

# THINK TANK

Process of deliberation on new political culture: Working Document No. 17

## THE THREE PROJECTS OF THE NEW PHASE: BASES FOR DRAWING UP THE MAP OF COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN GIPUZKOA

(26 January 2022)

### Introduction

This working document is the fourth of the 2021-2023 phase and is based on the proposal presented by Naiara Goia on 26 January 2022 for drawing up the map of collaborative governance in Gipuzkoa and on the contributions made in this regard by the group.

From a methodological point of view, as a component of the sessions aimed at learning from the conceptual contributions of experts and external experiences, this session dealt with the action to be developed by Arantzazulab. The interventions throughout the session, such as the proposed mapping exercise, among others, are included in the report and are not repeated in this document. This document is therefore intended as a complement to the report, adding to its contents.

Having heard the proposal, the members of the group first analysed its suitability. The following are the contributions of the group members.

### Suitability of the proposal

*Aspects related to working methods or methodology to be taken into account:*

- The methodology is very suitable. Although the results are ambitious, they are achievable
- Place reflection and knowledge in the background
- It is necessary to differentiate between merely participatory initiatives and those related to discourses on governance
- It is necessary to examine in depth what has been done well and what has not been done well
- Determine how collaboration will be measured
- Methodologically, conduct open-ended interviews in groups rather than individually: world café
- We recommend using the simplest possible approach to complex situations, since the complex situation itself will complicate the approach
- How do we integrate different types of knowledge? Inviting experts, analysing successful models; and perhaps also making use of the possibilities offered by a digital platform
- We would like to learn more about the characteristics of digital tools. It is something that is necessary

*Need to integrate young people into the process:*

- Imagining the attitude of young people to collaborative governance

## *How collaborative governance is conceived in the project:*

- We have struggled to come up with a definition of CG in the deliberation group. We believe that the mapping will lead to different ways of understanding collaborative governance
- Two different definitions of cooperative governance: one from the government, but not the other (there is tension there). This is a dynamic definition, and we will be working on it as we go along

## *Mapping as part of a wider snapshot of the policy ecosystem:*

- Finally, specify the relationship with the Think Tank
- The timeline of the mapping exercise. Because previously there have been results from the deliberative process that have led us to where we are now. In passing, they would lend legitimacy and credibility to the process. Legitimation in dealing with internal and external agents
- We must never lose sight of the main goal: what is collaborative governance for? Effectively channelling the challenges we face, through public management and before the citizenry
- The normative area of governance has a direct impact on multilevel governance. They should be structured within the framework of the European Union, and the processes should be well established. Incidentally, the community should be solid (i.e. including all of Gipuzkoa)

The group members were also asked about their expectations, interests and possibilities of contributing.

## **Expectations, interests and contributions**

### *Expectations as to impact:*

- Any impact will not be achieved by mapping, but only if we view and use mapping as a resource
- Conditions already exist, to the extent that there is a willingness. We do not know whether results will be obtained: what is needed is action
- There is always an impact, and if a new political culture and collaborative governance is promoted, that would be sufficient in itself.
- We see intermediate targets. But it is essential to take into account the generation of public value in order to effectively manage the challenges we face in a shared manner.

### *Interest:*

- The process has been interesting and enriching. Not so much theoretically, but in practice.

### *Contributions:*

- It can be important in disseminating the Etorikizuna Eraikiz model and a way of understanding collaborative governance

- Contribution: integration into the Etorkizuna Eraikiz narrative
- The results are very suitable, especially for connecting with research or launching new initiatives

When the groups discussed the previous contributions, they also raised the following issues:

- The map must be integrated into the time and perspective of the process
- The process, as defined, prioritises the voice of public institutions
- It is important to build and reinforce a way of rationalising the information received
- It is important to gather the views of the people who work in this area on a day-to-day basis, even if it is difficult

## Summary of contributions

The above proposal was summarised as a question made to the person participating in the deliberation group who was in charge of facilitating the project, with the aim of answering the following questions over coming sessions:

- 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?
- 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 existed for some years?
- How will voices outside public institutions be integrated into the process? How will young people be included? How will those who work on a day-to-day basis in this area be integrated into collaborative governance?
- How will incoming information be rationalised and collaborative governance measured?

## Criteria for action

In response to the members of the group, the criteria gathered for action by Naiara Goia were as follows:

- **Result of mapping:**
  - Create a community practice in the NPC group with a mission and a task
  - Collaborative structuring with different stakeholders
  - Relate it to the research
- **Prioritization of results:** it is necessary to prioritise the needs and projects identified after the mapping, if we want to do something operational
- Digital tool - added value: collection, monitoring, **galvanisation of the ecosystem**
- **Make use of what already exists:** guarantee a connection with initiatives that are already taking place and take into account those carried out so far (Territorial Development Laboratory, Udal Etorkizuna Eraikiz, etc.)

- **Role of deliberation in the action. 'Directed':**
  - Attracting new agents to the group
  - Consolidating several governance projects jointly
  - The role of each of us. Combination of different knowledge