



ETORKIZUNA
ERAIKIZ
think tank

NEW POLITICAL CULTURE
REPORT OF THE 17th MEETING

18/02/2022

Contents

1. Programme	3
2. List of attendees	3
3. Welcome	5
4. Presentation of the working document	5
5. Presentation of the action being carried out at the Provincial Government	9
6. Group dynamic	15
7. Appendices	21
a. Presentation used during the session	21
b. Working Document No. 18	23
c. Session programme	27

SPACE FOR DELIBERATION ON THE NEW POLITICAL CULTURE

17 February 2022, 3 pm - 5 pm

1. Programme

Theme	Person responsible
Welcome	Eider Mendoza. Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa
Presentation of the working document	Miren Larrea, Orkestra - Basque Institute of Competitiveness Naiara Goia. Arantzazu Social Innovation Laboratory
Presentation	Eider Mendoza. Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa Nerea Urcola. Consultoría Urcola
Group dynamic	Eider Mendoza. Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa Nerea Urcola. Consultoría Urcola
End of session	Eider Mendoza. Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa

2. List of attendees

1. Eider Mendoza. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
2. Xabier Barandiaran. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
3. Ander Arzelus. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
4. Sebastian Zurutuza. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
5. Ion Muñoa. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
6. Itziar Eizagirre, **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
7. Julen Cocho. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
8. Fernando Tapia **University of the Basque Country (UPV)**
9. Mikel Irizar **Eusko Ikaskuntza**
10. Asier Lakidain **Sinnergiak**
11. Naiara Goia. **Arantzazu Social Innovation Laboratory**
12. Nerea Urcola. **Consultoría Urcola**

13. Miren Larrea, **Orkestra - Basque Institute of Competitiveness**
14. Eva Sánchez. **Orkestra - Basque Institute of Competitiveness**
15. Mikel Gaztañaga **Orkestra-Basque Institute of Competitiveness**

3. Welcome

The Deputy (Provincial Minister) for Governance opened the session. *“Good afternoon. Thank you for coming to today's session. Nerea Urcola and I will be presenting today's session. There's always something special about talking about one's own area. And so today's session is special for me. We have done a solid job, and presenting it is special for us. After a long process of reflection in the Think Tank, the time has come for action. In the previous session, the director of the Arantzazu Social Innovation Laboratory explained her action, which is to be carried out outside the Provincial Government. Today, however, I am going to tell you about my action, the action we have taken within the Provincial Government. However, this action may affect the entire ecosystem of the Provincial Government. And so, it is important to explain this action here. I will not labour over this introduction any more. I will be offering some further explanations later. And so, I hand the floor over to the Orkestra facilitator”.*

4. Presentation of the working document

The Orkestra facilitator took the floor and thanked the Deputy for Governance. *“In my introduction I would like to make a reflection. I would like to reflect on the goal of this session. What is the aim of the exercise we are going to carry out today? The Deputy for Governance has already set the conditions for action. She explained some of her concerns in these sessions. We, for our part, made some contributions. A dialogue arose between what she had raised and the ideas that were expressed in the session. Before we moved to action, the Deputy for Governance and myself drew up a plan. Once we had done that, we moved to action. So the project has gone ahead.*

“What have they learned in the process? At today's session, the Deputy for Governance and by Nerea Urcola will be sharing the things that have proved useful. In a way, this changes the focus. To date, the focus has been on the actions of the Deputy for Governance and the Provincial Government. But now the focus is on the ecosystem. In

other words, by explaining the process in this session, the ecosystem - i.e., those of us who participate in this session - become part of the action or the problem. So we have to start thinking about this problem as an ecosystem. We have to internalise this problem. Indeed, the goal of this Think Tank is to transform the Etorkizuna Eraikiz ecosystem. We are in the midst of that process. Indeed, we are part of the Etorkizuna Eraikiz ecosystem. Therefore, based on the lessons that we will be sharing today, we have to make our own changes.

“To recap briefly. In this Think Tank, we are proposing three actions. On the one hand, the action of the Provincial Government. This action was driven by the Deputy for Governance. On the other hand, there was the action that was oriented towards the province. This action was to be led by the director of the Arantzazu Social Innovation Laboratory. And finally, a third action was proposed, which I was in charge of. The goal of this action is to turn this group into a non-passive group. Let me explain it a bit better: we didn't want this group to become a group that passively listened to the other two actions. This group cannot fall in the trap of becoming too comfortable. It also has to drive transformations itself. That is what we are working on. Today's session will be aimed at driving these transformations. We would remind you that the working documents are available on the website. The conclusions of the previous sessions are included. Next, I want to hand the floor to the director of the Arantzazu Social Innovation Laboratory to discuss the proposal from the previous session”.

The Director of the of Arantzazu Social Innovation Laboratory took the floor. “We need to try to find synergies between the three actions. In other words, the actions cannot be completely isolated from one another. We need to find links and synergies. In the previous session, some of you raised some concerns about the mapping exercise. We have compiled your concerns. In this regard, we would like to pose a series of questions. The questions are as follows:

- 1- *What form will the work take of developing the definition of collaborative governance in a dynamic way and ensuring that the process addresses collaborative governance beyond participation?*

- 2- *What form will the work take so that the mapping process, instead of being a project in itself, is related to the rest of Etorkizuna Eraikiz's projects, and is integrated into the path that has already existed for some years?*
- 3- *How will voices outside public institutions be integrated into the process? How will young people be included? How will those who work day-to-day in collaborative governance be included?*
- 4- *How will incoming information be rationalised and collaborative governance measured?*

“As for the action I am to lead, it was clear that we didn't want a static snapshot. The action must go beyond that. It has to be a dynamic and active community action, trying to find collaborative structures. Another issue raised was the need to link it to research. In addition, in the previous session, some people raised the need to set out the action somewhere. Otherwise, it might all come to nothing. We have looked at the possibility of a digital tool. That would provide sustainability over time. That way, the work that has been carried out will be reflected somewhere. Moreover, this tool can serve to galvanise the ecosystem.



“In conclusion, I would like to mention two other thoughts. One is an idea that is drawn from the last session: it is important to make use of what already exists. SWe cannot ignore what is already there. Indeed, there are many actions already underway. Many of these actions have been set up by the Provincial Government. We need to make use of them. On the other hand, there is an ongoing concern about how to fit the action into this deliberation group. In other words, how to carry out that third action, to reflect on each person's role in the ecosystem. We need to transform the ecosystem from here. Each person has a number of roles and responsibilities. At the same time, the idea of incorporating new agents into the group was also raised. That is to say, to recruit the agents that appear in the mapping process to this group. We need to promote new projects. As we always say, in this group we have to combine expert and experienced knowledge. And that is my presentation. Thank you very much! I will now hand over to the Deputy for Governance”.

5. Presentation of the action being carried out at the Provincial Government

The Deputy for Governance took the floor. *“Our action, as you know, is being carried out within the Provincial Government. We are trying to solve a historical problem within the Provincial Government, one that we have often mentioned to you. You already know the structure and functioning of the Provincial Government. We have often commented that we have difficulties in working jointly. However, I have only a limited knowledge of the subject. This is my first term in office. But when I joined the Provincial Government, the Deputy General (Provincial First Minister) entrusted me with two tasks. The first was very simple. Indeed that first task is so simple that I am not going to comment on it. The second task, however, has historically caused major problems in the Provincial Government. It is a problem that exists between the departments of the Treasury and Governance. Their interpretations on several issues have been very different. And that poses practical problems.*

“I am going to briefly explain the problem, to give you a better understanding. When a department makes a decision that needs to be ratified by the Governing Council, a report is prepared. The Department has to issue a report. If this report has an economic impact, a report will be issued by the Treasury Audit Department. When this report reaches the Audit Department it is usually urgent and requires immediate attention. Actually, each department devotes the time it deems necessary to the subject, but the last phase has to be carried out very quickly. The Audit department has to give a ruling in this regard. But it often raises objections to certain sensitive issues. This document is sent to the originating department, with a list of the considerations mentioned by the Treasury. So the department then has to respond to this situation. Moreover, it has to respond very quickly. Finally, it is referred to the Governing Council. Sometimes, the unfavourable report comes from the originating departments, but those arguments do not reach the Treasury. So, the Treasury issues its own report and there is no relationship between the two departments. The problem seems simple. But the agreements that are adopted are very important”.

Nerea Urcola took the floor. *"First of all, good afternoon to everyone and thank you for giving me this opportunity to participate in this session. The road we have travelled has been a very interesting one. We searched for a name and finally chose "palanca amiga" (friendly lever), perhaps because that was the aim: to mobilise some people in order to mobilise others. The Deputy for Governance called me one day. I went to the Provincial Government and the Deputy for Governance explained that the Provincial Government was promoting some very important projects. They were implementing collaborative governance. She told me that some of the projects were outward-oriented, but others were designed for the Provincial Government. They were intended to transform the Provincial Government. The aim was to develop collaborative governance in the Provincial Government. It was about training people to work together. The Deputy for Governance told me: We need to identify the facilitators in the Provincial Government and then given them some form of training. However, I wasn't so sure. I am a consultant and I provide training on an almost everyday basis. People are usually very satisfied and, in general, providing training is an easy task. But, in this case, I didn't see that the answer lay in training.*

"As I said, I didn't see the need for classical training. Because training is all very well, but then what? What I wanted to know was: "Once the training is completed, how are these people going to continue advancing?" So I had to think up some other course of action. I proposed the following: why don't we choose a real case and work on it? Teamwork or a kind of workshop, but not training. Directly. I submitted this proposal to the Deputy for Governance. She did not reject it out of hand; she told me she had been planning to do something else but she did not turn the idea down. A week later, she called me back and gave me the green light. I told her that the first thing we had to decide was who should take part. And then we had to decide on the problem we wanted to solve. Well, I don't call it a problem. It is more helpful to ask: what is the situation we want to solve? The Deputy for Governance weighed up that approach. I think that phase was very important. The Deputy for Governance decided who to start with. Then, we decided on three goals: interdepartmental work; promotion of interdepartmental collaboration; and, finally, implementation of a pilot project for future work with other departments. It

was agreed to begin with the Governance and Finance departments. Four people were selected. Service chiefs and directors. They have done a great job. I wanted to explain the project to everyone, individually. I wanted to know everyone's story. I wanted to know how they viewed the situation”.



Nerea Urcola continued her presentation. *“They have been very positive about it from the outset. Instead of viewing it as a problem, they have interpreted it as a situation to be solved or improved. At the end of the working day, we meet and define the situation together. We agreed on the narrative. The two departments gave their approval. They were prepared to start the process. They identified the situation. They agreed with the diagnosis. And they were ready to go ahead with it. We told them it would be hard work. It is a commitment. But they were willing. They felt it was necessary. We asked them where they wanted to start. They answered that they needed to reach a consensus on criteria. That this was the first step. A list was drawn up: direct subsidies, state aid, Covid-19-related expenses, job listings, hiring, next generation funds, etc. They were developing a forum. They agreed that there was a need to reach a consensus on these issues. Commitments had to be made. This all took place in January. It was agreed to*

work on three topics for the summer. It was decided to define the role of each department. It was also necessary to clarify the role. There was often a certain lack of knowledge in this regard. And they said they would start work on 18 January. They decided to start with the area of direct grants. They said they would agree on the criteria, and that it was important to monitor it. They said they would perform a monitoring exercise every Friday.

“One of the people involved in the process commented that preparing reports was a huge task. They said it took up a lot of their time and energy. Some reports get submitted, but others don't. And they don't get any feedback. They said feedback would be very helpful. There was also agreement on this point. We have been with those people today. And as you can see, the list has grown. They began the work and along the way found more topics to study: direct subsidies, contributions, subsidies, strategic plans, tariff revisions, prices, public companies, state aid, development agencies, job descriptions, CPI, hiring, etc. They said they would start in January with the first theme, in other words, with direct subsidies. But they have done far more work. They had committed to starting with one topic. But they have now explored four topics. The process has been nice and simple. They have shown us all the work they have done. Steps have been taken. I think they are important. The first step is that they have performed more work than initially asked of them. They tell us that communication between them has been strengthened, teamwork has been reinforced, existing inertia has been overcome and a new work style has been implemented. There has not been a bad word in the whole process. The attitude has been very positive. This is not the norm. I am involved in many of these processes and I can tell you that this is not the norm. Normally, people look for someone to blame. So the attitudes that have been adopted here have been unique.

“These people have been able to observe that their work has some kind of effect. They agreed on the next steps, commitments and challenges. As you know, our idea is to replicate this process in other areas. We understand that there have been some key factors in this process, which I would now like to set out. Processes do not develop spontaneously, they are driven. Several levers have to be developed. Some decisions have to be made, even if they are not easy. Courageous decisions have to be made.

Consistency is also very important. To sell abroad you also have to sell domestically. There can be no mismatch between the two. You have to be sure of the goal. Define the problem well. In this type of process it is easy to apportion blame. But that sort of attitude interferes with the processes. I believe that the Deputy for Governance's participation in the process has been of key importance. She doesn't think so. But I think it has been of key importance. At the same time, I believe that people are the key to changing things. The participants have been hardworking and modest. This has been a great help in ensuring that the process is a positive one. Something else that was important is that the timing was right. It has also been of key importance to initiate the process individually rather than jointly. They are very committed. And they have worked hard. They have been grateful for the collaboration we provided".

Nerea Urcola continued her presentation. *"So far I've told you what we've done so far. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to raise them. Is that all clear? Or, is there anything specific you want me to elaborate on? Any questions?"*

In response to a question from DFG1, Nerea Urcola said that the process has also been influenced by being implemented at a time when the Provincial Government is going through a process of change, which has made it possible to overcome some of the inertia. When a process of this kind has to be initiated, there's one question that must always be asked: Do you want change? Do you want to drive change? Often, after a month of work, there are lots of people who say they don't want changes to happen. So, it is very important to ask at the beginning of the process whether there is a willingness to change. In this process, at the beginning, we meet with each participant individually and ask, "Do you want there to be any change? We tell them it will involve work and commitment, and if they are in agreement, we start working. So, the people and the timing are very important".

The Deputy for Governance then took the floor. *"I think it is very important to have facilitators in key places. To avoid creating blocks. To identify each person's roles and strengths. Moreover, there is no room for blame. It is necessary to seek out*

responsibilities and facilitate processes. At the same time, I would like to mention the weight of inertia in organisations”.

DFG3 took the floor. *“There were conditions to carrying out a process of these characteristics. I would like to highlight the Ekinez Ikasi initiative. Indeed, the participants were familiar with the Ekinez Ikasi process. So there was an awareness there. There were conditions. And that is very important”.*

The Deputy for Governance then took the floor. *“It has taken us some time. And it's true: there are plenty of precedents. Ekinez Ikasi, for example. And as we said before, I want to emphasise the importance of the people and the timing”.*

The Orkestra Facilitator then took the floor. *“There's something I'd like to say about those last reflections. I found the reflection on people interesting. If you don't have the right people, is it worth implementing a process like this? It's easy to become fatalistic. But, as we discussed earlier, that is something we have learned. Over the years, we have swum against the tide, trying to push for change with people who were not ready for it. Or trying to push for change when the time was not right. And these processes did not yield positive results. I think that is one of the lessons we have learned in recent years. We have to accept it: not all projects have the right conditions to develop a process of this kind. That is something that has to be accepted from the outset. Indeed, a lot of time and effort has to be invested in this type of process. And if the outcome is predetermined, because there are no conditions for change, there's no point expending those forces in vain. So, the best processes of change often do not take occur in spectacular areas, but in areas with the right people. If they have the right people then the results can be satisfactory”.*

Nerea Urcola took the floor. *“For me it has been very hard to accept that. I used to think that if there was a will, you could achieve anything. But now I have come to realise that this is not the case. The people and the timing are very important. It's not that some people are bad. Rather, they don't have the will or the strength to undertake the change. So they are not prepared to make that change. The change must first take place within*

each person. I believe that is a fundamental pre-condition. For me, this learning process has been tough”.

DFG3 took the floor. *“There are also hierarchies. Different interdepartmental histories. One department says one thing. The other says something else. It is a chain. Each of us has to analyse our own dealings”.*

Nerea Urcola said: *“Feedback is very important. Unfavourable reports or texts that can be used as contrast are also valid”.*

DFG5 took the floor. *“I have a couple of questions. How do you measure the results in these cases? And another question: is it always good to facilitate the process?”*

6. Group dynamic

Nerea Urcola took the floor. *“We will now go to the group dynamic. We will get into three groups. Then later, the spokesperson from each group will try to explain the discussion they have had in that group. They should set out the most important ideas. The questions to be discussed in the groups are as follows: Have you experienced a similar situation? What did you do in that situation? What lessons have you learned in your processes in relation to the Provincial Government? How can that process feed your own process? If so, is there anything else you would do?”*

After the group dynamic, the participants returned to the plenary.

First group:

The spokesperson for the first group was ECO10. *“In general, we talked a lot in the group. Everything we discussed was very interesting. We believe what has been proposed here is a great experiment. I too work in a hierarchical institution. The things that have been raised here are also very common in my institution: silos, lack of*

communication between departments, etc. The departments work without relating to each other. In addition, they have different languages. And the use of a common language is very important. This project has worked to solve these problems. Our group mentioned the importance of leadership. We understand that departments need to know how to communicate. They have to arrive at a common language.

“There have been transformations in the action described. A common language has been created. The departments are working together. What does that mean? We believe that transformations are taking place in the institution. These changes should be extended to the entire Provincial Government. This type of action transforms the Provincial Government. The next political office holders will find themselves with a new and well-rooted political culture. The aim is a profound transformation of the Provincial Government. This type of project contributes to this. So these experiences need to be publicised more widely. Another of the issues we mentioned was that of authority. Who is in charge in an institution like the Provincial Government? The political appointees? The technical staff? In my case, in the university, I have my doubts about all this. Is the rector in charge? The employees and technical staff have enormous power. Often, political will cannot change inertia”.

DFG1 took the floor. *“I believe that political momentum is very important. Leadership has a strong influence. However, it is far from easy. Sometimes you have to encourage or impose those impulses”.*

DFG3 took the floor. *“The civil service has power. There is no doubt about it. But if the political office has leadership, it is possible to get things done. In general, politics is strong. The involvement of the political class can have a great influence”.*

Nerea Urcola took the floor. *“I believe that imposition does not help. It is important to encourage cooperation. I think that's the most important thing”.*

Second group:

The spokesperson for the second group was DFG5, who commented as follows: *“One central idea has emerged in our group: the right conditions have to be created for this influence to occur. It is necessary to identify when the right conditions exist. You have to know how to find the right moment. As regards the project, we are concerned about how to bring some continuity to this initiative. We think that some conflicts may arise that have not arisen so far. This process is due to the presence of the right people. The timing was right. The character and will of the people are highly important. Then there is the issue of discretion. We believe that the issue of discretion is very important. It is a cultural element. Emotion management is also very important. You have to take emotions into account. Another idea mentioned in the group was that of power. These two people will not lose their position of power with this action. The way you manage power relationships is very important. Egos play an important role in the processes. They can get in the way”*.

Third group:

The spokesperson for the third group was ECO1. *“A lot of ideas came up in our group. We made some similar comments. One of the ideas we mentioned was whether similar dynamics are at work in private companies. How would such an action be carried out in a private company? We have discussed the differences between private companies and public institutions. In public systems people can block processes or the system itself. We believe that there are more capabilities in business to unblock the situation. There are a number of reasons. It would be interesting to compare different experiences.*

“Another of the ideas we discussed was this: How can this experience be expanded to the system? When this type of initiative starts to spread, we will encounter 3 different profiles. When we begin promoting change in an organisation we may find three types of people. Some accept change easily. We call them “early adopters”. They support change and do not stand in the way. In addition, they will have a proactive profile in this

change. They will have initiative. However, this profile is not usually the majority. We need to be aware of this. Organisations usually have few people who readily accept, drive and internalise change. The majority, despite their initial unwillingness to change, are willing to take incorporate the changes when they come. But not abruptly and very quickly. Moreover, they usually do not know how to channel these changes. There is a third profile. These people, albeit usually quite few in number, have the capacity to block the process. They are against the changes from the beginning and may block the process. They do not see the need to make changes and may perceive change as a form of attack.

“We need to show caution when pushing for change. In fact, if we undertake the process only with the participation of the “early adopters”, they may be frowned upon by others in the organisation. They may see them as the “teacher’s pets”. It is important to avoid this situation. It is therefore necessary to work with different profiles. I would recommend identifying those people who are going to hinder the process, because they have a large capacity to obstruct things. So, we see we should not only work with the “early adopters”, but with people of different profiles. And in addition, it is important to identify profiles that may block the process”.

DFG3 took the floor. *“Credibility is very important. I believe we are achieving that credibility. I believe that the political will exists and people are becoming aware of it. People are realising that what is being done is serious. One example of this, I think, is Ekinez Ikasi. For example, one person left the process. She said it was not for her. People are realising that this is serious”.*

The Deputy for Governance then took the floor. *“There’s something else I would like to say. Yesterday we had a negotiation session with the Committee. And all sorts of things come up at those meetings. They are interesting. One participant said that there are some special people in this institution, who are very difficult to work with. We cannot organise training areas with them. We are working to advance collaborative governance. We have a lot of dynamics going on”.*

Nerea Urcola took the floor. *"We talk about special people. But, those "special people" are always other people. We all believe that changes need to be made. But, we always believe that it is the other people who have to change. However, I believe that each person has to initiate his or her own change. We have to start to change. And I would also like to mention an idea about leadership. Leadership, in my opinion, is an interview that has to be conducted at the right time".*

"Some thoughts to finish up with. It has been a great experiment. But it was the starting point. It needs to be expanded. There has been leadership. The experience needs to be disseminated. I found one idea that has been put forward interesting: who's in charge, politicians or technicians? And at the same time, how should we monitor this? Some ideas we can extract: managing emotions, discretion, power, situations, roles, etc. What ECO1 said was very interesting. The session was very interesting. Thank you for offering me this opportunity to take part".

The Head of Strategy and Research took the floor. *"Technical staff use their position of power. The bureaucratic ecosystem has great strength. We need to internalise the political initiative. It must be clear what the role of the political class is".*

The Orkestra Facilitator then took the floor. *"I would like to set out a couple of things before ending the session. The next session will be on March 23, when Hillary Bradbury will be taking part. In this session we will be reflecting on the third action and how we are going to go about it. We need to tackle this third action. I would like to end with just one phrase: When I was young, I wanted to change the world; now that I am older, I want to change myself. So that is the direction this third action will take. Change as part of the ecosystem. We will have to conduct a test, a self-diagnosis. We will be asking for volunteers".*

Nerea Urcola took the floor. *"Thank you all for your time and for listening. I would like to thank the Deputy for Governance for placing her trust in me. I have felt listened to. Thank you very much".*

The Deputy for Governance then took the floor. *“Thank you Nerea. It has been a pleasure to make this journey together and we will continue on it. I have changed my approach and I think we got it right. Thank you very much for your participation! See you at the next session”.*

7. Appendices

a. Presentation used during the session

New Political Culture

2022/02/18

Structure of the session

- Introduction
- • From deliberation to action: questions and answers
- Presentation and dynamics with Eider Mendoza and Nerea Urcola
- Close

17. Working Document:

ETORKIZUNA
ERAIKIZ



GIPUZKOA
ETORKIZUNA
ORAIN

THINK TANK

Kultura politiko berriaren inguruko deliberazio prozesua: 17. Lan Dokumentua

FASE BERRIKO HIRU PROIEKTUAK: GIPUZKOAN LANKIDETZAZKO GOBERNANTZAREN MAPA EGITEKO OINARRIAK

(2022ko urtarrilaren 26a)

Sarrera

Lan dokumentu hau 2021-2023 faseko laugarrena da eta 2022ko urtarrilaren 26an Naiara Goiak Gipuzkoan lankidetzazko gobernantzaren mapa egiteko aurkeztu zuen proposamena eta taldeak haren inguruan eginiko ekarpenak ditu oinarri.

Metodologiaren ikuspegitik, adituen ekarpen kontzeptualatik eta kanpoko esperientzietatik ikastera zuzenduriko saioen osagai, saio honetan [ArantzazuLab-en](#) eskutik garatzera doan ekintza izan zen aztergai. Saioan zehar esandakoak, [mapatze](#) ariketaren proposamena besteak beste, memorian daude jasota eta ez dira dokumentu honetan errepikatzen. Ondorioz, dokumentu honek memoria osatzen du, edukien lanketan pauso bat emanez.

Proposamena entzun ondoren, taldekideek lehenik honen egokitasuna aztertu zuten.


Accesibilidad: es necesario investigar


Concentración

<https://www.gipuzkoa.eus/es/web/etorkizunaeraikiz/-/nueva-cultura-politica>

The results of the previous session are presented as a question

- What working method will be used to develop the **definition of collaborative governance in a dynamic way** and ensure that the **process addresses collaborative governance** beyond participation?
- What working method will be used so that the mapping process is not a stand-alone project in itself, but is related to **other Etorkizuna Eraikiz projects** and integrated into the path followed over the years?
- **How will voices from outside the public institutions be integrated into the process?** How will younger people be integrated? How will the people who work **day-to-day** be integrated into collaborative governance?
- What means will be used to **streamline** the information received and to **measure** collaborative governance?

To be included in the mapping process

- **Result of mapping:**
 1. Create a community practice in the NPC group with a mission and a task
 2. Collaborative structuring with different stakeholders
 3. Associate to the research area
- **Prioritisation of Results:** it will be necessary to conduct an exercise in prioritisation of needs and projects identified following the mapping if we want it to be operational.
- **Digital tool - added value:** recruitment, monitoring, **dynamisation of the ecosystem.**
- **Enhance the value of what already exists:** ensure connection with existing initiatives and take into account the actions carried out so far (Territorial Development Laboratory, Etorkizuna Eraikiz municipal ...)
- **The role of deliberation in action.** "Directed"
 1. Attract new agents to the group
 2. Consolidate various joint governance projects
 3. Role of each participant. Combination of different knowledge

Evaluation and next session



Please complete the evaluation, it is of great help to us in preparing the next sessions.



The next session will take place on March 23 when, with Hilary Bradbury's help, we will try to explore further the role of each participant in the process.

b. Working Document No. 18

THINK TANK

Process of deliberation on new political culture: Working Document No. 18
INTERNAL TRANSFORMATION PROCESS OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OF
GIPUZKOA: STUDIES DERIVED FROM THE FIRST CYCLE OF REFLECTION/ACTION
(18 February 2022)

Introduction

This deliberation group for elaboration of the new political culture has adopted two projects (3 processes) as a reference for the co-creation of knowledge for 2022. One of the two projects will seek transformation within the Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa (DFG), and the other will target transformation in the province, through a mapping process. The third process will be based on the studies of the two previous ones; the aim is to develop the deliberation group and increase its impact in Gipuzkoa. The first cycle of reflection-action developed in the first project was presented at the session of the deliberation group held in February 2022. This cycle can be summarised as follows:

- a) In September 2021 the projects and challenges to be addressed were presented to the group; Eider presented the Provincial Government's internal transformation challenges.
- b) In October 2021, Maria José Canel explained some of the internal transformation work that has been carried out so far in the Provincial Government, especially within the framework of the Ekinez Ikasi initiative, and the group proposed priorities and criteria for this work
- c) In November 2021, the group reviewed the experience of La 27e Région and again made contributions, especially on the characteristics that an internal transformation process should have.
- d) Between December 2021 and February 2022, Eider Mendoza, with the collaboration of Nerea Urcola, facilitated a concrete process of action, establishing the space, criteria and procedures for collaboration between two areas of the Provincial Government which had previously had a low level of collaboration.
- e) In February 2022, Eider Mendoza and Nerea Urcola shared the lessons learned from that process, which were addressed as a group to help in the next steps of the Think Tank.

Lessons contributed to the group

More detailed presentations on each of the lessons learned are included in the report dated 18 February 2022. These are listed below:

a) Making courageous decisions

With regard to the experience, at the beginning of the process there was a difficult process of restructuring. The process was hard for everyone, but helped to develop the right conditions subsequently.

b) Consistency

In the process, it was important to show a conviction in the importance of disseminating the same message within the Provincial Government as that which is disseminated to the outside world and of turning that message into action.

c) Having a clear goal

This does not mean that the goal of the process is immovable; Indeed, the proposal made by Eider Mendoza was modified as a result of the reflection. But once a consensus was reached, the goal guided the process.

d) Defining the problem properly

If, despite having a clear goal, the problem is not properly diagnosed, the process may go in the wrong direction.

e) Looking forward without looking back

Too much time is often wasted looking back, dwelling on things that have happened. It is important to work on the ability to look ahead in order to transform.

f) Stop apportioning blame

It is very easy to point the finger at those responsible for the problem and stop the process, but this temptation must be avoided.

g) Persons

The people who assumed responsibilities for transformation in this process, their attitudes and way of working, their disposition and mutual respect have been fundamental in making the transformation possible.

h) Good timing

Previously, other initiatives had been carried out in the Provincial Government that supported this process, among them, the Ekinez Ikasi initiative, which was developed in the Think Tank. But this process has managed to combine the possibilities opened up in other processes and the phases of people's trajectories, and to take a step forward.

i) Analyse the problem on a differentiated basis with each of the parties

First, the problem was studied calmly with each person, before approaching the joint work. This created the right conditions for subsequent dialogue.

j) Commitment and willingness of all parties

The participants have been committed and have done a good job.

k) Trust

The relationship of trust that developed among the participants was of fundamental importance.

l) Help from the rest

On the one hand, the participation of Eider Mendoza was of fundamental importance. On the other, the role of Nerea Urcola was appreciated, demonstrating that people who come to collaborate from outside can also play an important role.

Group reflection

The group was very positive about the overall process; the contributions are grouped below under the X idea.

a) The importance of the process presented and of some of the items that appear in it was highlighted:

- a. The problem raised, silos and lack of interdepartmental collaboration are common in other institutions as well
- b. The role of leadership is very important in this type of transformation process
- c. In order to foster collaboration, it is very important to work on the construction of a common language
- d. Who is in charge in this type of entity, the technical staff? The political appointees? We are not sure, but this is an important question in understanding the transformation

b) Some doubts about the next steps of the process were raised and contributions were made to solve them.

- a. An attempt must be made to bring about a profound transformation in the Provincial Government through projects of this type.
 - b. One question has arisen in relation to the project: How can this initiative be continued? We believe that some conflicts may arise that have not appeared so far.
 - c. Looking ahead, the following factors should be taken into account: the nature of the people, will, understanding of discretion, management of emotion, power (whether or not the participants would lose power in the proposed process) and situations.
 - d. How to extend this experience to the system? Early adopters (those how adopt the changes quickly and enthusiastically) are in the minority; A few others are very opposed to the changes and may block the process. Most of them, even if they are initially not very well-disposed to making changes, will be willing to introduce them. The proposal is not to work only with "early adopters" and to identify as early as possible people who might interfere in the process.
- c) From this process we tried to draw lessons that could be valid for other processes. The doubt is that it is unusual to have the conditions to obtain such good results in such a short period of time and, above all, that it is not always possible to find people with this profile. If at the time of launching a process we do not have people with suitable profiles for this type of work, is it worth going ahead with the process? Wouldn't it be more effective to focus the transformation on other areas?

c. Session programme

THINK TANK

SPACE FOR DELIBERATION ON THE NEW POLITICAL CULTURE

Gunea, 18 February 2022

CHALLENGE TO BE WORKED ON IN THE SESSION

After addressing the bases of the mapping exercise in the last session, we will go back to the experience of working on the new policy culture within the Provincial Government, to draw lessons and look at how we can develop the policy ecosystem.

In this process we will be led by Eider Mendoza and Nerea Urcola. They will share the lessons learned from the process that is already underway in the Provincial Government and we will work as a group on the foundations for building the new political culture.

AGENDA FOR THE SESSION

- Introduction
- Transfer based on the latest contributions
- Presentation of the progress of the project for developing the new political culture in the Provincial Government
- Group dynamic
- Close