THINK TANK

Deliberation process on the work of the future: Working Document No. 7

(25 February 2021)

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE: BUILDING ECOSYSTEMS

1. Context for reflection

Collaborative governance corresponds to a new paradigm linked to the notion of open government. Classic forms of governance are limited in their ability to incorporate stakeholders and citizens into the policy cycle (formation, implementation and assessment). Collaborative governance is developed on the basis of three complementary processes: a) institutional and economic resources to foster collaborative networks (heterogeneous actors), b) collaborative leadership (effective solutions incorporating different perspectives), c) formally structured deliberation forums (consensus spaces).

1. The conditions for collaborative governance in Social Policies

1.1. Positive Conditions (facilitation)

1.1.1. Strengthen the Third Sector

One condition for fostering collaborative governance is to strengthen the Third Sector in order to increase its capacity for transformation. Strengthening the Third Sector improves the conditions for the development of collaborative governance between organizations in the sector and social policies. The institutional weight of the Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa may limit collaborative governance if organisations are not strengthened at a provincial level.

1.1.2. Change in decisional culture in a Post-Covid-19 context

The Covid-19 crisis has created a new decision-making and participatory context that facilitates the development of collaborative governance. It is necessary to strengthen this path in which officials from the Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa open up spaces in which a shared decision-making culture can be created.

1.1.3. The creation of Etorkizuna Eraikiz Think Tank

The Provincial Government's intention is to open up the space for deliberation to contribute to other social designs within the framework of Etorkizuna Eraikiz in order to promote innovation, networks and raise awareness of the need for change. The think tank is a space

for generating trust between Third Sector organisations and Social Policy managers, as well as a facilitating space for putting into practise a new innovation agenda.

1.1.4. Institutionalizing collaborative governance

An important condition for promoting collaborative governance is the existence of political will and having a definition and a consensual management model on collaborative governance that is reflected in provincial legislation on participation, municipal models and other policy instruments.

1.1.5. Developing pilot experiences based on collaborative governance

Innovative proposals based on collaborative governance can arise in the social services of the Department of Social Policies, where they are structured as pilot experiences that allow experimentation, wider roll-out of results and changes in the legal framework, once the validity of the experience has been socially and institutionally assessed.

1.1.6. Creating decision-making forums

Moving from participation forums to decision-making forums, taking in the users of social services could be a central element in promoting collaborative governance in order to strengthen the autonomy of users and facilitate the defence of their rights.

1.1.7. Power to define its own model

Within the state and regional legislative framework, the Historical Territory (province) of Gipuzkoa has the power to modify social services, transform services and promote new care models. This power is a potential for driving collaborative governance to transform social services.

1.1.8. Associative culture

In Gipuzkoa there is a deep-rooted associative and collaborative culture, as well as a culture of creating communities that facilitate the development of collaborative governance, both for collaboration between organisations and with users.

1.1.9. Past record of public-private partnerships

In Gipuzkoa there is a consolidated track record of public-private collaboration in the design and execution of social policies.

1.2. Limits, obstacles and risks

1.2.1. Limits in the collaborative experience

Although there are experiences of collaboration, these are limited to cooperation projects. However, it is necessary to promote collaborative experiences of greater dimension and scope, such as the design and development of ecosystems. In addition, there is little linkage between technical and policy decision-makers and participatory processes and complex

decision-making. It is not merely a question of limitations in the collaborative experience of the organizations in the province, but also of limitations in the collaborative experience of the provincial government's own technical and decision-making staff.

1.2.2. Lack of awareness of what collaborative governance means

Collaborative governance is a new concept and experience that needs to be clearly defined with examples that show the meaning of participation and its direct consequences, such as accountability, shared management, allocated resources and the impact of collaboration. In addition, it is necessary to address the paradoxes of collaboration such as whether competitive concurrence is compatible with collaborative governance or decisional transparency.

1.2.3. Fragmentation of powers

The fragmentation of powers, levels, specialties and scarce cooperation dynamics between institutions, both internally and externally, represent the limits of collaborative governance.

1.2.4. Limited financial resources to promote new care models

Collaborative governance needs to be promoted within the framework of new care models, for which more resources (funding for innovation) are needed to transform care models based on collaborative structures (such as ecosystems).

1.2.5. Limits for addressing the single socio-health record

A single socio-health record will allow case information to be shared (especially when dealing with complex cases), facilitating the collaborative process between different institutions and organizations, and different professional and disciplinary approaches. Restrictions on access to information of relevance for care place limits on collaborative governance.

1.2.6. Connecting deliberation with policies

One risk of collaborative governance is the potential lack of or limitation on specificity with regard to collaborative work in designing and developing social policies.

1.2.7. Citizen involvement in social policies

Collaborative governance requires constant and active participation by citizens, which potentially poses limits in order to guarantee the involvement of the elderly, people in rural areas, people in conditions of social exclusion, whose mode and intensity of participation is a challenge. It is important to promote new methodologies for integrating these vulnerable groups into the deliberation and decision-making processes.

1.2.8. Resistance of public institutions to participation

There is a limit to collaborative governance, which is the resistance of public institutions to real and effective participation of the third sector in the design, implementation and evaluation of social policies, beyond the "mere" provision of services of public responsibility. Likewise, reluctance and resistance to "delegate" to the users of social services the organization of their care or social participation processes, opting instead for a position based on the control of all processes and the creation of "intermediary" agents between the administration and the users.

1.2.9. Absence of effective decision-making spaces

Absence of instruments or spaces which, beyond simple consultative participation, will guarantee the real and effective participation of the third sector in the design, execution and assessment of social policies.

1.2.10. Lack of an agreed-upon model of care and attention

The lack of a model of care and organisation of services based on rights, support, person-centred care and quality of life outcomes, shared between institutions, universities and third-sector organisations.

2. Collaborative governance tools for social policies

2.1. Networking (collaborative experimentation)

Networking enables coordination of activities between different organisations (multi-agent) as well as facilitating collaboration and the implementation of collaborative experimental projects (multi-disciplinary). Networking requires supports (e.g. technological and digital) and technical teams that galvanise, nurture, secure and generate value for the network and its participants.

2.2. Multi-agent dialogue committees (mutual learning)

The aim of the multi-agent dialogue committees is to share learning and best practice (what works and what doesn't), to consider new agendas, challenges and solutions and to disseminate new tools. Mutual learning facilitates the generation of institutional and social trust (social capital).

2.3. Strategic design as a method of reflection

Strategic design makes it possible to strengthen the anticipation capacity of third-sector and public-sector organizations, as well as establishing consensual goals (objectives and long-term impact indicators) that facilitate the design of impact pathways.

2.4. Training programmes in collaborative governance

To promote a comprehensive training programme in participatory governance that facilitates learning in participatory and cooperative processes, and acts as a vector for professional development in the different public spheres and in private and social initiative. Open social innovation can facilitate learning, through experimentation, among staff from the public and private spheres, thus formalizing the culture of cooperation.

2.5. Flexible and practice-oriented Think Tanks

The development of flexible and practice-oriented think tanks can act as a powerful tool for developing collaborative governance. This involves combining modes of reflection with collaborative action to facilitate the acceleration of social innovations and new care models.

2.6. New models of care and organization

The development of collaborative governance can best be developed if there is a clear consensus on the model of care, which should include cost-efficiency parameters, case management tools (Kaiser pyramid) and person-centred planning.

2.7. Service-mapping tools

The development of collaborative governance needs to define key information on health services, community services and social services. Tools for mapping services and actors, with a community and ecosystemic approach, are needed to design spaces for collaboration, coordination and structuring of services oriented towards PCC and quality-of-life models. Map of services for care and attention at home and in care homes.

2.8. Planning tools

Collaborative governance requires *comarca*[1]-level planning tools to foster cooperation between grassroots social services and (primary-secondary) social services.

3. What impacts (positive/negative) can be expected from collaborative governance

3.1. Positive Impacts

3.1.1. Greater quality of life for users

The purpose of collaborative governance is to improve quality of life, as measured by objective and subjective data, such as an increase in user satisfaction with the services provided. Quality of life is related to increased personalization of care and attention.

---

[1] Comarca: a sub-provincial administrative division, comprising several municipalities.

3.1.2. Improved quality of future social policies

The 360º vision provides multi-agent and multi-disciplinary collaboration to improve the design and implementation of social policies in the future by incorporating all perspectives and experiences.

3.1.3. Improved efficiency of future social policies

Collaborative governance improves efficiency in the use of public and private resources by avoiding duplication, specialization and long-term coordination.

3.1.4. Acceleration of innovations

Collaborative governance can be an important factor in driving, accelerating and evaluating social innovations to transform collaborative environments and care models.

3.1.5. Increase in commitment

Collaborative governance facilitates the development of the social and institutional commitment of the province's organisations in the cooperation processes, but above all in giving responsibility to all agents participating in the ecosystems.

3.1.6. Shared diagnostics

Collaborative governance facilitates the development of shared diagnostics; it is not only about designing initiatives but also about understanding the problems in a more comprehensive way and from different perspectives.

3.1.7. Local synergies

Collaborative governance facilitates meeting and coordination between the public administration, private and social sector organizations, universities, and community and citizen associations, provided there are facilitation structures in place to manage governance.

3.1.8. Social integration and empowerment

Collaborative governance can be a tool for integrating users into policy processes, but above all for providing positive participatory experiences and strengthening user empowerment.

3.1.9. Prioritization of objectives

Collaborative governance facilitates the generation of common goals through the participation and inclusion of different perspectives in the design of social policies.

3.1.10. More flexible social policies

Collaborative governance facilitates the generation of social policies that are more flexible and adapted to emerging realities and needs. This adaptation must be aligned with the real needs of the most socially vulnerable individuals, prioritising people's rights and quality of life over management and organisational criteria.

3.2. Negative Impacts

3.2.1. Slowness in collaborative learning

Collaborative governance requires experimentation and mutual learning, which requires time and strategy development. Many of the social problems operate at a dizzying rate (e.g. the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic), restricting learning times and collaborative capacities.

3.2.2. Loss of executive responsibility

Collaborative governance, and its deliberative and consensus-building processes, can affect the ability to make agile and timely decisions. Collaborative governance requires a new balance between public administration and organisations (companies and third sector) that must be accepted and processed by the system. It is important to structure and parameterize the notion of success and failure of collaborative governance (how are success and failure managed, and by whom?).

3.2.3. Risk of poor governance

An inadequate understanding and management of collaborative governance can have undesired results, such as increasing the problem of fragmentation of powers, reinforcing the dispersion of some initiatives and the abandonment of others, creating new problems, increasing institutional conflict and installing failure.

3.2.4. Potential for frustration

One negative potential of collaborative governance can be to produce frustration (social and institutional) when activities are not maintained in the long term and especially when deliberative processes are not shown to be consistent and actually implemented in practice.

3.2.5. Participatory fatigue

Collaborative governance requires citizen participation. The ongoing and long-term participation of the citizenry can exhaust and, above all, derail the process of collaborative governance. Participatory methodologies need to be innovated to avoid this risk to participation.

3.2.6. Communicative limit

Collaborative governance requires a lot of communication which involves not only the style of communication but also an understanding of the key messages, as well as thinking about the communication supports (not only technologies). If communication processes, dynamics, tools and materials are not adapted to the existing diversity, people may feel excluded.