organising teams at RS and COE.

Where there are perceived risks by individuals that discourage participation, more anonymous opportunities to participate will be explored. In ongoing co-design forums including workshops, it may be appropriate to offer opportunity for participants to select what data they consent to be collected e.g. photos, audio, video. The informed consent process will highlight to organising team members that participation is voluntary and free from obligation.

3. Enabling meaningful participation, addressing researcher bias

This strategy addresses: Risks 3, 6 & 7

The researcher draws from co-design processes and experience that enables meaningful participation – as both a participant and a facilitator within the the organising team co-design sessions, all participants engage as partners in the design of solutions. This approach seeks to equalise power between participants and raise the voices of those unempowered. My role as researcher will include to check in with other participants after co-design sessions to validate or correct any assumptions made. Ways I can do this include getting participants involved in the synthesis, and opportunities to review data.

Conducting the research

Because of the very nature of the research, it is unlikely that an incident might necessitate it to be stopped early. Participants will be facilitated in inclusive, discussions that might some times challenge their views, and tensions will be managed in such a way that they can lead to valuable exchanges rather than conflict. An incident of conflict that arises between participants or a trauma-induced outburst would need to be well managed by facilitators. It would be paramount for the situation to take precedence over the prescribed agenda of proceedings. If the situation cannot be managed in an effective manner, then the session would need to be halted and postponed with adequate acknowledgement of the circumstances to all other participants.

Despite the risks and discomforts discussed, this intended research is still a valuable undertaking as the risks are minimal, and as the research is fundamentally oriented towards the emergence of an ethical economical model – it necessitates ethical forms of collaboration as a foundational process.

Discuss likely or possible risk to researchers (including yourself), and your strategies for minimising such risks (4000 character limit)*

Research of co-design processes at both RS and COE will conducted amongst a group of trusted colleagues and as such there is little likelihood of any risks to the researcher through this part of the research. Although I am not intending to collect personal experiences of systemic social injustice or ecological destruction from participants, there is a potential for the researcher to be emotionally impacted by listening to stories and engaging over an extended period of time in sometimes sensitive topic areas. To minimise this, I have undertaken trauma informed training workshops, have sought (and will continue to seek) advice from counselling at UTS, will undertake research with support of supervisors and peers, and will undertake regular reflection sessions to check in with my emotional state. If emotionally impacted by the research, I will seek support from UTS counselling.

Please save and continue to the next page

Pre-existing relationships

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Are there likely to be any pre-existing relationships with research participants? (e.g. employer/employee, colleague, friend, relation, student/teacher, etc) (REF NS 4.3)*

- Yes
- No

Please describe (4000 character limit)*

All participants from both Regen Sydney and Coalition of Everyone are colleagues with whom I have pre-existing professional relationships.

How might these relationships influence their decision to participate, be affected by the proposed research or create potential ethical conflict? Please describe strategy for dealing with this (4000 character limit)*

The pre-existing professional relationships are unavoidable with my insider researcher position and participant observation research methods. The organising team members and potential participants have relationships of mutual trust with me and as such will be inclined to consent to my research, with greater knowledge that their reputation, profession and personal life will not be negatively impacted. Moreover, the potential learnings that could arrive through my research will likely be seen as incentive to participate.

It is important for me to be clear in my participant information sheets and consent forms of the data collection methods to be used as well as to clearly analyse my subjective positionality as insider researcher in both sites of research.

Describe how you will ensure that student assessment, employee security, etc., will not be adversely affected by participation in this research (4000 character limit)*

Student assessment and employee security are unaffected by my research.

Will you be recruiting UTS staff and/or students as research participants?*

- Yes
 No

Please save and continue to the next page

External organisations

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Indicate if your research will involve any of the following:*

- Institution
 Organisation
 Community Group
 None of the above

Please describe what type(s) of institution / organisation / community group will be involved and how many will be involved (4000 character limit)*

Regen Sydney is an emerging network of over 300 practitioners coalescing to bring about a shift towards regenerative economics in Greater Sydney. RS could be called both an organisation and a community group.

Coalition of Everyone is an organisation working on discrete projects primarily in Victoria to enable citizen participation in governing for bioregional health.

Was the research generated from within the institution / organisation / community group?*

- Yes
 No

Please save and continue to the next page

External organisation consent

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Have you sought appropriate approval or support from the institution / organisation / community group involved?*

- Yes
 No

Please attach a copy of any letter of approval/agreement at the end of this form

Do you intend to feed the research results back to the institution / organisation /community group?*

- Yes
 No

Please describe how (4000 character limit)*

My thesis and its findings will be presented to both RS and COE through reports, diagrams and presentations to convey relevant insights. Reflections on the research process could shed light on the internal operations of the organisations along with learnings about the their respective co-design practices - the primary focus of my research.

Does this research involve any contracts, including confidentiality agreements? ([REF NS 3.2.12, 3.5.6](#)) ([Section 2.5 and 4, The Code](#))*

- Yes
 No

Please save and continue to the next page

Section 8: Data

Data collection & use

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

Does your research involve access to student records at this University?*

- Yes
 No

Provide an analysis plan outlining how the aims/objectives will be met, the statistical methods to be used, and who will be carrying out the analysis. *

A systematic record of RS and COE meetings will be kept in the form of written notes and diagrams, supplemented by recordings of key co-design sessions. Data from co-design workshops and interviews will be transcribed. I will send a copy of any raw visual artefacts produced along with some synthesised findings for participants to review and feedback on, forming a part of iterative co-design processes. Where appropriate, tools such as NVivo might be employed for analysis.

A thematic analysis of the transcripts, collaborative artefacts or observation notes and diagrams will be used to identify emerging themes. This form of inductive analysis sees themes emerge from raw data through steps of coding, theming, decontextualizing, and recontextualizing the data (Nowell et al. 2017). In order to ensure and communicate the rigour of this analytical process it will be crucial to record, systematise and disclose the methods of analysis so that one may determine the credibility of findings. To strengthen the validity of the interpretation the results will further be tested during further internal workshops and community engagements.

It will be evident from the emerging themes (through analysis of co-design sessions and interviews) as to which aspects of the collaborative processes lent themselves most effectively to the impacts sought in my research questions. One example of this is to highlight co-design processes best inclined to harness deeper understanding about bioregional ecosystem mismanagement in the Castlemaine context (COE) when developing a 10-year community transition plan.

Describe any foreseeable future use of this data; such as sharing with other researchers, secondary use for related research, publishing for unrelated research and non-research purposes and any other possible uses. Please note this information must be included in the participant information sheet. *

Aggregated and/or deidentified data would be made available to external researchers upon request, as well as to members and affiliates of RS and COE.

Do you have a research data management plan?*

- Yes
 No

Please save and continue to the next page

Section 9: Additional information

Other ethical issues

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

If there are any additional ethical issues which you do not believe have been covered by this form, please explain them for the HREC: (4000 character limit)*

N/A

Please save and continue to the next page

Section 10: Attachments

Attachments

We recommend you save your application regularly while editing. You can save your application at any time by clicking on the save button. For further information and help in completing your application go to our [website](#)

I have attached the following supporting documents

Doctoral or Masters assessment (i.e. panel's report)*

- Yes
 N/A

Sample research advertisement/announcement

- Yes
 N/A

Participant Information Sheet(s)*

- Yes
 No

Informed consent form(s)*

- Yes
 N/A

Evidence of approval from external institution, organisation or community group*

- Yes
- N/A

Explanations of any technical terms used *

- Yes
- N/A

Research data management plan (RDMP)*

- Yes
- No

Standard Operating Procedures

N.B. May include a [distress](#) or disclosure protocol [see [UTS HREC Disclosure Guidelines](#) under University policies and guidelines], [Faculty of Health - Low Risk protocol](#); procedures for participant screening, physiological, or biological sampling and/or laboratory or safety procedures where relevant.

*

- Yes
- No

Please explain why any of the above items have not been attached (either softcopy/hardcopy) and when they will be provided (4000 character limit)*

N/A

Documents attached to this application:

How to attach documents

1. Click on 'Add'
Ensure the fields are as follows:
 - Document type- soft copy
 - Name: Include the document name and version number
 - Description: This field is optional
2. You can then either select the file you want to upload OR drag and drop it where it says 'Drop file here'
3. Click on 'OK'

Note: Please use the following HREC templates when creating an information sheet, consent form, verbal script, etc.: [HREC templates](#). All submitted documents should be titled, and have have version control included in the footer.*

1	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Stage 1 confirmation
	Reference (Document Title)	KiranKashyap_Stage1_v2.pdf
	Description	
2	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Stage 1 confirmation review
	Reference (Document Title)	Stage 1 Review.pdf
	Description	
3	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Research Sites Timeline-01
	Reference (Document Title)	Research Sites Timeline-01.pdf
	Description	
4	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	DIRC Ethics Standard Operating Procedures
	Reference (Document Title)	DIRC Ethics Standard Operating Procedures v06Apr21.docx
	Description	
5	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Letter of Support Coalition of Everyone
	Reference (Document Title)	Letter of Support Coalition of Everyone_WB.pdf
	Description	
6	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	RDMP
	Reference (Document Title)	RDMP.pdf
	Description	
7	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Stage 1 Assessment
	Reference (Document Title)	Stage 1-Assessment Kiran Kashyap_signedABRL_AML_KK.pdf
	Description	
8	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form
	Reference (Document Title)	HREC_Participant information sheet_consent form_KK.docx
	Description	
9	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Theory of Change Workshop
	Reference (Document Title)	Theory of Change Workshop Guide.pdf
	Description	
10	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Semi-Structured Interview Questions (amended)
	Reference (Document Title)	Semi-Structured Interview Questions.docx
	Description	
11	Document type	Soft copy
	Name	Letter of Support Regen Sydney
	Reference (Document Title)	Letter of Support Regen Sydney_BM.pdf
	Description	

Reminder to student applicants:

1. Please note that once your application is submitted it will go directly to your supervisor and not to the Committee.
2. We **strongly** recommend notifying your supervisor that you have submitted your application in case of any technical issues, to avoid potential delays in the review process.
3. Once your supervisor endorses your application it will go to your Local Research Office for endorsement before coming to the Ethics Secretariat for review.
4. Your electronic application must be endorsed by your supervisor by the [Local Research Office \(LRO\) submission deadline](#).
5. Please also ensure that the Primary AOU listed at the end of the Investigators page is updated to your supervisor's AOU. This will show in the table under 'Internal personnel listed below', once you add them. If you need any assistance with this please contact Research.Ethics@uts.edu.au or call 9514 9772. Please note that this is particularly important if you have a dual role as a staff/student as your application could go to the wrong faculty for review through the automated process.

Declaration

Declaration

I have answered all questions in the risk assessment truly and completely to the best of my knowledge

I will notify the UTS Human Research Ethics Committee of any variation to this research that may alter the level of risk associated with it

This research will be undertaken in compliance with the UTS Research Policy or any replacement or amendment thereof

This research will be undertaken in compliance with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research and National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research

Please click on the "Submit" button in the Actions menu.

Confirmation

Confirmation by Local Research Office Low Risk

Application type*

Internal personnel listed on this ethics protocol*

1	Primary	No
	ID	125218
	Surname	Kashyap
	Given Name	Kiran
	Full Name	Mr Kiran Kashyap
	Position	5Research Student
	Type	External
	AOU	DAB.DIRC (Design Innovation Research Centre)
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Kiran.Kashyap@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	
2	Primary	No
	ID	997061
	Surname	Mellick Lopes
	Given Name	Abby
	Full Name	A/Prof Abby Arwen Mellick Lopes
	Position	Co-Supervisor
	Type	Internal
	AOU	DAB.School of Design
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Abby.MellickLopes@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	
3	Primary	Yes
	ID	020476
	Surname	Tonkinwise
	Given Name	Cameron
	Full Name	Prof Cameron Tonkinwise
	Position	Chief Investigator
	Type	Internal
	AOU	DAB.School of Design
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Cameron.Tonkinwise@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	+61 2 95148366

Confirmed by:*

Georgina Donovan

Faculty reference number if applicable (e.g. faculty TRIM number, otherwise write "N/A")

This question is not answered.

Please select "**Local Research Office review**" from the dropdown list.*

Local Research Office review

Date of review*

14/10/2022

The Local Research Office has certified that:

- This application has been deemed low risk by the Faculty/School/Centre in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (Chapter 2.1).
- All information in this application and supporting documentation is correct and as complete as possible.
- This research will be undertaken in compliance with the UTS Research Ethics and Integrity Policy or any replacement or amendment
- This research will be undertaken in compliance with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research and National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

*

- Yes
 No

Confirmation by ADR

Application type

Human

Internal personnel listed on this ethics protocol

1	Primary	No
	ID	125218
	Surname	Kashyap
	Given Name	Kiran
	Full Name	Mr Kiran Kashyap
	Position	5Research Student
	Type	External
	AOU	DAB.DIRC (Design Innovation Research Centre)
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Kiran.Kashyap@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	
2	Primary	No
	ID	997061
	Surname	Mellick Lopes
	Given Name	Abby
	Full Name	A/Prof Abby Arwen Mellick Lopes
	Position	Co-Supervisor
	Type	Internal
	AOU	DAB.School of Design
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Abby.MellickLopes@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	
3	Primary	Yes
	ID	020476
	Surname	Tonkinwise
	Given Name	Cameron
	Full Name	Prof Cameron Tonkinwise
	Position	Chief Investigator
	Type	Internal
	AOU	DAB.School of Design
	Managing Unit	Design, Architecture and Building
	Email Address	Cameron.Tonkinwise@uts.edu.au
	Work Number	+61 2 95148366

Faculty reference number if applicable (e.g. faculty TRIM number)

This question is not answered.

Declaration:

- I am aware that this research is being conducted within this Faculty/School/Centre.
- I am satisfied that the researchers have met all Faculty/School/Centre requirements in relation to this research
- I am satisfied that this research has been deemed low risk by the Faculty/School/Centre in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (Chapter 2.1).
- This research will be undertaken in compliance with the UTS Research Ethics and Integrity Policy or any replacement or amendment thereof.
- This research will be undertaken in compliance with the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research and National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

*

- Yes
- No

Date Approved/Endorsement*

19/10/2022

Comments

This question is not answered.