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Introduction

From time to time I walk backwards,  
it is my way of remembering.  
If I only walked forward,  
I could tell you how oblivion is like.  

Humberto Ak’abal

Systematization can seem like a considerable challenge even though it is a diverse and enriching exercise that allows us to improve our work in multiple dimensions. In our case, three broader actions took place simultaneously:

1. Regular development of accompaniments in digital security with social organizations.
2. Construction of our methodological systematization tool that we would use to review those processes.
3. Performance of our systematization on the experience of accompanying.

It was a constant back and forth from theory to practice. To develop these last two actions, we overhaul existing documentation. In this regard, we based the methodology on popular education and community work experiences, which we later formalized as a guiding method.
Since our beginnings -back in 2011- Sursiendo has been interested in building bridges between the fields of technology, groups, and communities, as well as between people and their contexts, and between diverse formats and experiences. We are inspired by linking processes that may look different at first glance. Hence, we build ourselves from a critical perspective of technologies, relying on popular education and free software to accompany the defense of human and collective rights of the land and territory as a way to open space for dialogue, meeting, debate, and collective reflection.

With years of experience and having worked with various formats, we decided to dedicate time to a systematization exercise; to conceptualize the practice that would allow us to do both: a review with a critical distance of the experiences of accompaniment in digital security, and give meaning to the next course. By “experience”, we refer to what Zúñiga López and Zúñiga Preciado (2014) name as “what has been lived, what has been felt, what has happened, what has been thought, implies actions, the theories, the feelings, the political, historical, cultural context, not as separate parts one from the others, but interrelated with each other with a certain logic that is what gives it meaning ” (p. 73). We wanted to start a collective reflection; connecting with a tender self-criticism would allow us to unveil our actions to know their deep sense and thus, recognize and willingly share the learnings that emerged from the process.
There were several analysis that prompted us to do this. The field of digital care, digital self-defense or digital protection intended for groups and individuals defenders of human rights, is relatively new compared to that of integral protection. However, due to the characteristics of the world in which we live, it is a significant field in everyday life. Such is the relevance that, at the time of writing this introduction, new insights surfaced regarding government surveillance through malware, Mexico being mentioned as an example again. The Pegasus Project revealed that the military-grade spyware, belonging to the already questioned Israeli company NSO Group, has been used to monitor activists, journalists, human rights defenders, politicians, academics, among other “people of interest” around of the world.

Even considering that digital protection is an increasingly part of integral protection, there are few in-depth studies on how we are conducting accompaniment of groups and defenders, how we can strengthen them and what other tools (human and technical) may be necessary to reinforce our field. Human rights defenders are a specific community that face risk situations according to their context. Reviewing our own practices as companions will help to strengthen the defense of human and collective rights themselves.
From the very moment we reflected on developing our experience systematization (which findings we shared at the beginning of 2021); we were building a methodological tool as an invitation for this exercise to be carried out by other groups that accompany defenders in strengthening their digital care and thus enrich the dialogue about and of our duties.

We are no experts in the task of systematization. However, we had previously gone through experiences of this type. We knew, for example, that documenting (which would only be the collection and ordering of an experience), evaluating (analyzing, measuring, or assessing the results obtained in an experience), or investigating (an exercise that seeks to contribute to the construction of knowledge) are easily confused with systematization; which Sursiendo defines as “the process of going through an experience; recovering, organizing and analyzing information for further interpretation; transforming through sharing lived experience” (Sursiendo, 2021: 9).

The present methodological tool for the systematization of experiences focused on accompaniment processes in digital security for communities of human rights defenders, and the how-to use guide arises from nurturing our own experience with the review of the work of giants such as Oscar Jara, Rosa Elva Zúñiga, Ana Bickel or ÁBACOenRed. We consider this tool, the guide, and its files to pave the way for other groups who want to make an in-depth review of their accompaniment processes.
We wanted to share it in a unified format to promote that more systematizations are possible.

The guide is divided into ten sections: In the first, you will find a diagram that shows the general path of systematization, what we call the Systematization spiral. The second section, titled "Designing our systematization process," provides key aspects to consider when planning a systematization of experiences; it has to do with who participates in each stage, details about the time to develop them, the modalities for working together –either in person or online--; other elements to consider, and the financial resources necessary to carry it out. Sections three to seven deal with the stages to follow in the systematization process, with a description of the moments that comprise it and the tools that may be useful to develop it. The last sections correspond to conclusions, glossary, and references.

Given that a good part of this process took place during the COVID-19 pandemic; you will see that we refer to both: work that can be done in person (always preferable due to greater value-added from face-to-face conversations), and online (resuming Oscar Jara's proposal which invites us to make our technological approach consistent with our pedagogical project and an ethical foundation that gives it meaning).
It is essential to mention that this guide is not intended as a recipe. We present it with an open license to allow users to mix it up and share it again: enriched with their routes, considering the diverse contexts where their practices are developed.

If you decide to do them, we hope that these exercises will serve your projects by adding collective knowledge in the form of inspiration, guidelines, and ideas to build an insubordinate digital culture.
Systematization Spiral

Stage 0: The experience
- Stage 1: Methodological design
  1. Creating horizons
  2. Tracing the path
  3. Preparing the trip

- Stage 2: Historical reconstruction
  2.1 Peeking through files
  2.2 Giving an account of the lived process
  2.3 Identifying key events
  2.4 Writing to share

- Stage 3: Main characters' voices
  3.1 Listening to voyagers and their walk
  3.2 Deep dive
  3.3 Sharing main characters' voices

- Stage 4: Critical interpretation
  4.1 Bringing together the pieces of a puzzle
  4.2 Rebuilding the puzzle
  4.3 Enabling and strengthening futures
  4.4 Building bridges to meet

Moments
**Stage 0. The experience.**
Define what of our work we want to systematize. Delimit time, place/s, and actors.

**Stage 1. Methodological design.**
Unify expectations around systematization. Establish main methodology guidelines and work plan. That is, collectively design a systematization framework.

1.1 Creating horizons and establishing guiding principles for the systematization process.
   - 1.1.1 Creating the horizons worksheet
   - 1.1.2a Support reading to choose a nagual worksheet
   - 1.1.2b Establishing a nagual worksheet
   - 1.1.3 Exquisite corpse worksheet

1.2 Tracing the path. The methodology construction process with which we will approach the systematization of our experience.
   - 1.2.1 Building goals support worksheet
   - 1.2.2 Brainstorming worksheet
   - 1.2.3 Fundamental axis of meaning
   - 1.2.4 Differentiation guide between systematization, evaluation and research worksheet
   - 1.2.5 Systematization methodological scheme worksheet

1.3 Preparing the trip. Planning the systematization process.
   - 1.3.1 Systematization plan worksheet

**Stage 2. Historical reconstruction.**
Reconstruct and order the experience from descriptive elements. Review and synthesize the most relevant information.

2.1 Peeking through files. Analysis of documents related to the experience to be systematized - project proposals to funders, methodologies, agendas, follow-up reports, logs.

2.2 Giving an account of the lived process. Synthesis and ordering of documentary information.
   - 2.2.1 Systematization tool of written source worksheet

2.3 Identifying the most important parts of the experience and its participants. Key events of both the context and the process itself by those who have lived the experience.
   - 2.3.1a Timeline / Context Analysis worksheet
   - 2.3.1b Ordering and reconstruction matrix worksheet
   - 2.3.2 Lessons achieved worksheet
Stage 3. Main characters’ voices.
Complement the historical reconstruction with the voices of people and organizations involved in the experience to be systematized. Gather a range of points of view -experiences, reflections, and feelings-about the process from the different organizations involved.

3.1 Listening to voyagers and their walk, exploring reflections and feelings of those involved in the experience to be systematized.

3.1.1 Focus group worksheet
3.1.2a Semi-Structured Interview With Directors Worksheet
3.1.2b Fill out Focus Group or Interview Worksheet
3.1.3 Mixed-Mode Survey Worksheet

3.2 Deep dive. Glimpse continuities, ruptures, agreements, disagreements, and elements to be explored.

3.2.1 Comparative Analysis of Information Worksheet

3.3 Sharing main characters' voices. A document that gives an account of the overall process considerations expressed by main participants.

Gather lessons achieved from the critical reflection on the findings in previous stages.

4.1 Bringing together the pieces of a puzzle. Identifying factors and consequences of each of the key moments in the process to be systematized.

4.1.1a Working on EFIFPCNO worksheet
4.1.1b Consolidating Factors and Consequences Worksheet
4.1.2a Sorting Factors and Consequences Worksheet
4.1.2b Calculating New Weight of Factors and Consequences Worksheet

4.2 Rebuilding the puzzle. Causal analysis of one or more enabling and impeding factors.

4.2.1 Causal Analysis or Explanatory Network Worksheet

4.3 Enabling and strengthening futures. Critical construction of knowledge about action. Formulating conclusions for future processes, conceptual learning, and trends.

4.3.1 Meaningful Lessons Worksheet

4.4 Building bridges to meet. Preparing a final report with findings and conclusions to improve our practice and link us to other and different experiences.
Designing Our Systematization Process

Before starting to design our systematization, we will define the procedure to follow:

1. **Who will guide the systematization**: It is essential to define the person/s responsible for carrying out the process. It can be one person or two (if two, it may help the process move forward faster) in coordination with a directive person of the organization.

It is also possible to hire someone to guide the systematization (either to form part of the organization's team or as a specific consultancy). Doing so can provide us with an objective glance from someone who has come to know our practice - and got involved in it. Carrying the task internally might lead to missing observations as we are immersed in the organization's inertia. If we choose to hire someone externally, it is crucial to ensure that the person has relevant knowledge both in the field of applied research and in monitoring social processes. Ideally, the person should also have a background in systematizing experiences and enough time to learn about our specific processes. Even more desirable, the person should be interested in the type of experience we want to systematize! In our case: skill building for
human rights defenders at the intersection between technologies and free software from a popular education approach.

2. **Who will participate in the systematization process:** this will be according to the interest of those who are promoting the process. For example, in the exercise we carried out as Sursiendo, we were interested in participation at two levels. On the one hand, of those who carried out the Digital Security Accompaniment (DSA) in all its stages: assessment, implementation of the accompaniment plan, and follow-up actions. On the other hand, of those who participated in this process, the accompanied organizations.

**At each stage:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 0. The experience</th>
<th>If possible, all team members who have participated in the experience to be systematized. They can join at different times and formats, but ideally, everyone would be invited to the workshop to define the work together.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1. Methodological design</td>
<td>There will be moments of individual reflection, collective thinking, and moments that will be carried out mainly by the person responsible for guiding the systematization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2. Historical reconstruction</td>
<td>Directors, the focal contact, and one or two assistants to the digital security accompaniment spaces of the grassroots organizations involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3. Main characters’ voices</td>
<td>If possible, all team members who have participated in the experience to be systematized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4. Critical interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The time in which the systematization exercise will be carried out: this will undoubtedly be marked by multiple factors, such as the team’s time availability, the interest of those who will participate in the process, and economic resources to carry out the systematization. It took us a year to do so, as we were simultaneously building this methodology and continuing with the accompaniments. So we hope that having the currently shared methodological proposal, time frame should be reduced. By making these agreements, we can draw up an action plan for systematization that shows us the days, weeks, or months that we will dedicate to each stage.

Times suggested in this guide are those that we consider the minimum necessary to develop each of the stages. These times will also depend on the size of the organization and the process to be systematized.

We contemplate that the duration and tasks (carried out mainly by whoever guides the systematization process) are agreed upon with a person in charge of the organization and must include feedback moments and moments to review work progresses, methodologies to developed, etc.

To plan the times for working together, each person should allocate time-spaces to assemble with all participants and thus advance in the systematization process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology drafting for the experience definition Ordering first information that serves as input for next stage.</td>
<td>We consider a 4-hour workshop to work together and reflect on the experience we want to systematize. To identify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the experience to be systematized;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the time frame of the experience we are systematizing, which helps define the time of systematization;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• where the experience takes place;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• who participates in the experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology development for working together and material elaboration (if necessary) depends on the person responsible for the systematization process.</td>
<td>We consider 16 hours for working together. We decided to do this stage in two face-to-face workshops of one day each and a few weeks apart. This spare time helped us to mature first ideas and collective reflections expressed. Although the distance between each workshop responded to unforeseen situations in the team, we recognize that the time was beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary review, synthesis, information sorting, elaboration of a methodological proposal for working together, preparing work material (for example, the timeline), combining information from learning sheets, and preparing the first draft of our findings report.</td>
<td>We consider 16 hours to share, look, reflect, dialogue, and agreement on the elements that come out of this stage. It is necessary to dedicate specific days for reviewing joint work and report preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary review, synthesis and information order, preparation and transcription of interviews, surveys, or other methodological tools (focus groups or collective workshops), besides drafting the preliminary document that accounts for the gathered insights. For example: if we think that the interview with directors will last 2 hours and we will interview five people, we will have to contemplate 10 hours for conducting the interviews. And add the hours for its transcription.</td>
<td>We consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for the participating organizations’ directors moments: 8 hours of face-to-face work in a focus group or 2 hours for a semi-structured online interview;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for the focal contact and participants from organizations moments: 8 hours of face-to-face workshops or 30 minutes to fill out online surveys;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for sharing, reviewing, reflecting, discussing, and agreeing on the elements that come out in this stage moment: 4 hours;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 days would be necessary to draft the document that collects the information obtained at this stage. In addition, the days required to review and integrate comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology preparation for working together, the concentration of factors and consequences, and subsequent consolidation of a first draft of the entire systematization process. It can be considered, for example, two weeks for its writing. Additionally, the days required to review and integrate comments. This report will be nourished by documents written at each stage that were elaborated for collective reflection. If there are no documents for each stage, preparing a final document may take more time.</td>
<td>We consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for individual tasks: 6 hours;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for working together: 16 hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Conditions for systematization:** Jara claims that there are two necessary conditions: personal conditions and institutional or organizational ones (2018: 105).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Conditions</th>
<th>Organizational Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- interest in learning from experience by reflecting in our practice with an active disposition to build creative, innovative thoughts that adapt to the novelty of process changes.</td>
<td>- search of teamwork’s continuity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sensitivity to speak through it (what has happened and how it has happened). It involves getting rid of prejudices (that is, pre-judgments, previously formed judgments) and rigid patterns of thought;</td>
<td>- strategic bet;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ability to do analysis and synthesis;</td>
<td>- time and resources reserved for the systematization process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- constructive attitude;</td>
<td>- build collective learning that will serve as a reference for those coming to our organization;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- active listening;</td>
<td>- active listening;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- respect.</td>
<td>- respect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the economic resources applied to the systematization process, organizations should consider:

If it is a face-to-face environment, it would be necessary to contemplate resources for:

- stationery (markers, colored pencils, colored paper, bond paper - flip chart -, crayons);
- the rent of space, if we decide to carry out the sessions outside the office;
- food and drinks, both for breaks and lunch. It helps to outsource the catering to ensure that those of us who are in the process of systematization can devote all our attention to what is being discussed and reflected on;
- provide white sheets/notebooks to write down reflections, do the exercises, and take notes.

If it is online:

- ensure that all participants have the inputs to be able to connect (computer equipment, internet connection);
- ask the participants to have white sheets or a notebook at hand to write down reflections, do the exercises, and take notes.

5. Coexistence agreements: recognize and agree on how we want the systematization process to develop. These can be proposed by those who carry out the process but must acknowledge by all participants. For example, times for arrival to collective work, responsibility to carry out individual tasks, etc.

Regardless of the agreements, we invite you to write them on cardboard or bond paper and have them visible in all the spaces you gather to give continuity to the systematization process; this will help keep them very present.
### 6. Modalities for working together:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Face-to-Face Meeting</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The methodology can contemplate moments to work in pairs or small groups. Considering the number of participants in the systematization process, this helps to balance the participation of all. Working in couples or small groups makes it easier for everyone to provide input and contributes more elements for conversation in the plenary sessions. It can be beneficial if all face-to-face meetings occur in an alternate location to the usual workplace; this helps clear everyone’s mind and heart. It is recommended that we ensure that the place is ventilated and has enough light.</td>
<td>When planning each of the meetings, it is desirable that we verify if there are any materials we should previously send through email. Hence, participants arrive with elements already analyzed for the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of experience</th>
<th>In a meeting between 2 to 4 hours in which we discuss to define the experience.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face workshop / work meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In collective workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: Methodological design.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In meetings between 2 hours to 4 hours. That is, 4 meetings could be planned (perhaps one more or less depending on the time available and the pace of progress) to achieve the elements of this stage complete:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish guiding principles;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work on the objectives, and delimit the object,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish the fundamental axis of meaning and identifying where the information necessary to carry out the systematization is located,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review what was worked in previous meetings, refine if necessary and agree on the systematization plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the third session is to work the fundamental axis of meaning you should send the worksheet previously,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2: Methodological reconstruction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In meetings between 2 to 4 hours. So, four meetings could be planned (depending on the time available and the pace of progress) to have the elements of this stage completed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. timeline and context analysis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. timeline review and identification of significant moments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sharing learning cards answers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. presentation of the historicization report and its validation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If individual answers to the lessons achieved worksheet are to be shared, it is necessary to send the form previously to be filled out before the meeting.

It could also be helpful for each participant to draw up their own timeline of the process to be systematized before the group workshop where this topic will be addressed.
### Face-to-Face Meeting

It is essential to have the assistance of the focal contact—if there have been—one or two participants and the organization’s directors.

You could plan the workload to last a full day. This workshop seeks to collect inherent elements to the previous context, the experience of accompaniment, and the current situation of the organizations.

We are interested in hearing the experience according to the role that each one has had, so we plan specific moments of work for each individual. For example, we envision that the focus group would work on the same issues but in separate groups: one among those who are directors, another among those who are focal contact, and one more among those who assisted to OSA.

We will explore key moments in the experience. We suggest working on a timeline with these groups since it can show moments we may not have considered in the previous stage.

You could previously prepare the questions addressed in the focus group according to the concepts, edges, and interests of the experience you wish to systematize. These questions can be based on worksheet 3.1.2a. The emphasis to rescue the information will be placed not only on participants’ responses but also on the interaction within the group.

### Online

On the one hand, we suggest doing semi-structured online interviews with directors of each grassroots organization involved in the experience to be systematized. These interviews will help collect inherent elements to the previous context, the experience of the accompaniment, and the current situation of the organizations. It may be a good idea to allow each interviewee to choose the most appropriate place and time for the interview, as this will generate a climate of trust and distension.

On the other hand, we will use mix-mode surveys to explore the reflections and feelings of the focal contact, to deepen on the characteristics and activities that they assumed according to their role. Also addressed to the team members of those organizations that completed the accompaniment process to deepen their workshops experiences, support visits, and experiences as users of the recommended tools. The survey will be composed of mixed questions, some open and others with multiple answers, to be filled in asynchronously.

You could contemplate a virtual meeting between 2 to 4 hours to present the document prepared with general considerations about the process expressed by main characters in terms of methodology, addressed topics, achieved results, appropriation, changes, feelings, expectations, and desires.

### Stage 3: Main characters’ voices

This stage requires more effort than the previous ones. If this is the first time we are systematizing an experience, it will also be essential to know and learn from the methodology and familiarize ourselves with terms that we hear for the first time. It will be beneficial to consider this in planning to ensure the slowest participants can keep up with the rest of the group so that there is clarity to all. Considering this helps us guarantee that everyone can contribute and enrich the interpretation.

It is important to note that we highly recommend a face-to-face meeting for this stage, at least concerning the group work. Instead of online conversations, there is higher quality feedback on face-to-face discussions regarding the interpretation of the experience, as well as the findings and meaningful lessons developed.

A 3-day retreat can be planned in which moments of work and individual reflection are combined with moments of discussion in plenary. Alternatively, two workshops for collective thinking, one each day, can be organized. There will be moments to carry out individual tasks—three exercises, at least—that will provide inputs for dialogue and reflection as a whole.

### Stage 4: Critical interpretation

In 2 to 4 hour meetings. That is, four meetings could be planned (considering time availability and the pace of progress) to have the elements of this stage complete:

1. factors and consequences;
2. rearrangement of factors and consequences;
3. causal analysis or explanatory network;
4. explain the learning that we formulate from our duties.

For the first session, File 4.1.1a must be previously sent to work on EFPCEINNO, which will be carried out individually. This way, everyone’s answers can be shared in the group meeting, enabling them to advance smoothly in the sessions together.

### Recommendations

Do not ignore the importance of participants’ hydration regardless of whether the meeting is online or in person. Drinking water helps our brain connections to strengthen and have clear thinking. Dehydration often causes tiredness and irritability. Also having some fruits on hand can help us during the brainy work time that we will do.

Remember to schedule breaks and perhaps some exercise to focus your attention on when you return from them. Focus exercises can also be done at the beginning of each workshop, either face-to-face or online. We recommend doing stretching and brain gym exercises.
It is desirable to promote the use of privacy-friendly software, considering the digital care domain's importance in recent years and due to the nature of the topics discussed in the present proposal. Thus, we encourage you to use secure platforms and free applications. From Sursiendo, we share this platform with which we can easily approach some practices and tools to protect our "digital life": https://cuidadosdigitales.sursiendo.org/ (only available in Spanish)

Considering the current situation in which a large part of our activities take place virtually, the invitation is to continue with reflection and dialogue on the challenges of popular education in the context of a pandemic-digitality. For what it is advisable to promote online processes where dialogue and collective construction exists. Also, strategies that encourage the creativity of each of those who participate in them. Face-to-face meetings should be carried with the necessary care and always promoting that each session is rested, relaxed, and with moments that allow collective construction (Zúñiga López, 2021). We know the limits and risks of working online, including limitations of access, connectivity, technology, training, and ownership. From digital activities, we should promote technological appropriation in relation to life (Jara, 2021).
STAGE 0:
THE EXPERIENCE
Stage 0: The Experience

In his five-stage proposal, Oscar Jara establishes this as the “the starting point” of the experience, for which is necessary:

- to have participated in the experience;
- to have records of the experience.

Stage Goals:

- define the experience we want to systematize;
- delimit time, place, and participants.

The choice of experience relies on what we want to problematize about the trail or paths trodden to find new elements. That is the experience from which we have an interest in assuming the meaning of our practices. This moment proposes to deepen the bases of the experience to be systematized and will be built from solving the subsequent premises:
- the experience to be systematized;
- the time window in which what we want to systematize took place or the duration of the experience itself. Thus, we need to define the period which will be systematized;
- where the experience took place;
- who participated in the experience.

Probably at this stage, we are only clear about the experience to be systematized. No problem, because in the next step, the methodological design, we will delve into details of other points. We will reveal much more of the experience at the historical reconstruction stage.
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**Stage 1: Methodological Design**

This stage consists of developing a plan to trace the route to be followed within the systematization process. You can build this plan by solving the following questions:

- why do we want to systematize this process?
- what experience do we want to systematize? If we have already defined it in the previous stage, we could delve deeper into it or detail what is needed in line with all the questions to be solved;
- what central aspects of the experience are we interested in deepening? from where (with what lenses) are we interested in looking at it?
- what data sources do we have, and which ones do we need?

This stage will be finalized by answering these questions, having the framework that will guide the whole systematization process (systematization methodological scheme) and a roadmap to follow up with activities, managers, times, tools to use, necessary resources, and who will participate (systematization plan).

It is essential to dedicate enough time to the present stage - necessary time to clarify doubts, move forward together, and establish a collective voice-. This may help all the participants have clarity about the way
forward and ensure that the questions we ask / answer throughout the process respond to systematization and not to an evaluation or investigation. The differentiation worksheet between each one (1.2.4) can help us to achieve this goal.

It would be best if you did not project the systematization question into the future. It must refer us to the experience we have chosen to address to answer it. For example, in the beginning, we asked ourselves: "How can we ensure that Human Rights social organizations improve their digital security through reappropriating principles, practices, and tools of free software?" If we reread it, we can see this question does not allow us to review past experiences but rather actions in the future. This is how, in our second workshop, we rephrased it as: "How did the digital security accompaniment for grassroots human rights movements in Chiapas, developed and implemented by Sursiendo from 2018 to 2020, improve digital security?"

It has also helped us conduct a series of "secondary questions" to guide the information-gathering process. We elaborated these to orientate the information collecting based on the experience we chose to systematize, the first moments already defined in it, and the lenses of the fundamental axis of meaning (which we will address later). Also aligned to the elements we were interested in knowing about the organizations involved in DSA.
Although the methodological design draft outlines the direction of the path that we want to range, we must be open to changes if deemed necessary "insofar that those who propose the path are, in turn, voyagers" (Jara, 2018:136). However, reviewing this methodological design - or any of the stages - as required will help keep the fundamental axis of meaning and goals in mind and thus reach the final stages having responded to what we proposed at the beginning. Returning when necessary will prevent us from going to the critical interpretation stage, realizing that what we have done - the information we have organized and analyzed - is far from the proposed route because this would mean a new start.

When defining the experience, it is wise to remember that it is not necessary to cover up the entire experience from the beginning to the present moment. Outlining our goal will help us focus on the experience we will be systematizing by defining the systematization object and where we are making the cut!

It is important to review every step we take in the systematization process. Whether it is face-to-face or online meetings, meticulous documentation will help build the document that we will all validate. In our case, the person who guided the systematization was responsible for making this documentation.
### Stage Goals

- Unify expectations around systematization;
- Establish main methodology guidelines and work plan.

Which is collectively designing the systematization framework.

### Timeframe, Moments and Tools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moments</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Creating horizons. Establishing guiding principles for the systematization process.</td>
<td>1.1.1 Creating the horizons worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Support reading to choose a nagual worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Establishing a nagual worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Exquisite corpse worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Tracing the path. The methodology construction process with which we will approach the systematization of our experience.</td>
<td>1.2.1 Building goals support worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Brainstorming worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 Fundamental axis of meaning exercise worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4 Differentiation guide between systematization, evaluation and research worksheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5 Systematization methodological scheme worksheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Preparing the trip. Planning the systematization process.</td>
<td>1.3.1 Systematization plan worksheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1 Creating horizons. Establishing guiding principles.

This moment allows us to establish the principles that will guide the systematizing process. These will enable us to structure the whole work strategy to be followed during the process. It is suggested that they are in line with the principles of the organization itself, and at the same time, they can be specific to the experience to be systematized.

Here we share three exercises as suggestions. You can choose one that best suits your group or organization to help establish a culture that shares values, principles, hopes, and intentions that each one brings to define the systematization principles collectively. We briefly describe each of these exercises to give us an idea of the intention of each one. At the end of this section, you will find their respective worksheets with further details on carrying them out. You can also do the three exercises if you see them pertinent and have time to do it. In that case, we propose you follow the order listed below.

The first exercise is a narrative practice-based suggestion called “Creating horizons” (worksheet 1.1.1). In this exercise, we work with images associating them with a value, principle, dream, hope, or intention, giving us the guiding principles of the process to be systematized.
The second proposed exercise involves establishing a nagual (worksheet 1.1.2a and 1.1.2b) which will accompany us in the adventure of systematization to invoke this animal energy to guide us along the way with its qualities.

The third exercise is to make an Exquisite Corpse (worksheet 1.1.3), so we can collectively assemble words or images to create a unique work that contains elements of each one.

We merged the second and third exercises by developing the exquisite corpse to describe that fantastic nagual animal we selected. However, these are exercises that can be done independently.

1.2 Tracing the path. The process of methodology construction in which we will approach the systematization of our experience.

At this time, we will reflect on and discuss each team member's beliefs and ideas about what a systematization of experiences means. You can take a moment so that everyone individually writes their ideas. Then share them in pairs and put them together in plenary, making a construction among all that frames the exercise we will develop. Next, we will brainstorm ideas to specify the action of systematizing according to what each one understands for such action, defining it collectively so that the concept is clear to all easily and concretely.
On this basis, you can then:

(a) define systematization goal/s - the deep meaning of them. This answers the "why" question. When describing it, we need to be clear about the usefulness related to the systematization. Here we provide you with a supporting worksheet (1.2.1) for goals construction -based on Jara's proposal of general utilities of a systematization (Jara, 2018, 86-103). We hope this worksheet can guide you to get ahead.

This activity can start with a "brainstorming" session (worksheet 1.2.2.), answering why we want to start with the systematization exercise?

Later on, it is necessary to agree among all the goals; this helps clarify what is expected of the entire systematization exercise.

For the goal to be helpful, it should consider these two dimensions: the organizational, which support is essential, and the personal, whose motivation will be crucial.

Given that the goal (s) guide the entire systematization process, it is crucial to stop at this step long enough to clarify to everyone involved.

(b) define systematization object. Answer the "what" question. It is possible that in the previous stage, we have advanced answers
about what experience, where it has been carried out, time-frame, key moments, who participated. Now we can think thoroughly about the experience.

The criteria for selecting and delimitating the experience can be diverse. In our case, the DSA process presented innovative elements that we consider to analyze and share: a continuous, long-term accompaniment with a comprehensive approach.

(c) the fundamental axis of meaning - the central aspect that we are interested in deepening. Answer the question "which ones." They are the lenses from which we analyze the entire experience. This aspect helps us to focus the analysis and critical reflection.

To guide ourselves and not lose sight of the axis construction, we can review the differentiation sheet between research, systematization, and evaluation. (worksheet 1.2.4).

Fundamental axis of meaning responds to: why systematize this experience and not another? To define the axis of systematization, we must all understand what it is and what it will serve us. It is worthwhile a brief explanation by who is responsible for guiding the systematization process and the dialogue between what each one understands in this
regard. We also have the fundamental axis of meaning exercise worksheet! (1.2.5).

A better specification is provided according to answers given through "brainstorming." For example, we established that the general interest in carrying out our systematization exercise responded to: "c. The experience is still ongoing or, it is not known whether or not it has been successful in its results; however, it has interesting, innovative elements that we should know." And it was after the "brainstorming" session, we detailed elements that seemed innovative to us. So in our case, we chose to look at the experience from an integral point of view, for which we set out to list the criteria that define "comprehensiveness." In this way, we assume systematization as a "permanent task of building a system of ideas, concepts and symbols" (Antillón, 2002: 43).

It is then worth specifying the elements and concepts that we bring into a dialogue during systematization.

(d) identify and locate where the information is needed to recover the experience process and order its main elements. In addition, determine what information will be required to obtain via interviews, document search, file review, etc. In this step, we answer the questions: what sources of data do we have, and which ones do we need?
The information to be retrieved is which is relevant to the defined goals and mainly related to the fundamental axis of meaning and the aspect/s into which we have decided to delve. This will prevent us from concentrating on information that may not contribute to the systematization we are striving to accomplish.

Where can we find the information we need?

- **Physical or digital files related to the process**: project document, logs, meeting minutes, reports, evaluation documents, descriptive letters.

- **Interviews**: to prepare the interviews, it is essential to know the size of the entire group that received the accompaniment to decide how many people and which profiles will be interviewed. If it is a small group (up to 5 people), it is advisable to conduct short interviews with each of them. On the other hand, if the group is large, it may be better to consider interviews with a single person of each profile or moment of the accompaniment process they participated.

The decision on how many people to interview and how to do it depends on our footage. If the experience has been poorly documented, we will need to collect information directly from the people involved. At the time
of the interviews, it is also beneficial to have secondary questions of the systematization.

Finally, in the interview worksheets (2.3.3a. and 3.1.2a.), you will find further details about preparing them, what elements are needed to consider, and other necessary materials to prepare before facilitating the analysis process.

### 1.3 Preparing the trip

Planning the systematization process.

We finalize our methodological design by drawing up our work plan for the systematization process (worksheet 1.3.1). We define what we will do, the goal, activities, managers, participants, and timeframe for each development step.

The systematization plan sheet can be completed:

- by the person guiding the systematization based on the dialogue between all and then it needs to be validated;
- among all in plenary.

Regardless of the chosen path, it is necessary that all participants in the systematization validate the route to be followed, pay attention to details, and put it in a visible place for all to keep in mind the activities and how we are progressing.
Procedure:
Images are spread out on the floor. The indication is given for each one to take one that represents something important to them. Then participants should answer what they are honoring when following up the systematization process (a value, commitment, principle, dream, hope, or wish).

In pairs, few minutes are allocated to talk about the image and its importance.

You will interview your partner with the following questions to explore the image:

1. What value, commitment, principle, dream, hope, or desire does your image represents?
2. Since when would you say it has been important to you (name the value, commitment, principle, dream, hope, or desire expressed by the interviewee)?
3. Are there times when ___________ is more powerful than others? What do you think contributes to this? have you noticed if there are contexts where ___________ is more likely to exist?
4. Could you tell a time when ____________ played an important role for you? or for someone else?
5. Would you say it was easy or not so easy for _________________ to be present?
6. What knowledge or skills do you think you had to put into practice to open the doors to ____________?
7. What effects do you think ______________ presence had?
8. From whom would you say you learned the importance of ____________? Or, who do you think would not be surprised to learn that ______________ is important to you?
9. Where do you think you were when you learned the importance of ________________?
10. If ______________ were to be present during the systematization process, how do you think we would see (name the value, commitment, principle, dream, hope, or desire expressed by the interviewee) reflected in actions? What actions would they be?

**Interviewer:** Write the answers to the following questions (when you introduce your partner to the group, be sure to make a very brief presentation. You do not have to read the questions, only the text resulting from the answers):

- What value does your image represents?
- From whom did you learn its importance?
- Where did you learn the importance of this?

After this presentation and considering the values, dreams, hopes that each one has exposed, we proceed to the collective construction of the principles that will guide the systematization process.
In the Mesoamerican territory, where Sursiendo develops its work, there are different resistance to the current colonial, neoliberal model, such as spiritual resistance. There is a claim arguing for another way of counting time, which is the Quiché Mayan calendar. This calendar speaks of the forces and effects that the nagual keeps each day. The naguals represent the energy, spirit, or force of the beings and elements of nature. According to the Mayan worldview, they represent and link each person with the ecosystem, thus creating balance.

A brief description of the 20 naguals in the Quiché Mayan calendar:

**B’atz:** Means monkey or thread. Nagual of all the arts, of fabrics, of artists. An excellent day to ask for a partner, tie or untie any matter. They are masters of all the arts.

**Ee:** Means wild cat. Nagual of all paths and leaders; of the nervous and blood system, as well. A suitable day to start any trip or business. They are natural leaders.

**Ix:** Means jaguar. Nagual of nature and the Mayan altars. A day to ask for physical and mental strength. Nagual of the seven human shames: pride, ambition, envy, lies, crime, ingratitude, ignorance due to laziness. Represents internal reasoning people who like nature and solitude.

**Tz’ik’in:** Means bird or eagle. Nagual of economic well-being and good fortune. An auspicious day to give thanks and ask for economic well-being. It is the communication and intermediation between Uk’ux Kaj and Uk’ux Ulew, the heart of heaven and the heart of the earth. Represents people who build their well-being.

**Ajmaq:** Means bee. Nagual of all faults. The day of grandmothers and grandfathers who have passed away and the day to apologize for our shortcomings. Represents brave and sweet-blooded people who easily fall to blame.

**Noj:** Means Woodpecker. Nagual of intelligence. A day dedicated to asking for wisdom, talent, good thinking. Nagual of the tremor or earthquake. Represents very creative and imaginative people.
**Tijaax:** Means toucan and swordfish. Nagual of sudden death and suffering. An auspicious day for healers and authorities to cut down ills and diseases. Represents confronting people who cut all kinds of harm and problems.

**Kawoq:** Means turtle. Nagual of all kinds of controversies. The woman's day, the day to cure diseases. Nagual of the quartz stone and the seeds of Tz’ité. Represents creative people, defenders of women.

**Ajpu:** Means human being. Nagual of the sun. A day to ask for wisdom, talent, and physical strength. Nagual of flowers, music, sports, hunters, and agriculture. Represents leaders and selective people who seek their benefit first.

**Imox:** Means lizard or shark. The left side. Nagual of the sea, rivers, and lakes, a day to heal diseases of the mind, to thank and ask for rain, conditions of the mind. It is not the concept of madness that we commonly know; it is the ability to feel what others can’t. That is why some people say they speak crazy stuff. Nagual of all the places where the water is.

**Tz’í:** Means dog, raccoon, coyote (some grandmothers and grandfathers also say TZIU = word). Nagual of justice, material and spiritual authority, order. A day to ask for the solution to the problems before the courts. Day to ward off vices. Represents people who speak for others. Owners of the laws who judge others.

---

**Support reading to choose a nagual worksheet**
Iq: Means hummingbird. Nagual of the air and the moon, of the spirit of the human being. A day to move away from bad energies and diseases. It is the wind that cleans our house and our body. Represents noble people who get involved in the problems of others with ease. They come and go from one place to another, like the wind.

Aq’ab’al: Means macaw. Nagual of clarity, a day to ask for the light to come out in all things. The day of the people who make up the bones of the sick and the healers that use plants. Represents people who keep their commitments.

K’at: Means spider or iguana. Nagual of the visible and invisible prisons, a keeper. Represents the net where the corn is kept and where the fish are caught. A day to pray for those who are imprisoned, to tangle and untangle things. Represents people with a lot of fire in their being and those who handle positive and negative energies.

Kan: Means feathered serpent (serpent and quetzal). Nagual of the creation of man and woman, owner of all material things. A day to ask for a solution to all kinds of problems and needs. Represents people with a high sense of loyalty.
**Keme:** Means tecolote or owl. Nagual of all kinds of deaths. A day to ask for death to move away or to request the rest and peace of a dying person. Death is not bad, it is the complement of life, the rest. Also, a day to withdraw negative energies in people. Represents people with skills for the arts and crafts.

**Keej:** Means Deer. The authority of the community. Nagual of all kinds of quadruped animals. A day to ask for strength to bear our sorrows. Nagual from the four corners of the world. Day of the Ajqiqab’ or Mayan priests. Represents leading people, dominant with their partners, people who like fame.

**Q’anil:** Means rabbit. The planet Venus. Nagual of all kinds of animal and vegetable seeds. Fertility and harvest day, suitable for starting any sowing or business. The four colors of corn, red, black, white, and yellow. Represents people of “hot” hands to whom everything they sow flourishes.

**Toj:** Means offering, payment and rain. Nagual of the four lords of fire, Tojil, Awilix, Jakawitz’ and Nikajtakaj. An excellent day to level or pay off any debt. A day when everything we receive in our lives is appreciated, the good and the bad. Represents people with great sensitivity to the arts and who cry easily.

More information on the prophecy of the Grandmothers and the Grandfathers and this harmonious vision in Barrios and Squirru (2009) and Yac Noj (2013).
The invitation to call the energy of a nagual in the systematization process is to bring their energy to accompany us accomplishing the process; this is why we propose to be guided by the energy of a nagual. However, we know that there are different sacred beings associated with local cultures in other regions that may make more sense for the group that wishes to systematize their experience. If so, we encourage you to incorporate them instead!

**Procedure:**

- The facilitator explains what a nagual is: a guide animal which brings its energy, skills, and qualities;
- Starting from the qualities we want in our systematization process, we suggest that all animals we think of represent these qualities. We make a list of animals and choose one;
- Information about the chosen nagual-animal is provided;
- The group is asked to choose some central elements of the selected nagual: principles, qualities (4 or 5 maximum);
- Collectively, participants will list the elements we want to rescue and seek to be present in the systematization process.
The exquisite corpse is a collective creation technique born in the literary field in the 19th century and was later applied in various spaces. It is a play on words through which many more words are created out of an image. The result is known as an exquisite corpse or cadavre exquis in French. It is a technique used by the surrealist art movement since 1925 and is based on a board game called consequences. (Wikipedia, 2021)

It is a kind of game where each participant makes their contribution without knowing the contribution that others make. The sum of these individual contributions generates a work that has not been previously imagined. It is the revelation of participants' collective unconscious, as reason has not intervened in the result.

Some principles of the exquisite corpse taken up by Perezchica (s. F.) are:

- it must be carried out as a playful act, without the pressure of style or coherence of meaning. Moreover, it can be paradoxical, that is, exclude meanings;
- in the exquisite corpse, the accidental, the random, and the intuitive play an important role;
- it should, as far as possible, remain an experiment in character from beginning to end;
- the work must be understood as a group creation;
- it is based on the random assembly of elements;
- it can be played indefinitely, but more or less continuously. The participants decide in common what is the final destination of the work and the convenience of its completion;
- expresses the spirit of a moment artistically;
- it is a machine of shared discoveries, a key to open the imaginary.

Procedure:
To make an exquisite corpse, the first participant writes a phrase, a word (or draws a picture) on a sheet of paper, and then folds it, revealing only the last thing she wrote (or drew) that will join a second participant writes. This, in turn, will fold the sheet again to leave a new participant only a clue of the last thing she wrote (or drew). When all the people involved in the creation have finished making their contribution, the sheet is extended, and the individual phrases or images end up assembled into the final result.

Performing this exercise in the systematization process helps to make a fantastic description of the nagual animal that we selected, highlighting the elements shared by each participant. Collaborative writing also reminds us of what we want to guide our process.
A goal is the meaning, the usefulness, or the expected process result. Answers the question "why." It reflects the ends to be achieved and to which an action is directed.

Jara (2018: 144) points out that for defining a systematization goal, we must consider:

- the mission and organization strategy, group, or institution to which we belong, in such a way that this exercise contributes to it. Therefore, we can count on the support, interest, and collective approval;
- the interests, motivations, and personal possibilities of each team member that promotes the systematization. Either because a person suggested the exercise and socialized it with the others or because all have proposed it. Consequently, interests, motivations, and possibilities will depend on each person's involvement in the process.

Given that the goals give direction to the entire systematization process, it is essential to stop long enough so that those we build are clear to everyone.

**Procedure:**
The activity can start with a "brainstorming" session answering the question, why do we want to start the systematization exercise?
You can build your own or consider these suggestions:

- to understand our experiences more deeply and thus be able to improve them;
- to exchange and share our learnings with other similar experiences;
- to contribute to theoretical reflection with knowledge arising directly from experiences;
- to provide feedback for orientations and guidelines of large projects or big institutions based on the concrete learning that comes from the particular diverse experiences;
- to strengthen the collective identity of an institution or organization.

According to the amount of "what for" answers, the participants can do a first exercise of unifying similar ones and then, with the rest, work in small groups. Each group takes at least two of the answers and transforms them into goals.

Already in the plenary, you can review all the written goals. We suggest selecting a maximum of three to avoid dispersing the attention of the systematization process.

Keys to writing goals:
The SMART goals must be: specific -formulated with precision, in detail-, measurable -either qualitatively or quantitatively-, achievable -be realistic-, relevant -they must be related to what we want to do and achieve- and timed - They must have a time frame, a deadline-.
- **General goals.** Summarize the purpose of a job. In this specific case, they will summarize the purpose of the systematization process.

- **Specific goals.** They detail the processes needed to get the job done. They define each of the steps that we must follow to achieve the general goal.

- **Secondary goals.** They do not always appear, but when they do, they describe a set of collateral goals that can also be achieved by systematization. They can refer to other knowledge we want to generate, other groups we want to reach, etc. They should not deviate from the general goal of systematization and should have the same SMART elements.

In order to write it, it is necessary to start with an action verb, that is, in the infinitive. This table can help:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Element on which the verb falls</td>
<td>Proposes quantitative and / or qualitative achievement levels</td>
<td>Compliance feature</td>
<td>Period of time in which it will be achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Verbs for general goals: analyze, categorize, compare, compile, contrast, create, define, demonstrate, develop, describe, diagnose, design, carry out, conceptualize, consider, deduce, detail, establish, evaluate, explain, examine, expose, formulate, substantiate, generate, identify, infer, show, guide, oppose, reconstruct, distinguish, enunciate, enumerate, specify, estimate, relate, replicate, reproduce, reveal, plan, present, test, produce, propose, locate, trace, organize, record, connect, summarize, select, separate, synthesize, suggest, finish.

* Verbs for specific purposes: caution, analyze, base, determine, indicate, designate, interpret, decompose, justify, describe, mention, show.
Procedure:
Who guides the activity must ask a straightforward question that expresses the goal that is pursued. The question must allow us to respond from our reality, from our experience.

While we are expressing our ideas, who guides the activity should write them down:

a. if the goal is to know the opinion we have on a specific topic, the annotation of the brainstorming can be done as they arise, in disorder;

b. if the goal is to analyze the different aspects of a problem or to diagnose a situation, it is important to write down the ideas in a certain order;

c. once the brainstorming is done, we choose those ideas that summarize the opinion of the group majority. Conclusions could also be drawn up as a group, carrying out a process of eliminating or clipping ideas.

What is relevant in this technique is the idea sorting, so we have a clear vision of what we think, being graphically expressed in which aspects the most significant number of group ideas are concentrated.
This technique can be used:

- to make a diagnosis about what the group knows or thinks about a particular topic, which will be conversed and deepened in the collective discussion;
- to draw up conclusions on a topic that has been discussed;
- to plan concrete actions;
- to evaluate work done.
Procedure:

1. We will collectively establish the general motive of our interest for the systematization of our experience:

   a. it is a successful experience, and it is interesting to know the reasons for this positive result;
   b. it is a failed experience, and it is interesting to know the reasons for this negative result;
   c. the experience is still ongoing, or it is simply not known whether or not it has been successful in its results. However, it has attractive, innovative elements to acknowledge.

2. We will specify and detail the reason chosen in point 1:

   a. If our chosen reason was "A," that is, it is a successful experience, and it is interesting to know the reasons for this positive result. We must specify what makes it a successful experience. For example, "This experience has been successful because a high percentage of the participants have appropriated the digital security tools shared in the workshops";

   b. If our chosen reason was "B," that is, it is a failed experience, and it is interesting to know the reasons for this result, then we will
specify what led us to fail. For example: "Despite the workshops in which we shared digital security tools, a low percentage of the participants make use of them";

c. If our chosen reason was "C," that is, the experience is still ongoing, or it is simply not known whether or not it has been successful in its results. However, it has interesting, innovative elements that we should know, then we will answer what those innovative elements are. For example, our response: we consider that Sursiendo’s accompaniment process contains several innovative features to be analyzed "a continuous, long-term accompaniment, with a comprehensive approach that encompasses multiple aspects: from the political and critical approach of technologies, passing through training workshops in specific practices and tools, personalized technical support, registration of digital security incidents, to the elaboration of institutional protocols and policies in this matter."

3. What we detail in point 2 is what our systematization axis will be. What does this mean? We should look at the experience from that issue and concentrate only on that issue. If, while doing the fieldwork, you discover other aspects or topics that are also very interesting, you can organize another systematization exercise. We suggest not to mix topics.

A systematization fundamental axis of meaning is like a spinal column that communicates with all the experience but from a specific perspective. For this reason, it is often helpful to formulate it related to
central aspects. For example: "Factors that influence the appropriation of digital security tools and involvement in the care practices of the participants."

The fundamental axis of meaning must be consistent with the systematization process and its object. The axis has a practical sense. It must be a facilitator of the systematization process, preventing us from getting lost in the multitude of experience elements that are not relevant to it. In other words, there must be an intimate relationship between the goal that we want to achieve with the systematization of this experience and the main specific aspects that we want to address with greater emphasis.

Note: every experience is so enormously rich in multiple and diverse elements that, even having a defined goal and a delimited object in place and time, it will still be necessary to specify more precisely the approach to be given to systematization so as not to disperse. The role of the systematization fundamental axis of meaning is to concentrate and focus attention around the central aspect or aspects that, like a common thread, cross the path of experience.
The three knowledge processes have the following characteristics in common:

- they involve systematic, rigorous work, of reflection and analysis, that is, a method;
- all three have to:
  - define what you want to know (systematization axes, evaluation goals, problematizing questions);
  - order, organize, structure, categorize, conceptualize information;
  - analyze and interpret the data.

All contribute to the same purpose of knowing reality to transform it:

- they are situated in the field of knowledge;
- they provide mutual feedback and neither substitutes other one;
- they seek to improve practices;
- they seek replicability -in the sense of being a creative inspiration to reinvent-.

However, they also have their differences. To get to know them and focus on this proposal, we share in the following table some details of each one.
that can help us prepare the systematization question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systematize</th>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- it emphasizes processes dynamics and their movements;</td>
<td>- intends to analyze, measure or assess the results obtained;</td>
<td>- it is an exercise that seeks to contribute to the construction of scientific knowledge;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- it implies historical recovery of the process of those who have been its subjects;</td>
<td>- it puts greater emphasis on results;</td>
<td>- it can be checked, contrasted, and compared;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- it is related to the process, its dynamics, path, and vitality;</td>
<td>- it is an educational fact;</td>
<td>- it includes experiences in a broader framework;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- it recovers experiences and knowledge generated to recognize the senses that are generated from different actors;</td>
<td>- it contains practical conclusions;</td>
<td>- its purpose is to recognize reality concerning other experiences or some unknown aspect of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- its purpose is to make a critical interpretation of the lived process, to learn from the experience.</td>
<td>- it is related to the project and its fulfillment;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- it carries out a value judgment;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- it will produce information for decision-making;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- its purpose is to know results obtained by the experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Systematization methodological scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What is systematizing?</strong></th>
<th>Here we place the definition we have collectively created. There are many definitions of what systematization is. We consider that each group must define it concerning what this process represents to them.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systematization question</strong></td>
<td>The guiding question that allows us to go through the whole experience to be systematized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systematization object</strong></td>
<td>Delimit the field of experience in which we will carry out the systematizing exercise: which one? Who / is it? Where? Period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Why do we want to systematize?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundamental axis of meaning</strong></td>
<td>It is the spinal column that communicates with all the experiences from a specific perspective. It must be consistent with the goals and the object to be systematized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** If you want to see an example, you can review page 10 of the document of findings that we share of our systematization: https://sursiendo.org/2021/03/hallazgos-de-la-sistematizacion-del-proceso-de-acompanamientos-en-seguridad-digital/
**Systematization Plan Worksheet**

**Prepared by / Taken from:**
Sursiendo

**Goal:**
Have a series of detailed steps that allow us to monitor the systematization process. It should contain its goals, activities to follow, responsible people, and timeframe that help to visualize the follow-up of the drawn route.

|-------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------|
| 00. Choose the experience to be systematized | Delineate the experience (temporality, space, actors). | 1. Step description  
2. Step description  
3. ... | 1. name of the person responsible for this step  
2. ... | Schedule |
| 01. Prepare the methodologic al proposal for systematization | Unify expectations around the systematization. Establish the main guidelines of the methodology and the work plan. | 1. Step description  
2. Step description  
3. ... | 1. name of the person responsible for this step  
2. ... | Schedule |
| 02. Reconst the history process/interaction with key events in the context | Reconstruct and order the experience from descriptive elements. Synthesize and analyze the most relevant information. | 1. Step description  
2. Step description  
3. ... | 1. name of the person responsible for this step  
2. ... | Schedule |
| 03. Collect information from the organizations participating in the experience | Complement the historicization with the voices of the organizations participating in the DSA process. Collect views and feelings about the process. | 1. Step description  
2. Step description  
3. ... | 1. name of the person responsible for this step  
2. ... | Schedule |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Qué?</th>
<th>¿Para qué? (objetivos)</th>
<th>¿Cómo?</th>
<th>¿Quién? Responsable/s, participante/s</th>
<th>¿Cuando?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04. Critical interpretation</td>
<td>From the critical reflection, gather the meaningful lessons from experience regarding the findings in previous stages.</td>
<td>1. Step description 2. Step description 3. ...</td>
<td>1. name of the person responsible for this step 2. ...</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05. Draw conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Step description 2. Step description 3. ...</td>
<td>1. name of the person responsible for this step 2. ...</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06. Prepare the final systematization document</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Step description 2. Step description 3. ...</td>
<td>1. name of the person responsible for this step 2. ...</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07. Communicate findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Step description 2. Step description 3. ...</td>
<td>1. name of the person responsible for this step 2. ...</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We suggest that each step also includes the activities, responsible people, and review timeframe of the developed content. In general, the person responsible for guiding the systematization is different from the person assessing the information that appears at each step.
STAGE 2: REHISTORICAL CONSTRUCTION
Stage 2: Historical Reconstruction

This is a mainly descriptive and narrative exercise to reconstruct the history of the process that we want to systematize. The idea is "to have a detailed and global vision of the main events that took place in the journey of the experience, usually exposed chronologically" (Jara, 2018: 152). We must not forget that this reconstruction must always be carried out from our proposed goals and our systematization fundamental axis of meaning.

The most important thing at this stage is that the information we obtain enables us to have a comprehensive visualization of the entire experience "as a journey made and lived. Since it will be the basis for further reflection, it is not necessary to carry out now detailed and meticulous writing of the history of the experience, but rather to record the main milestones that have shaped the process" (Jara, 2018: 154). It is preferable not to formulate any conclusions or advanced interpretations during the historicization process, although topics to be explored or critical questions that we will work on in the interpretive phase can be noted down.
As for documentary records, we often do not have solid documentation—sometimes we entrust the data to our memory, and then we forget—we notice this when we have to make reports, evaluations, or some systematization. We often lack an "institutional system of records." To solve this, it helps to generate clear guidelines on how to carry out the documentation/registration of our activities to meet our needs as an organization. If we lack cohesion on the format, the information gathered by the people documenting the activities might not respond to what we require. These guidelines must also include which indicators or elements should be considered so that the records are not solely descriptive but also provide more analytical aspects.

**Stage goals:**

- Reconstruct and order the experience from descriptive elements.
- Review and synthesize the most relevant information about the experience to be systematized.
### Timeframe, Moments and Tools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moments</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Peeking between files.</td>
<td>2.2.1 Systematization tool of written source worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Giving an account of the lived process.</td>
<td>2.3.1a Timeline / Context Analysis worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Identifying the most important parts of the experience and its participants. Identification of key events.</td>
<td>2.3.1b Ordering and reconstruction matrix worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Writing to share. Writing historization report -descriptive-</td>
<td>2.3.2 Lessons achieved worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3a Semi-structured interview with team members worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3b Fill-out interviews worksheet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Moments

### 2.1 Peeking between files.

Analysis of documents related to the experience to be systematized (project proposal to funders, methodologies, agendas, follow-up reports, diagnostic logs, workshops, support, or any other activity that includes our accompaniment). This documentary review will be carried out by the person facilitating the systematization process. It is essential to provide
the necessary documents so that the person in charge can review them with ease. It will be easier if there is an institutional system of records, that is, a system within the organization to make/organize records (logs, reports, minutes, etc.) of activities developed. The documentary review provides elements to support the following moments.

This first moment can also show lacks. That is, it can lead us to information that we are missing (documentation or documents that do not provide us with the necessary information). If this happens, it is essential to register it to decide how to solve these shortcomings.

2.2 Giving an account of the lived process. Synthesis and ordering of documentary information.

To perform the synthesis and organization of the information, it helps to create a systematizing tool of written sources (file 2.2.1.). This is a database file in which for each sheet you can fill out:

- **who participated in the experience.** In our case, we filled out one sheet with the organization personnel responsible for carrying out the accompaniment process, and we filled out another sheet with the information corresponding to the organizations involved in the process;
- **goals, results, and indicators of the process to be systematized;**
the moments of the process. It is suggested to create a new sheet for each moment.

2.3 Identifying the most important parts of the experience and its participants. Critical events of both the context and the process itself by those who have lived the experience.

The goal is to identify the stages of the experience that we are systematizing. It also helps to name them. If we are systematizing a project-related process, the project framework serves as a reference. It will also help to identify:

(a) contextual conditions, whether economic, social, political, local as well as regional, national or international, that cross the experience;

(b) particular conditions -organizational, group, or personal- that influenced the development of the experience.

When developing the systematization tool of written sources, likely, we had already identified the stages of the experience. If so, then they should be validated by all participants to define the main activities developed in the experience to be systematized.
To collectively agree on both the main activities and identify the significant moments of the experience, we can then draw up a timeline (worksheet 2.3.1.a) that allows us to visualize the whole process globally and “thicken” the story.

At this timeline, we can include the contextual situations in a parallel line. Below it, we can trace the particular conditions that have gone through the experience that we are systematizing.

Once we have the global image of the process to be systematized, we will select the significant moments we want. We believe that we can develop meaningful lessons or knowledge gained.

After choosing the significant moments, we can use the lessons achieved worksheet (2.3.2) and fill it out individually. These “will allow us to retrieve lessons from significant moments of the experience to gradually create a learning information bank, which can be used in the systematization and can be shared with other people interested in the experiences we carry out” (Jara, 2018: 208-209). These worksheets are intended to rescue:

- the context of the situation -significant moment-;
- account of what happened;
- learnings;
- keywords.

The learning we are interested in generating must relate to our goals when proposing the systematization process and its fundamental axis of meaning. Remember that our methodological design will help us not to lose sight of this.

What has been worked individually will be discussed and reflected collectively.

In addition to the information obtained, it may be that it is desired to delve into any particular information. Then one-on-one interviews with team members can also be planned. We can return to worksheet 2.3.3a. for questions formulation. And to worksheet 2.3.3b. for emptying the information obtained in the interviews.

2.4 Writing to share. Writing the descriptive historicization report.

The person guiding the systematization prepares a document that gives an account of the experience (the key moments, successes, external difficulties, internal difficulties, weaknesses, agreements, and
disagreements), providing the first meaningful lessons from the systematization process.

This document will surely provide some first elements to be taken up at the critical interpretation stage. Ideally, this document would be reviewed by all participants in this stage to correct gaps, ask, modify, add, remove, reflect. In our case, only one person was present throughout the entire experience process to be systematized. Together with the person responsible for guiding the systematization, she carried out a more exhaustive review of this first document. In contrast, the other people did so partially. We consider that this is a decision that can be discussed and agreed upon collectively from the beginning.
The database to be built can have a sheet for each component and specify from which file/document we take the information. For instance:

a. a sheet presenting the organizations participating in the experience and when they participated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>What does the organization do?</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Moment 1</th>
<th>Moment 2</th>
<th>Moment 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One row for each organization.

b. a sheet displaying the personnel who carried out the experience and when they participated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Moment 1</th>
<th>Moment 2</th>
<th>Moment 3</th>
<th>And one column for every other moment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One row for each role.
c. a sheet exposing goals, indicators, results of the experience to be systematized.

d. a sheet for each of the experience moments to be systematized. In our database, we added a sheet for diagnosis, workshops (with columns for each workshop and topic addressed), technical support, evaluations (internal and with organizations), and follow-up.
I. Timeline.

Procedure:
It can be done in two ways:

1. Based on the documentary review. The person facilitating the systematization may have already prepared a timeline of the experience. In this way, in the workshop, everyone will be able to work on it;

2. Collectively graphing: it helps to use colored paper or markers.

We can also combine both formats. Have some of the elements already proposed by the person guiding the systematization and graph collectively. Regardless of how we decide to do it, generating agreements about the moments and timeframes is essential. Assess if you want to make adjustments or complement the information. The
ordering and reconstruction matrix is helpful for the development of a graphic expression of the experience.

Uses and variants of the timeline. Can be used for:

a. formulating a general historical overview of the experience main milestones as a starting point to define the object, goal, and axis;
b. collectively carrying out the historical reconstruction in such a way that the development of the experience is plotted among participants, here aspects and stages are marked;
c. graphically synthesize a more complex and elaborate process of reconstruction of the history of the experience to present the set of the performed journey globally;
d. you can assume from highly structured forms such as bar graphs or chronological diagrams to creative and symbolic pictures (roads, rivers, landscapes). Even a double-entry matrix where the facts are noted in columns to refer to the aspects being rebuilt on a horizontal timeline could work.
e. the contexts of the experience to be systematized by graphing the external (the socio-historical context) internal (organizational) conditions that could influence the experience.

II. Context analysis:
Regarding the critical moments of the context, Jara points out that “all experience is always carried out under certain conditions of an economic, social and political context at the local, regional, national or global level. The historical moment, the geographical space and the socio-cultural environment are the possibility condition of each experience, outside of which it is not feasible to understand it, since they are part of its
realization”. It is essential to visualize the context as it is one of the dimensions of the experience.

For particular situations, Jara defines them as: “circumstances, a space and a place, in which an experience is lived and that give it its own and unrepeatable dimension” (Jara, 2018: 53).

Contextual analysis is a methodology that aims to “reveal the relevant facts, behaviors or discourses relevant that affect the understanding of the social phenomena being investigated” (Hinestroza and Serrano, 2017: 36). In this case, this is a methodology that, in addition to providing us with a framework of understanding about the study experience or situation, can help us document and investigate human rights violations.

**Procedure:**

Having already our timeline plotted, we can parallel place two other lines:

- **a.** Above: contextual situations occurred throughout the systematized experience.
- **b.** Below: particular situations -organizational, group, personal- that have happened and may have influenced the experience to be systematized. For this line, we can also graph each of these aspects with different colors.
--line containing events from socio-political contexts related to the experience to be systematized--

--------TIMELINE OF THE FACTS THAT MAKE UP THE EXPERIENCE TO BE SYSTEMATIZED--------

--------line of personal/group situations that occurred during the experience to be systematized--------

Together we graph both lines and validate the global image. This image helps reflect and ask ourselves: Did the contextual and particular situations we see on the line influence our process? If so, how?
### Order and Reconstruction Matrix Worksheet

#### Prepared by / Taken from
Jara, 2018: 211

**Goals**
- Have a visual synthesis of what has been done in the experience ordered chronologically.
- Identify significant moments.
- Identify stages.
- See continuities and discontinuities.
- Facilitate the analysis of aspects separately.

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This matrix must be built flexibly. The number and type of columns depend on the needs and interests of each systematization process (we could remove columns or add other aspects different from the example).

#### Recommendations when using this matrix:
- it should synthetically describe the most relevant insights of each aspect;
- it can be kept in a visible and significant place (billboard, wall, etc.) Thus, when the team meets, it is gradually filled out, allowing its visualization during the development of the activities;
- it can be used during the execution of the experience or after it;
- it must be adjusted to the period that has been chosen to systematize;
- it allows, once filled out, to identify stages. The steps that occur are registered, not those in the project; only what takes place is documented.
### Lessons Achieved Worksheet

#### Prepared by / Taken from
Jara, Oscar (2018)

#### Goals
- Retrieve lessons from significant moments of the experience to shape a learning information bank; this can be used in the systematization and can be shared with other people interested in the experiences.
- Practice the skill of orderly writing stories about facts, important situations, and everyday learnings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File title</th>
<th>Gives a notion of the central idea of the experience.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Refers to the person who will fill up the form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Refers to the date the worksheet was filled-out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Location where the action that is being reported took place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of the situation</td>
<td>One or two sentences about the context in which the significant moment occurred (where, when, who participated, for what purpose. This is a reference that places what will be related in a broader context).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account of what happened</td>
<td>A page that describes and relates what happened to reveal the development of the situation, its process, and the different participants’ roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnings</td>
<td>Half a page about the teachings that the moment has left us and how they could serve us in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keywords</td>
<td>Descriptors allowing us identify central themes to which the experience refers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Type of interview: semi-structured individual.

Interview addressed to: general direction/coordination or key people in our organization.

Interview length: one hour, one hour and a half maximum.

Interview modalities: the interview address questions posed in the template, not necessarily in chronological order. Questions can be added to deepen aspects considered of particular interest and left out in case the information has been recorded in previous questions. The interview will be transcribed entirely, and it will be delivered to the interviewees to validate the gathered data.

Premises (to be shared with the interviewees).
This interview is about the process **(the experience to be systematized)** in which you have participated:
- the goal is to know the experience from your point of view, your impressions, and assessments;
- it is not about a job evaluation but a process that seeks to reflect on the lived experience and draw meaningful lessons from both, to improve our accompaniment processes and to share with those who want to undertake accompaniment processes in digital security;
- anonymity will be respected in the publications that will emerge from this process;
- I prepared a questionnaire, but I invite you to interrupt me, ignore the questions if they do not convince you, if you do not understand them or if they do not seem significant, and narrate what you consider to be most relevant;
- I will also improvise to delve into aspects that you mention and seem appropriate to me;
- the interview is designed not to have a duration greater than 70 minutes;
- the questions are divided into four sections: the initial situation and its context, before the start of the experience, the accompaniment process and its context, the final or current situation and its context (results and benefits), and lessons achieved.

Here we add the in-depth interview plan proposed by Jara. In our case, it was directed to all the people who carried out the DSA process from Sursiendo.
In-Depth Interview Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial situation</td>
<td>In this section, you can include questions to obtain data on age, origin, professionalization, when the interviewee began to participate in the experience, what they know about the philosophy of the organization, as well as questions related to the situation before the systematization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(background of the experience to be systematized)</td>
<td>In our case, the questions were about causes and motives of the DSA process, process goals, inspirations for the process, personnel selection, internal decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience - in our case DSA-</td>
<td>Can you tell me about your experience in (the experience to be systematized) emphasizing key moments or events? (before this/after this moments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In our case, the questions were about the methodology of the DSA process, about documentation and recording of the activities, contents addressed, changes on the fly, faced difficulties, the follow-up, and the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final situation</td>
<td>Questions aimed at obtaining the perception of the benefits or results of the experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons achieved</td>
<td>Example: If you could start again (the experience to be systematized), what things would you like to see done differently? Why? What would it be like to make them different?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-Structured Interview with Team Members Worksheet

Sursiendo, based on Jara (2018)

Collect information obtained in the semi-structured interviews scrutinizing the experience from the point of view, impressions, and evaluations of the people participating in the experience.

Make a database with a sheet for each moment, contemplating the voices of each interviewee. For example, a sheet with the background of the experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About The Initial Situation - Antecedents of the experience -</th>
<th>Main Ideas Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you think to carry out the experience?</td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What activities did you think the experience might include?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you approach the organizations for them to participate in the experience?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And so, a sheet for each of the moment of the experience. You can also include a sheet showing major agreements and disagreements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Main ideas synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience - in our case the process of accompaniment in digital security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAGE 3:

MA IN
CHARACTERS’
 VOICES
In this stage, we collect the thoughts and feelings of those who made the experience a living process. In our case, grassroots organizations that participated in the long-term accompaniment in strengthening digital security capacities. It is also a mainly descriptive and narrative exercise to supplement historical reconstruction of the process to be systematized. It can also be seen as the second part of the previous stage.

Gathering all participants' voices can add elements to the systematization's enrichment. Thus, while Sursiendo considered analyzing all the organizations' experiences in the historical reconstruction stage, we decided only to consider those that completed the entire accompaniment process. We think this decision should be compatible with the systematization exercise expectations and its goals.
### Stage Goals:
- Complement the historical reconstruction with the voices of people and organizations involved in the experience to be systematized.
- Gather a range of points of view -experiences, reflections, and feelings- about the process from the different organizations involved.

### Timeframe, Moments and Tools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Moments</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We consider:</td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong> Listening to voyagers and their walk. Exploring reflections and feelings of those involved in the experience to be systematized.</td>
<td><strong>3.1.1</strong> Focus group Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to work with directors of involved organizations: 8 hours of face-to-face focus group work or 2 hours for a semi-structured online interview; to work with focal contacts and organizations team members: 8 hours of face-to-face workshop or 30 minutes to fill out an online mixed-mode survey; For sharing, looking, reflecting, dialoguing, and agreeing on the elements outcome in this stage: 4 hours.</td>
<td><strong>3.1.2a</strong> Semi-Structured Interview With Directors Worksheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>3.2</strong> Deep dive. Glimpse continuities, ruptures, agreements, disagreements and elements to be explored.</td>
<td><strong>3.1.2b</strong> Fill out Focus Group or Interview Worksheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3</strong> Sharing main characters’ voices. Document that gives an account of general considerations about the process expressed by main participants.</td>
<td><strong>3.1.3</strong> Mixed-Mode Survey Worksheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.2.1</strong> Comparative Analysis of Information Worksheet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Listening to voyagers and their walk. Exploring participants’ reflections and feelings of the experience to be systematized.

This moment takes place with the accompanied organizations. The aim is to summarize the experience from their point of view, to listen to their voices, impressions, and evaluations.

This query can be asked from the secondary questions elaborated in the methodological design stage since we worked them out to support the information gathering process.

- an organization x-ray (name, number of team members, age composition, gender-genetic composition, cultural composition);
- background of the experience we are systematizing (the organizations’ interests and reasons to get involved in it);
- data on the experience (definition, key events, positively rated elements, context, experience reception, what participants enjoyed most, changes made, problems faced and those solved);
- current situation regarding the lived experience (results, changes that have occurred, factors that made it possible or imped it, expectations, and future wishes or needs).
This moment is designed into three levels:

**a** gathering directors voices from the organizations involved in the
systematized process to isolate some of the institutional features
of those that completed the accompaniment process to
understand their initial situation regarding holistic and digital
security;

**b** Mustering the voices from organizations focal contacts to
understand the perception of their role as a bridge with the
accompanying organization (in our case, Sursiendo) as well as
with their organization (that is, the accompanied organization to
which they belong);

**c** Collecting the voice from the organization people involved in the
experience to find out how they lived the process, both in terms of
content and the methodological point of view, to gaze at the
elements that eased or impeded the experience.

Originally it was expected this phase would work with a focus group
workshop (file 3.1.1) made up of directors, focal contacts, and those
attending the accompaniment workshops. However, pandemic in
between, we decided to obtain the information:
- with a semi-structured online interview with the organization's directors (file 3.1.2a);
- with an online mix-mode survey addressed the people who work in the organizations involved in the ASD process (focal contacts and assistants) (file 3.1.3).

To have a complete overview of the information obtained, either in focus groups or through interviews, it is helpful to create a database in which each of the above points is developed on a different sheet (file 3.1.2b).

3.2 Deep dive. Glimpse continuities, ruptures, agreements, disagreements, and elements to be explored.

Bring together the information recovered from the internal historical reconstruction and which was gathered at the current stage. The comparative analysis tool will function as a basis (file 3.2.1).

Merging up participants' information along with elements collected in previous stages -methodological design and internal historical reconstruction-, is possible identifying continuities, breaks, agreements, disagreements, and elements to be deepened in the critical interpretation stage. This moment is developed by who is guiding the systematization process.
3.3 Sharing main characters' voices. A document that gives an account of general process considerations expressed by main participants.

The person who guides the systematization prepares a document that summarizes the participants' experiences during the ADS. It was essential for us to consider:

- an organizations characterization;
- general assessments of the experience to be systematized;
- the most appreciated, fun, and useful elements;
- the least appreciated, heavy or difficult elements;
- perception of the accompaniment methodology;
- perception of outcomes achieved;
- on appropriation, how did it come about?
- significant changes;
- feelings;
- expectations and desires.

Deep listening is important in every systematization moment, and it allows us to gather reflections resulting from the experience, be they unexpected, exciting, or problematic. The written document must provide a concrete vision of each point. We recommend taking up testimonies and direct narrations poured by participants from the first moment of this external historical reconstruction.
This document yields additional elements to regain during the critical interpretation stage and complements the one prepared in the internal historical reconstruction stage.

Likewise, the document will be shared with all those responsible for the experience being systematized, and some first questions can be raised as regards the critical interpretation:

- what do we see?
- what do we think, what do we feel about what we see?
- is there anything that surprises us about what we see? what was to be expected?
- what do we want to deepen?
Focus groups are discussion groups. "The main purpose of the focus group is to bring out attitudes, feelings, beliefs, experiences, and reactions in the participants; this would not be easy to achieve with other methods. Furthermore, compared to the individual interview, focus groups allow obtaining a multiplicity of glances and emotional processes within the context of the group" (Escobar and Bonilla Jiménez, 2009: 52).

Within the experience of the systematization process framework, it will be interesting for organizations directors with whom we have worked to attend as well as focal contacts -if applicable- and one or two participants of each organization that followed the process; this can be planned as a complete workday. This workshop seeks to gather elements inherent to the previous context, the accompaniment experience, and the current organization's situation.

We are interested in listening to experiences according to the role of each participant, so we need to plan specific work moments for each group during the workshop. For example, we envisioned that at some point, the focus group would work on the same issues but in separate groups: one with directors, another with focal contacts, and one more with those involved in digital security accompaniment.
Working a timeline in a focus group is suggested, given that key moments are being explored. It can show moments we may not have considered in the previous stage.

The questions to be answered in the focus group are elaborated beforehand and based on worksheet 3.1.2a. The emphasis on rescuing the information will be on participants' responses and the interaction that takes place within the group.
Interview type: one-on-one semi-structured interview;

The interview is addressed to: directors or key people of the involved organizations;

Interview length: one hour, maximum hour and a half;

Interview modalities: the interview address the questions asked in the template, not necessarily in chronological order. Questions can be added to deepen aspects of particular interest and omit questions if the information in previous questions has been recorded. The interview is fully transcribed and delivered to the interviewees so that the information can be validated.

The premises (to be shared with the interviewees) are the same as on sheet 2.3.3a.- Team Members' Semi-Structured Interview while, for this moment, we consider the in-depth interview plan proposed by Jara, which can help work out the questions:
## In-Depth Interview Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial situation</td>
<td>In this section, you can include questions to obtain specific data about the organization: size and team composition (age, f/m + sexual diversity; origin; professionalization), as well as for how long participants have been working in the organization and their role. Also, questions related to the previous situation (the experience to be systematized). We asked questions such as: Is integral security a work axis in your organization? How do you assess your risk situation? Where does your interest in digital security come from? Have you received training on digital security before?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience - in our case the digital security accompaniment process-</td>
<td>Example: Can you tell me something about your organization’s experience emphasizing key moments or events during the accompaniment process? (before this/after this moments). In our case: what do you think about the DSA methodology, the contents addressed, the changes along the way, faced difficulties, monitoring, and evaluation? We asked questions such as: Do you think context influenced the accompaniment process? Do you remember a particular episode or process? How did your team receive DSA? How are institutional decisions made within your organization, and how do you think this affects your digital security area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final status</td>
<td>Questions aimed at obtaining the perception of the benefits or results of the experience. Example: How do you assess (the experience to be systematized)? Did the outcomes where what you expected? Why? Why not? We ask questions such as: Have digital security habits changed in your organization? What has not changed? What it depends on? Is your organization already capable of finding a solution to DS problems on its own? How has the risky organization situation/s changed as a result of Sursiendo's DSA process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons achieved</td>
<td>Example: If you could start over (the experience to be systematized), what would you like to perform differently? Why? How would it be to do that differently?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Semi-Structured Interview With Directors Worksheet**
At the end of the work in focus group work or individual interviews, we sort information obtained to analyze it. The analysis purpose is to answer three questions:

- how wide is the variety of perspectives and points of view on each of the topics included in the interviews (initial situation, intervention process, final situation, and lessons achieved)?
- what are the main consensus on each of these themes?
- what are the main differences in each of these themes?

For this purpose, a database can be created in which a sheet is assigned to each participant who was in the focus group or the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Main Ideas Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience - in our case the digital security accompaniment process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And then, a sheet summarizing the contributions of all participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Main Ideas Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience - in our case the digital security accompaniment process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can also include a sheet showing major agreements and disagreements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Main Ideas Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideas on which there are agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The experience - in our case the digital security accompaniment process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview addressed to: focal contacts and team members of the accompanied organizations who participated in one or more phases of the accompaniment process.

Estimated time to fill out the survey: 15 minutes.

Survey modalities: asynchronous through the virtual tool we have selected.

Premises (to be shared with the interviewees):

$name of your organization, for example, Sursiendo$ is carrying out the systematization of $name of the process that is being systematized, for example, the DSA process$, to improve our future processes and sharing meaningful lessons with others. This survey is designed to gather participants’ reflections and feelings about the process. Sit in a comfortable place, relax, and take your time to remember and reflect on the experience.

The survey is anonymous, but you will be asked for your organization’s name. Survey questions can fit into the following sections:
### Theme

**Initial situation**

Example: How would you define your relationship with technology and the digital field before the experience for instance, of the accompaniment process DSA?

(a) Great! I have always loved technology, I am a curious person, and I would love to understand how it works.

(b) Pretty good! What I appreciated about technology is that it simplifies my life, my work, and its fun.

(c) Regular. I use it when I have to, but it is not my passion. I feel very frustrated when it doesn’t work as I want.

(d) Terrible. I would still write everything by hand and send letters by post if it was up to me.

### The experience -in our case, DSA process-

Example: Three words to describe the process:

(a) 

(b) 

(c) 

### Final situation

Questions aimed at obtaining perception of benefits or the experience outcomes.

Example: How do you consider your appropriation of the DSA process content? (tick the option that best suits your feelings)

(a) Yes, I feel comfortable with the new content, and I can practice with ease.

(b) Yes, but I still need time to understand it 100%.

(c) Kind of because I think that we should spend more time on it.

(d) Kind of, because I think we need more support from <accompanying organization>.

(e) No, this is all very complicated.

(f) No, I am not very interested.

### Lessons achieved

Example: What have you learned in this process? Think about three things you consider most important.

(a) I have learned ...

(b) I have learned ...

(c) I have learned ...
The database for comparative analysis is based on the elements we are most interested in deepening according to systematization goals and fundamental axis of meaning, and the question we posed in our methodological design scheme. This information will be very useful as we get to the critical interpretation stage. The development of this document is up to the person who guides the systematization.

Based on our own experience in systematizing our digital security accompaniment, here we provide examples of what each database sheet can include.

**Sheet 1: Organizations' radiography**
This sheet allows us to have each organization's general data. In our case, we added a data column referring to the experience that we were systematizing. Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Team Characterization</th>
<th>Technology Affinity</th>
<th>Resistance for Technology</th>
<th>Facial contact Characterization</th>
<th>Comprehensive Approach</th>
<th>Digital Security Accomplishment</th>
<th>Background on Digital Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sheet 2: Organization characteristics based on the expected outcomes in the experience to be systematized.

It is answered as fulfilled, partially fulfilled, not fulfilled, observations, or other elements to be emphasized. The sheet can be created as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcome 1:</th>
<th>Expected Outcome 2:</th>
<th>Expected Outcome 3:</th>
<th>Expected Outcome 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sheet 3: What happened?

This sheet contrasts the categories we chose based on what we planned, what we executed, and what the monitoring and evaluation exhibited of the systematized process. In our case, the categories from which we built our analysis were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example: Appropriation</th>
<th>What was Planned</th>
<th>What was Executed</th>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Change of habits / practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: DS tools acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example: Comprehensiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Comparative Analysis of Information Worksheet
Sheet 4: How did it happen?
According to points we are interested in addressing, this sheet allows us to overview all heard voices in stages 2 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship with (the organization impelling the experience)</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Directors</th>
<th>Organization impelling the experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process as a whole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you liked the most.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The least you liked, most difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reached level perception.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did it happen? Specify steps or elements that eased the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What habits were changed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you change them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which ones didn’t you change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical technology / free software.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with holistic security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAGE 4:
CRITICAL INTERPRETATION
Stage 4: Critical Interpretation

At this stage, we will read the experience critically. We will do it by contrasting the information gathered in the previous stages as Jara proposes (2018: 154-157), we can achieve:

- let the experience speak;
- build critical interpretations of what has been experienced from the richness of one’s own experience;
- uncover learning, make it explicit and formulate it;
- establish relationships and discover problematic transversal nodes, influences, conditioning, and determinations of the different factors within the overall experience;
- locate tensions and contradictions.

It is a stage in which we need to be very present collectively. The accumulation of information and new information we generate from it is the key to deepening and recognizing the lived experience. It will be time to bring together all team members who participated in the systematization process.
This way, we will try to "reflect on the process, what are the most valuable insights we gather from what has been done, in what sense it was a life-moving experience and why, what is the fundamental change that this process has evoked, etc." (Jara, 2018: 156). This collective exercise will allow us to distance ourselves from what we have experienced to discover experience deep senses.

To perform the work, we will problematize after our fundamental axis of meaning. We will sort all the information in the previous stages to ask ourselves: what we felt, what we thought about what we have done, and how we have done it. This can be uncomfortable at some point because what we find may: surprise us, conflict us, displease us, move us; this is why it is necessary to look from afar, allowing us to understand the logic of what happened, what we did, or did not do to make that happen. And to learn from it. And then "process all we have in a living state as approximations or intuitions, taking them to a more theoretical level of formulation" (Jara, 2018: 178). We will promote an "epistemological curiosity that recognizes the value of emotions, sensitivity, affectivity, intuition or guessing" (Jara, 2021), giving rise to dialogue of knowledge.

The "analysis will be done with a discovery logic and will not start from a preconceived hypothesis. We will not deduce explanations from theories, but instead, we will elaborate ideas from what has been lived (...) It is about questioning our practice regarding our political bets; it is time to
confront the social project that we want to build with what we are doing. But it is also the time to see the strengths and potentialities that our experiences produce.” (Zúñiga López and Zúñiga Preciado, s.f.: 73).

Reading and analyzing the experience will always depend on our specific place and our reference frame built throughout our history, whether as a group, institution, family, or person. That is, our way of perceiving the experience will always be somewhat subjective because it depends on: where we look at it, with what feelings we have lived it, what historical construction and cultural values have mediated the experience, the moment which this group was living as well as the historical moment being lived (Bickel, 2018: 4).
### Stage Goal

Gather and develop meaningful lessons from critical reflection on previous stages' findings.

### Timeframe, Moments and Tools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moments</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1</strong> Bringing the pieces of a puzzle together. Identifying the factors and consequences of each key moment of the process to be systematized.</td>
<td><strong>4.1.1a</strong> Working on EITIPCNO worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.1b</strong> Consolidating Factors and Consequences Worksheet.</td>
<td><strong>4.1.2a</strong> Sorting Factors and Consequences Worksheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1.2b</strong> Calculating New Weight of Factors and Consequences Worksheet.</td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong> Rebuilding the puzzle. Causal analysis of one or more enabling and impeding factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2.1</strong> Causal Analysis or Explanatory Network Worksheet.</td>
<td><strong>4.3</strong> Enabling and strengthening futures. Critical construction of knowledge about action. Formulating conclusions for future processes, conceptual learning and trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3.1</strong> Meaningful Lessons Worksheet.</td>
<td><strong>4.4</strong> Building bridges to meet. Preparing a final report with findings and conclusions to improve our practice and link us to other and different experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaborated documents in stage 1, stage 2 and stage 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Bringing the pieces of the puzzle together. Identifying the factors and consequences of each key moment of the process to be systematized.

We sorted the gathered information in the previous stage, and we recognized the process's key moments. From each of these key moments, we seek:

(a) To identify: why did it turn out as it did? Why did it come about so? Which components - methodological or organizational - had an impact on the process? Which are the consequences? The initial state, development, and final situation make it easier to answer the above questions following the experience's chronological order.

(b) To expose and reflect on the factors -enabling and impeding- and consequences -positive and negative- of what happened and why it happened.
To solve these two points, you can start with an individual task that fills up a database (File 4.1.1a). This database is developed by the person guiding the systematization. It lists the experience's key moments that we selected in previous stages. Four columns are associated with each key moment: enabling factors (EF), positive consequences (PC), impeding factors (IF), and negative outcomes (NO). For each person who carries out the filling, the database has a sheet with this same scheme. That is, for each participant in the systematization.

After completing this tool, who guides the systematization consolidates enabling factors, positive consequences, impeding factors, and negative outcomes (sheet 4.1.1b.); this helps everyone involved notice what has been accomplished individually. It is advised to take enough time to do this work collectively and to dialogue about each of the aspects the consolidated statement exhibits. In addition, the EF, PC, IF, NO that received the highest frequency (the most frequently mentioned) are observed.

Together, factors and consequences with greater prevalence and relevance are chosen. In this way, we can make a list of shared and agreed factors and their consequences and select the most relevant to our considerations. While not having a significant impact, there may be one fundamental factor for us to deepen its analysis, so we need to add it to the list. It is time for dialogue, argument, and consensus.
This will all help to dive into the interpretive phase and perform a first vertical reading—column by column—after mutual feedback, the output data becomes valuable information to conclude what, why, when, and how.

Collectively, preferably in the plenary, factors and consequences are rearranged (file 4.1.2a.) according to the frequency they appear on the consolidation sheet. This alignment is based on the fundamental axis of meaning and helps us make initial interpretations, answering:

- What meaning can this have?
- Why is that so?
- Is it relevant or not?
- Why?

Then, weighting factors and consequences are calculated (File 4.1.2b). Here they are sorted and written in descending order from highest to lowest frequency. This approach helps us to perform a cross-reading between the factors and their consequences. This cross-reading should take into account factors influence and consequences.

Thus we will prioritize the factors according to their influence. And consequences are rearranged now with their new impact weight. All this is possible because it is the outcome of the joint analysis and agreements established between the team that systematizes.
It is helpful to choose some enabling and impeding factors - with their respective consequences - to begin the causal analysis with them. That is, prioritizing factors according to our fundamental axis of meaning and goals set in the methodological design stage.

"Based on the enabling and impeding factors sorting according to their degree of influence, in both cases, we will prioritize 2, 3 or even 4 factors: those with greatest strategic potential for the facilitators, which it will be necessary to take advantage from now on; and most problematic ones so we can prevent them looking for ways to counterbalance in future experiences we develop" (CICAP, 2005: 81).

4.2 Rebuilding the puzzle. Causal analysis of one or more facilitating and impeding factors.

We start a second filter to analyze each component separately and perform synthesis and interrelations with prioritized factors. We observe the particularities and the whole, both the personal and the collective. The casual analysis tool or the explanatory network facilitates this analysis (File 4.2.1). At this time, structural causes and consequences of the prioritized enabling factors are analyzed and articulated in the team.
This moment begins with an individual exercise in which each participant fills out the causal analysis tool with two or three of the prioritized factors. After the individual exercise, each team member reviews the causal analysis matrices prepared by their fellows and modifies with an assigned letter color, sharing observations on the revised matrices.

Afterward, the individual results are shared in the plenary to identify critical nodes in the systematized experience that constitute a “beginning and finishing point” to face future experiences or improve them. Each of the matrices is checked among all participants to:

- identify possible faults and rectify;
- identify each critical matrix node;
- identify most essential findings, trends, and open questions.

The invitation is to use different colors to point out each event with arrows to the connection with its various causes. Different facts and causes in the same column - that is, the same level of abstraction - may have causal relationships, also indicated by arrows pointing to the cause.

In the end, both the causes on which we can influence and those beyond our reach are identified. Among the first, some appear to be central: graphically, if the job has been done well, those are where they converge and where more arrows come out from. We call these central causes
‘critical nodes’, which form the basis for subsequent strategic planning. In the case of the enabling factors network, these critical nodes are the strengths to be enhanced. It will be necessary to take them in and harness them when formulating new goals. For the impeding factors network, we proceed as we did before but identify the problems and weaknesses we must avoid. This is even more important and requires a high degree of self-criticism... most important are the discussions and clarifications that the accomplishment of this work will have aroused in the team. (CICAP, 2005: 82).

4.3 Enabling and strengthening futures. Critical construction of knowledge about action. Formulating conclusions for future processes, conceptual learning, and trends

From the explanatory network carried out before, this stage is concluded with a first systematization draft. This document will include the consequences generated and achievements complementing them with elements gathered in previous stages.

This moment aims to go beyond description or narration and find a critical and coherent explanation of what has been experienced.
This is the moment to relate and confront generated knowledge with the conceptual and methodological framework proposed at the beginning of the experience. To discover how it worked out, what has been modified, what has been enriched ... What re-definitions and corrections were made to the original approach, and why they needed to be done. In addition to raising the queries and questions related to the accomplished work (CICAP, 2005: 90).

It should be noted that at this time, it is relevant that within the team, confrontation of ideas, feedback, questions, and discussing approaches occurs. This enables us to deepen the search for new explanations and systematization contents enrichment.

Jara (2018: 80-81) states that the following is explicit at this point:

- from lessons achieved, we can identify key problems, questions, tensions, and contradictions that go through the lived process with a critical perspective concerning the reconstructed path of experience, which can lead us to rethink our intervention in the process;
- the main findings unveiled by examining the experience complexity and discovering the connections and existing interrelationships –in this case– between its different factors, results, and discoveries which are not simple descriptive reviews.
of what happened. They can also reveal the logic and hidden meanings behind, under, or in the background of the scattered appearance of events, and now it is possible to look beyond them.

Jara also mentions we must concretely express (2018: 158):

- the systematization resulting statements corresponding to the goal for which it was out;
- the most important answers to the questions posed in the critical interpretation guidelines concerning the fundamental axis of meaning specified;
- recommendations that arise to bring about changes in future practice.

We can distribute five-colored sheets in the joint work to reflect on successes, mistakes, scope, limits, and opportunities faced. Each color stands for one of the above points. Every participant works with one color and develops meaningful lessons subsequently shared in the plenary, assessing their relevance and weight.

We share a table on which these lessons can be filled out. We consider it is helpful to visualize them in this diagram to get an overall picture of the systematized process findings (File 4.3.1).
4.4 Building bridges to meet. Preparing a final report with findings and conclusions to improve our practice and link us to other and different experiences.

This stage is completed preparing a systematization report that “seeks to formulate conclusions and convey learning oriented towards practice transformation. It is essential to dedicate a certain amount of time and a good boost of energy to these tasks, as it will depend on them to fulfill the main systematization exercise goals. This must go beyond personal learning of those involved in the process and will also be reflected in organization renewed practice, making use of this knowledge to feed, enrich and enhance practice with a transformative sense”(Jara, 2018: 158). The report is a way of looking back to understand what has been done, but more important than the report is what is gained within the systematization process. That is both a mirror in which we can see ourselves and a window through which we can glimpse new possibilities to transform our ways in our practices as we deem. It is also a way of meeting with others, continuing dialogue, and reflection on things we discovered we want to deepen further and those we will get into to do our work.

From the full systematization report, we can agree on what we want to share publicly or semi-publicly and what we want to discuss with others,
and the format. We can also agree on different documents according to the levels of what we want to share or whom we want to do it with. Sursiendo decided to share findings and reflections of our systematization process widely. (https://sursiendo.org/docs/systematization_article_CollectiveAppropriation.pdf)

We consider it essential to significantly improve digital security accompaniment processes aimed at human rights defenders, communities, women, and the migrant population, as well as the struggles for land and territory embracing processes comprehensiveness not only from our territory - the Mesoamerican South and the digital world – to continue disputing meanings in life production and reproduction facing the risks seeking to transform our realities.

We also traced our steps to share the followed methodology- this tool and guide emanate from these efforts -, as we think it can inspire others.

Regarding formats, we envisage many ways of sharing: printed (documents, infographics, testimonials, comics), audiovisual (videos, radio capsules, digital presentations), or representations in forums, meetings, plays, and those that your creativity can craft! The chosen ways will depend on the groups and people we want to dialogue with, share our findings, and how we want to do it.
Procedure:

The systematization process facilitator creates a database with a tab for each participant (example below). Each participant receives the database to complete their corresponding sheet. We consider two hours to achieve this.

When everyone has completed this activity, the moderator draws up a list of the most relevant enabling and impeding factors (worksheet 4.1.1b) and shares it to reach a consensus.
**Procedure:**

The person facilitating systematization will create a database where the factors and consequences expressed in worksheet 4.1.1a. are visible.

In each column, we group:
"similar aspects (everything that relates to methodology or planning, logistical and material aspects, participation and integration, the situation, etc.), adding their frequencies. In pairs or small groups (one works on enabling factors and positive consequences, and another works on impeding factors and negative outcomes). Then socializing the outcomes with the whole team. In practice, it is necessary to group up between 10 and 15 categories per column. Unless it is important, it is unnecessary to preserve groups of factors or consequences that add very low frequencies (≤5) because there is a risk of losing representativeness. However, it is necessary to keep a record of what is being discarded: it is recommended not to eliminate these elements to have them available in case we need to go back or if we want to address these aspects, in instances and different formats, once the systematization has been completed" (CICAP, 2005: 78).

One of the most significant elements for Sursiendo was the amount of information that this process gave us regarding organizational aspects initially not considered for systematization. We knew that this stage was not the time to address these issues. Still, we decided to resume them at an
immediate later moment through a series of actions that allowed us internal strengthening at an organizational level.

"In addition, it is necessary to indicate what has been grouped in each phase by adding the frequencies (we can use different colors or codes to indicate everything that is grouped in the same category). In the end, the various categories are sorted according to frequency from highest to lowest. Factors are sorted with numbers; consequences are listed with letters" (CICAP, 2005: 78).

This exercise helps enter the interpretive phase by doing a first vertical reading -column by column- to convert the data into useful information in collective reflection.

**Consolidating Factors and Consequences Worksheet:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities/ Moments in the experience to be systematized</th>
<th>Enabling Factor</th>
<th>Positive Consequences</th>
<th>Impeding Factor</th>
<th>Negative Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consolidating Factors and Consequences Worksheet*
**Procedure:**

The facilitator guiding the systematization process creates a database that will order factors and consequences according to their frequency of appearance in sheet 4.1.1a. Also, indicate the number of times they appear. We will fill in the "new weight" column after working with worksheet 4.1.2b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling Factors</th>
<th>Impeding Factors</th>
<th>Positive Consequences</th>
<th>Negative Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>New weight</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Procedure:

1. Create a database. Person facilitating systematization elaborates a database as follows:

#### Positive consequences: from higher to lower weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enabling factors: from higher to lower weight</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Negative consequences: from higher to lower weight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impeding factors: from higher to lower weight</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. In a group session, we reflect to determine how each factor directly influenced each of the consequences. For example: "The facilitating factor 1, which could be: the activity is not properly designed (there are no workshop follow-ups, deficiencies in goal design, expected outcomes, indicators, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) had a direct influence on the consequences, which could be "insufficient commitment and reciprocity from organizations involved and do not have digital security among their priorities." And so on for every factor with every consequence a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h. Answer must be spontaneous if we doubt for sure the influence was not so direct.

We will ask if each factor directly influences each of the consequences emergences. If the answer is yes, the corresponding box is checked; if not, it will be left blank. It is important to emphasize that this evaluation work requires rigor, focus, and equanimity, so we encourage conversation through active listening and reaching agreements.

3. At the end, the number of crosses for each factor and each consequence is added and reordered from highest to lowest according to this data, which we call "new weight", as opposed to the "initial weight" given by the frequency. The factor that contributed to generating more consequences will have greater weight. The result developed due to a more significant number of factors will have more weight (new). Sometimes it is surprising to see how a factor reaches a "new weight" relatively low with a high frequency, or the other way around.
A logical interpretation of this "new weight" is that if there are eight consequences and a factor is given a new weight of seven, it is a fundamental factor as it affects almost the entire process. Consequently, it will be necessary to enhance it if it is an enabling factor or counteract it if it is an impeding factor. On the other hand, a factor is given a slight "new weight" must be interpreted by underlining its particularity.

Methodologically, this is a tool that "only" serves to obtain specific results. In the case of consequences, a new high weight indicates a result that we could achieve through the joint implementation of numerous factors; that is, it requires a complex strategy. Conversely, a consequence that has a new low weight indicates it is a particular result, depending on few factors.¹

From there, an optional step is to determine the "degrees of influence" of each factor and the "degrees of impact" of each consequence. The nuance that leads us to use two different terms is that both enabling and impeding factors effect is still valid and continues to affect the dynamics and needs to be reinforced (enabling factors) or counteracted (impeding factors). Instead, the consequences have already had their effect. The impact has already occurred, and, both to renew it (positive consequences) and prevent them from being repeated (negative outcomes), it will be necessary to intervene in a subsequent phase on the corresponding factors.

¹ To further understand the methodology: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KiX6kVzSvkk
Of course, to express this reality in percentages (proportion of the whole process on which a factor affects; the proportion of the whole process on which each consequence depends), the following formulas are applied:

\[
\text{Influence level of factor 1} = \frac{\text{New weight of factor 1} \times 100}{\text{# consequences total}}
\]

\[
\text{Impact level of consequence A} = \frac{\text{New weight of consequence} \times 100}{\text{# factors total}}
\]

Each factor has its level of influence expressed in percentage. We will do the same for consequences impact levels. They are classified into 3 percentage ranges according to whether the influence/impact is: minor (from 0 to 33%) - medium (from 34 to 66%) - greater (from 67 to 100%).

It is essential to consider that these percentages are only a way to simplify results presentation and classify them.
What is causal analysis? It is an instrument that allows us to make deep critical analyses, starting from the root causes of social phenomena. Once completed, we will be able to draft the first systematization conclusions.

How will we do it? We start isolating some enabling and impeding factors that, crossed with the positive consequences and negative outcomes, show their incidence level in the experience to be systematized. We recommend selecting a maximum of three elements from each. Otherwise, it can become a scattered and tiring exercise.

Once identifying the main elements of each column, we can relate in between to identify critical nodes.

Critical nodes are the elements where the most significant number of links are concentrated. These elements are essential points because if they are positive, they can improve selected factors, and if they are negative, they allow improvement. In summary, these are key elements for planning future processes or projects that will improve the quality of our interventions. First, we need to place one of the prioritized factors with the most significant influence weight at the top. We fill each of the columns from left to right, answering the given questions. Finally, collectively, we will relate each element to others locating points with the most connections.
### 4.2.1 Causal Analysis or Explanatory Network Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manifestation</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Deep causes</th>
<th>Trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is its practical manifestation: how did we realize this factor? How has it manifested itself to us in everyday life? They are the events, statements, trends through which certain elements (enabling and impeding factors) are shown in everyday work.</td>
<td>Why? Which are the causes generating this manifestation?</td>
<td>Which are the deep causes that are provoking this with its manifestation?</td>
<td>Which are the social trends related to those deep causes and the factor identified? They represent the shared vision, collective imaginary regarding the broad social phenomenon, which we learn from the process we are analyzing. Usually, trends should show something beyond our approach, which can serve other groups or processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meaningful Lessons Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements to boost in future processes</th>
<th>Elements to improve or correct in future processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ...</td>
<td>1. ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ...</td>
<td>2. ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conceptual Learning

Related with concepts of which we dialogued and reflected within the systematization process:
1. ...
2. ...

### Trends

That is, the findings we find relevant to share with other groups that develop similar and/or advocacy work
1. ...
2. ...

### Issues to Address and Reflect on Later

Issues we need to address deeply in order to develop meaningful lessons about the overall experience:
1. ...
2. ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling factors</td>
<td>Objective and subjective factors or conditions that, according to the team, help develop the activity and achieve results at the team’s consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive consequences</td>
<td>They are enabling factors consequences and effects that we want to achieve. Each enabling factor can lead to one or more positive outcomes. One or more enabling factors can generate a positive consequence. At a later time, we could connect them to enabling factors. It is suggested to use a different color to visualize these links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impeding factors</td>
<td>Factors or conditions –objective and subjective– that, at the consideration of the team, hinder the experience and its results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative outcomes</td>
<td>They are impeding factors consequences and effects that undermine achievement. Each impeding factor can lead to one or more negative outcomes. One or more impeding factors can generate a negative outcomes. At a later time, we could connect them to impeding factors. It is suggested to use a different color to visualize these links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal analysis</td>
<td>It is an instrument that allows us to make deep critical analyses, starting from the root causes of social phenomena. Once completed, we will be able to draft the first systematization conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifestations</td>
<td>They are the events, statements, trends through which certain elements (enabling and impeding factors) are shown in everyday work. They are practical manifestations that answer the questions: How did we realize this factor? How has it manifested itself to us in everyday life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary causes</td>
<td>They are the elements provoking primary causes. If we think of a tree, they are its more visible roots, which appear just digging a little. They answer the question: Why? Which are the causes generating this manifestation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep causes</td>
<td>They are the roots that appear when digging a little more into the earth. They answer the question: What deep causes are these factors causing with their manifestation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical nodes</td>
<td>They are the elements where the greatest number of links are concentrated. They are the most important points because if they are positive, they can improve selected factors, and if they are negative, they allow improvement. In summary, these are key elements for planning future processes or projects that will improve the quality of our interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful lessons</td>
<td>Lessons that allow us to understand and improve our work and share this information with others for future accompaniment (by us or others) and our organization (Sursiendo, 2021: 6, 14). Lessons that the process has left us and how they could serve us in the future. They are elaborated collectively: &quot;Why did we do it this way? What is the most important thing we collect from what has been done? In what sense has this experience marked us profoundly, and why? What is the fundamental change that this process has generated? (Manual CINDE, p.156). They contribute to cognitive, expressive, emotional, and practical change (Ghiso, 2011: 8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends</td>
<td>They represent the shared vision, collective imaginary regarding the broad social phenomenon, which we learn from the process we are analyzing. Usually, trends should show something beyond our process, which can serve other groups or processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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