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1. Context

AquaPath project aims to foster citizens’ awareness regarding their water footprint, and drive them to reduce their impact on water resources through:
- A change of consumption habits, from products with large water footprint to products with small water footprint;
- A reduction of direct water consumption;
- A push towards more sustainable production patterns.

Two target groups were identified, children and adults, with the scope that children could become afterwards ambassadors of AquaPath towards adults. To this extent, tools and materials were set up within the scope of the project, such as (all of these are available on the project’s website):
- A water footprint calculator;
- A short interactive video, available in 7 languages;
- A click to fix tool to address local water issues;
- A comprehensive training course on water sustainability and the water footprint concept;
- For children, a specific book, Aquapass, with adapted games and activities.

AquaPath partners led a full dissemination campaign (with newsletters, the project website, a specific Facebook page with regular posts, etc.) to make these resources useful and visible; Multipliers events were organised in each of the participating countries. To ensure and assess the quality of results and tools developed, methodologies were set up, with in-depth peer-review processes between partners and feedbacks collected through hard copy and online questionnaires.

The following report summarises the findings from these different processes, assessing the quality and efficiency of the work carried out within the scope of AquaPath.

2. Targets

Within the proposal, AquaPath partners had set a range of targets to be achieved within the scope of the project. These targets were both qualitative and quantitative and included for example:
- 30 questionnaires collected per country for comprehensive feedbacks (180 to 200 in total)
- 3000 recipients of newsletter
- 2000 recipients of raising awareness campaigns
- 500 followers on social media
- 1000 visitors on the project’s website
- A reduction in water consumption
- A high number of download of raising awareness courses
- 50 participants per country (30 adults, 20 children) for multipliers events
- Quality of learning outcome products

The final results are assessed in this report with regards to these initial targets.

3. Multipliers events
To ensure efficient dissemination of AquaPath materials, it was foreseen that two multipliers events would be organised in each of the six participating countries, gathering at least 50 people (30 adults, 20 children) or 300 people in total. The objective was to get feedbacks on materials produced, but also to have multiplying effects so that the project could reach a wider audience.

The following table gives an overview of the events organised in each country:

**Overview of AquaPath multiplier events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number of Adults</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>Questionnaires collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>13/12/2015</td>
<td>Monza</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/04/2016</td>
<td>Monza</td>
<td>13 (teachers)</td>
<td>120 (final beneficiaries, not present at the event itself)</td>
<td>197 Adults 260 Children (directly) / 380 in total</td>
<td>64 (including 34 online questionnaire from P1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-13/05/2016</td>
<td>Monza</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16/05/2016</td>
<td>Monza</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/06/2016</td>
<td>Monza</td>
<td>30 (reported – over 200 participants in total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>04/06/2016</td>
<td>Freiburg</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60 Adults 11 Children</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/07/2016</td>
<td>Freiburg</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>02/06/2016</td>
<td>Oegstgeest</td>
<td>2 (teachers)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35 Adults 46 Children</td>
<td>9 + simplified assessment by children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18/04/2016</td>
<td>Larenstein</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/06/2016</td>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>06/04/2016</td>
<td>Portoalegre</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/05/2016</td>
<td>Campo Maior</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37 Adults 92 Children</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>14/04/2016</td>
<td>Corte</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/05/2016</td>
<td>Villeneuve-Loubet</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 Adults 29 Children</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19/05/2016</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>09/06/2016</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36 Adults 51 Children</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14/06/2016</td>
<td>Barcelona</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 Events</td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Global targets in terms of participation were largely fulfilled with 400 participating adults (target 180) and 609 children (target 120), or 1009 persons in total (target 300). It enabled the collection of 200 questionnaires (including 34 online), as was foreseen at the start of the project. In the Netherlands, an alternative approach was chosen, with simplified feedbacks methods (with smileys) of feedbacks used to fit with the will of the local participants. Still, 9 full questionnaires were collected.

The questionnaire (hard copy) was developed to assess the efficiency, suitability and usefulness of these events. The following part summarises the main findings.
4. Assessment of events: questionnaire (hard copy)

Hard copies of the questionnaire were distributed at the end of multiplier events in each country, first to assess the level of satisfaction with the event itself and then to evaluate the quality of tools and materials developed, along with the potential for scaling up and dissemination. Participants were asked to rate the duration and format of the event, its content, the quality of the presentations/animations and finally the interactivity of the event, with 4 levels: insufficient, sufficient, good and very good.

4.1. Format and duration

Around 55% of the people interrogated qualified the format and duration of the events as good. 34% and almost 25% of the respondents rated the format and duration as very good, respectively.

Only one person found the format insufficient (less than 1%), while ten people rated the duration as insufficient. Some people wanted to learn more about the water footprint and maybe have time to explore the issue a bit more in-depth. However, this was difficult due to the variety of tools and materials presented, but they could of course go more in-depth on their own through the AquaPath web platform.

4.2. The theme

Respondents were asked about the content and usefulness of the theme, with the results presented in the graphic (beside).

Almost 2 persons out of 3 rated the content and usefulness of the theme as very good, and another 30% as good. Only one person found it insufficient.
4.3. Presentations/animation

Three questions were asked about the intervention itself, with participants having the opportunity to rate:
- The contents of the presentation
- The clearness of explanations
- The suitability of information to their needs.

Close to 90% of respondents rated the contents as good or very good, while this rate was of 84% for the clearness of interventions and 76% for the suitability of information to their needs.

4.4. Interactivity of the meeting

Finally, people were asked to rate the dynamic of the action and the use of different resources and tools, two key aspects that AquaPath’s partners aimed to follow for these multipliers events, as a way to effectively involve citizens.

A very large number of respondents rated the dynamic of the action as very good (46%) and good (40%). These rates were of 48% and 40% for the use of different tools and resources, respectively.

Participants particularly enjoyed the interactivity of the meeting, thanks to the use of a mix of tools with a video, a calculator, games, PowerPoint, debates, etc.

4.5. Summary of findings and global ratings

The following table summarized the different answers (in number of respondents), with a global rating on a scale of 4 for each of the question asked (1 being associated with insufficient, 4 with very good).
Considering the previous results, there are strong evidences that the majority of participants enjoyed the multipliers events and were happy with the contents. Overall, good and very good boxes on the questionnaire were ticked 46% and 40% of the time, respectively, against only 13% for sufficient and 1% for insufficient, for a global rating of 3.23.

In addition, participants were asked, on the same questionnaire, to rate the event on a scale of 1 to 5. The following table summarize the answers. A global average of 4.3 was obtained, which further supports the quality of the meetings held.

### Table: overall meeting rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Potential impacts on water footprint (from questionnaire – hard copy)

The second part of the questionnaire distributed at the end of the events focused on citizens’ understanding of the water footprint concept, on behavior change and on the extent to which the participants could play they role as multipliers and carry the AquaPath message across. The questions were as followed:

#### 5.1. Do you want to know more about the water footprint concept?

Two third of respondents (66%) claimed that they were willing to know more about this concept, whereas a third responded no. It should be noted that amongst those who responded no, some were simply not willing to provide an email (if they responded yes, their email was asked – though it was optional).
5.2. How would you evaluate your understanding of the water footprint concept, before and after the meeting?

As can be seen from the answers given, a large majority of participants had very little knowledge of the water footprint concept before the meeting (almost 80% for none and superficial combined). After the event, the answers were very different, with 60% claiming having good knowledge and 32% excellent knowledge, or 92% for both categories combined. Although it is a self-assessment, this supports the fact that multiplier events participated to raise awareness and disseminate the water footprint concepts. The debates following the use of tools and games also showed improvement in the understanding of this concept.

5.3. How is your understanding of your impact on water resources (before and after meeting)?

This question was aiming to assess the participants’ understanding of their impacts on water resources, before and after the meeting. This considerably improved after the events, with 35% of respondents considering they had excellent understanding and 53% good understanding, against respectively 3% and 21% before the meetings. It should be noted that 15% claimed that they had no understanding of their impact on water resource before the meeting (0 after), which is quite high. Again, this is strong evidence that the events contributed to improve people’s awareness about the water footprint and the impacts of their behavior.

5.4. Do you intend to adapt your consumption habits?

The purpose of the project is to drive change towards sustainable behaviors. Through the questionnaire we could assess the efficiency of events and materials developed to reach this objective. However, adults do not give up easily on habits: some participants for example underlined the fact that they’d like to keep eating meat even though it was mentioned that the
associated water footprint is high. Still, almost 75%, of the respondents to the questionnaire affirmed that they intend to change their behaviors. Amongst the possible changes that they mentioned were:
- Consume more water instead of soft drinks
- Reduce meat consumption and change dietary habits
- Reduce direct consumption at home
- Reduce waste and useless purchases of products.

5.5. Would you share the AquaPath experience and tools with relatives and friends?

This question was aiming to assess the multiplying effects of the events organized. Results were astonishing as over 92% of respondents claimed that they will share AquaPath with friends. The same feedbacks were gathered orally during the meeting, and all partners were very optimistic that these events will have scaled up effects in the future. The same remark is also valid for children, as several schools were interested to use the tools and materials on a regular basis, in Italy, France, the Netherlands but also abroad, for example in the US.

5.6. Which of the tools are the most effective and pedagogical to raise awareness?

While excellent feedbacks were gathered overall, it was interesting to assess which of the tools used and presented during the events had the most impacts and were considered the most pedagogical by citizens. The results are presented in the graphic beside (in percentage of answers - it was possible to have multiple choices).

The calculator and the video received the most appraisal, with 60% and 48% of respondents. Over 20% claimed that all materials were relevant and pedagogical. It should be stress out here that the AquaPass book for children was not really used during the adults’ events (where most questionnaires were distributed) but received excellent feedbacks during children events.

6. Assessment of results from online questionnaire

In addition to the questionnaire distributed, an online questionnaire was accessible on the website. 34 People filled this in, with the following results.

6.1. Have you ever heard of the water footprint concept?
Only 35% of the interviewees responded yes to that question, meaning that almost 2 persons out of 3 had no knowledge of this concept. There is a gap existing in this domain, which was already identified in the state of the art analysis conducted at the start of AquaPath project in all countries.

6.2. After having navigated on AquaPath platform, how you would evaluate your knowledge regarding water footprint concept?

65% of respondents claimed that after having navigated on the website, their knowledge of the concept was good, very good for 30% and superficial for the remaining 5%. 0 respondent claimed that they had no knowledge.

Comparing with the results of the previous question, this shows the relevance of AquaPath online materials to raise people’s awareness on water sustainability.

6.3. Do you think you have a clear picture about how your consumption habits impact on your water footprint?

This question was to assess if the online materials was adapted not only to raise awareness but also to drive behavior changes amongst citizens. Over 90% of the respondents said yes, and 6% responded “partially”.

6.4. Are you surprised by your water footprint?

Once people tested the tools and the calculator, 85% claimed that they were surprised by their water footprint. They particularly emphasized the fact that they did not expect their nutrition to be the main source of water consumption, far above the water they consume at home.

6.5. Would you be willing to change your habits to reduce your personal water footprint?
Following the previous answers, it was asked if people were willing to adapt their behaviors, now that they have better knowledge on their true impacts. More than 90% of respondents said yes, mentioning for most that they will change their nutrition towards products that are more sustainable from a water consumption perspective.

6.6. Which of the materials are the most useful and informative?

As for the questionnaire distributed during the events, the calculator and the video received the most appraisals, above the training modules.

6.7. Would you share AquaPath with relatives and friends

All of the respondents claimed that they were willing to share the AquaPath experience and materials to their relatives and friends, showing the potential for scaling up and dissemination and serving as evidences of the strong feedbacks we got from target groups.

Overall, close to 200 questionnaires were collected (Hard copies and online combined). The results collected show that:

1. The knowledge of the water footprint concept is generally low amongst citizens: almost 80% of respondents of the hard copy questionnaires and 100% of those filling the online questionnaire had very low awareness on this (none to superficial);

2. The materials and multipliers events highly contributed to raise this knowledge, to good and very good levels, but also to raise awareness on consumers’ impacts on water resources;

3. The large majority of respondents claimed that they were willing to adapt their behaviors for water sustainability, especially regarding their nutrition and reduction of useless consumption and waste;

4. Participants to the multipliers events really enjoyed the experience of the whole events, with excellent ratings;
5. Almost all of the respondents (92% for hard copy, 100% for online version) said they will *share the AquaPath experience* with friends and relatives, showing potential for multiplication and scaling-up of results.

The feedbacks collected therefore validated the approach chosen by AquaPath partners to educate adults on water issues - Children were also involved and will contribute to the dissemination of knowledge also by sharing their experience with adults – as well as the usefulness of the work carried on within the scope of this project.

### 7. Dissemination

This last part will focus on dissemination targets, as indicators of the efficiency of work carried on.

#### 7.1. Website, newsletters and social Medias

Within the scope of AquaPath, a specific website along with a Facebook page have been set up to improve visibility (the website also hosts the platforms with all tools). The objective fixed for the website was of 1000 visitors during the course of the project. The following data could be obtained:

![Website Traffic Graph]

Whereas the activity was still almost null until spring 2015, since then more than 3 000 sessions were opened on AquaPath website, with 7 950 page views for 2 256 users. This evolved to 3316 sessions ad 2 408 individual users by the middle of July 2016.

This is well above the initial target of 1 000, with a quarter of visitors being returning visitors: more than 600 users have been returning on the website after their first visit. It should be noted that a majority of users came from Spain, Portugal and Italy, where water issues are important, but also and most surprisingly from the US. Globally, the project reached people from a wide range of countries across the planet, including in Africa (Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Angola, South-Africa,
Regarding the Facebook page, a target of 500 followers on social media was set at the start of the project. Up to the 14th of July, over 110 posts and news have been posted on the project’s Facebook page.
At the end of June 2016, the page had received 250 likes, but far more could follow the project through specific channels (for example the Facebook page of partners but also other organisations, see screenshots below). For example, the AquaPath video was posted on the Water Footprint Network Facebook page with close to 4000 views and over 16 thousand people reached. This shows that the 500 followers objective was reached, though not only through the project’s Facebook page.

In addition, five newsletters were produced during the course of the project. These 5 newsletters were diffused to several thousand people (all languages included, data taken from the dissemination review conducted every 6 months). Some were part of the partners’ networks and others were the people who participated to the state of the art conducted at the beginning of the project. Overall, the targets of 3000 recipients reached through the newsletter has been fulfilled.
7.2. Other means of dissemination

Through the course of the project, a full dissemination campaign was led by all partners in their respective countries and abroad, not only on social media (Twitter, Linkedin, etc.) but also during specific events, through communication with their network, etc.

The following tables summarizes some of the activity that were carried out (events and publications):

Table 1: Event (in addition to multipliers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name and location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Target group reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2015 to 11/12/2016</td>
<td>COP21 – Paris, France</td>
<td>ENERGIES 2050 had booth in two different places during COP21 in Paris: within the accredited area (for negotiators and accredited organisations) in Le Bourget and in Le Grand Palais (Solutions COP21) in Paris. AquaPath project was presented at both these booth and leaflets of the projects were distributed to visitors.</td>
<td>Target groups were several hundred professionals and decision makers in Le Bourget, and citizens (usually interested by sustainability issues) in Le Grand Palais.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/2016</td>
<td>Office warming – Freiburg, Germany</td>
<td>Presentation of Aquapath project as part of the celebration at the occasion of Aiforia’s office change and team extension</td>
<td>About 60 Colleagues, partners and friends of aiforia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/04/2016 to 08/08/2016</td>
<td>Laboratory to experiment tools on sustainability.</td>
<td>Within the scope of another project on energy transition and sustainability, ENERGIES 2050 organized a weekly event with partners organization from Europe to test tools that are available to citizens to raise their awarness and push them to act and change</td>
<td>13 people from Partner organizations, mainly NGOs and consultancies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
behavior. This was the opportunity to present the different tools used in AquaPath, as a model of integrated strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Where it was published</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22/04/2016</td>
<td>Radio intervention</td>
<td>Presentation of AquaPath for radio energia positiva Portugal</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2016</td>
<td>CIBUS 2016 – Parma, Italy</td>
<td>Presentation of the project and main outputs - modules and calculator</td>
<td>Around 100 professionals interested in the sustainable use of resources: University, SMEs, Federalimentare, Banco Alimentare, Assolombarda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Sample of publications (in addition to partners’ newsletters/Facebook posts, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Where it was published</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Number of views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/01/2015</td>
<td>Aiforia website</td>
<td>Presentation of the project: <a href="http://www.aiforia.eu/portfolio/#aquapath">http://www.aiforia.eu/portfolio/#aquapath</a></td>
<td>About 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/2015</td>
<td>Apda</td>
<td>Presentation of AquaPath</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/02/2015</td>
<td>Ambiente Magazine</td>
<td>Presentation of AquaPath</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Enterprising time - newsletter of the Faculty of Business, Education and Law.</td>
<td>Presentation of AquaPath</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/04/2016</td>
<td>Industriambiente</td>
<td>Article about the calculator</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2016</td>
<td>Alternativa sostenible</td>
<td>Article about the project and its main outputs <a href="http://www.alterna">http://www.alterna</a>...</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>ENERGIES 2050 website</td>
<td>AquaPath presentation + tools and video embedded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2016</td>
<td>Hello Green</td>
<td>Article about the project and its main outputs <a href="http://www.hellogreen">http://www.hellogreen</a>...</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2016</td>
<td>Mediaterre (Francophone portal on sustainable development)</td>
<td>Article about the project and the main tools. The video in French is also embedded in the article.</td>
<td>More than 3300 views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Added to specific newsletters, posts on Facebook, etc., the number of 2000 people reached through dissemination was therefore largely fulfilled.

### 7.3. Use of tools: video, calculator and training modules

The video and the calculator were the main tools that were enhanced through the questionnaires, as being the most effective, interactive and efficient to raise awareness. The video has been published on several support and was shown in the multipliers events. Best results in terms of dissemination came from the Water Footprint Network Facebook page, where it was viewed close to 4,000 times, reached over 16 thousand people, received over 70 likes and was shared close to 100 times.
The video was also embedded in an article dedicated to AquaPath published on Mediaterre, the Francophone portal for sustainable development, with over 3300 views (3312) in just two weeks (first weeks of July).

Finally, it was posted on AquaPath project website and diffused on various Youtube channels (the one of the project and those of partners) in all languages, being viewed each close to 100 times. It was also posted by the video editor, Flikli, on its own channels.

In fine, it is likely that the video (all language combined) was viewed over 7 000 times across all channels.
Dissemination of the calculator and the other tools were also done by all partners through various channels. The Mediaterre article provided the direct link to the calculator in French and English. The Water Footprint Network network communicated on these tools on its Facebook page, reaching over 1.7 thousand people, and on Twitter.

AquaPath website metrics showed that the tools and resources pages (with the calculator and the training modules), in all languages, registered over 2000 page views, and close to 1000 people visited the pages containing the training modules.
8. Conclusion

The work carried on within the scope of this project was very important, with a wide range of tools and materials developed regarding the water footprint concept, with a systemic approach. All of these materials were subject to an in-depth quality review process, and the results from questionnaires also validated the approach chosen, with excellent feedbacks.

All of the objectives set at the start of the project were largely fulfilled, whether it is the number of people reached, the number of participants to multipliers events, the potential for scaling-up results, the metrics for dissemination, the number of questionnaires collected, etc. The involvement of expert organization, e.g. the water footprint level, enabled to reach a large number of citizens, at European levels but also abroad.

The feedbacks show that important gaps still exist regarding the water footprint concept and AquaPath partners will continue the work started to ensure the sustainability of results.