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Governance Innovation –
Towards Inclusive and Participatory Governance
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1. Governance Innovation in the Context of Social Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups

Learning Objectives

• To understand governance innovation in the context of social inclusion
• To introduce the key principles, types and elements of government innovation for social inclusion of vulnerable group
• To introduce diverse innovative governance innovation practices
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Definition of Governance

• It is now increasingly recognized that governance should be defined with various dimensions, including:
  - Governing with all stakeholders on board, not just government (this implies more tasks for civil society & business)
  - Governing the relations/processes with society/stakeholders (implying participation), including civil society organizations and vulnerable groups
  - Ensuring efficient and accountable institutions
  - Being subject to independent review and oversight mechanisms
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Definition of Governance

• The classical/narrow definition of governance, which is prevalent in many countries, is: how governments work to reach their objectives; policy is what these objectives are. Yet, this approach may risk excluding useful tools and solutions which may be needed in a specific (national) context.

• Therefore, we need a broad definition of governance:
  ➢ Governance is how public administration organisations and other stakeholders develop solutions and create opportunities for societal challenges
  ➢ This definition includes the (choices of) institutions, instruments/tools, processes and roles of actors
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- Governance measures, to be innovative, must also:
  - improve access;
  - produce better quality (such as better-quality services);
  - be inclusive by considering the needs of those furthest behind; and
  - develop people-driven and people-centered initiatives; and be transparent and accountable

- Other issues - Example: gender-responsive services

To ensure that vulnerable groups benefit from public services, other issues must also be addressed. Persistent gaps in the following areas continue to hamper the active participation of women as stakeholders and users of public services:

  - weak policy and legislative frameworks for gender equality;
  - low levels of women’s participation and representation in decision making positions, especially within the public sector;
  - limited capacity within institutions to conduct gender analysis and produce sex-disaggregated data; and
  - limited capacity to implement planning and budgeting for gender responsive services

Source: Meuleman 2008, 2018
Governance innovation is needed for government innovation

- Setting innovative goals and targets and using innovative technology alone is no guarantee for effective implementation.
  - Therefore, government innovation for inclusion of vulnerable groups requires also governance innovation

- The Global Sustainable Development Report 2019 mentions governance as the 1st of 4 ‘levers’ to enable & steer transformation & innovation
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• **Innovative governance** is about new approaches on how to achieve effective implementation of government policies/goals

• Effectiveness (in terms of leveraging the achievement of the SDGs) is the objective; innovation is not an objective, but a **means** to better reach the objective.

• Maybe it could be said as follows:
  - Innovative policy is **doing different things**
  - Innovative governance is **doing things differently**

• “What is innovative” depends on the state of play / the current **context** of governance in a country (or city)
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Innovative Governance & Vulnerability

- “Innovation for development is about identifying new and more effective solutions that add value for the people affected by development challenges” (UNDP)

- Not all government innovation is sustainable innovation

- Much government reform is focused on efficiency (saving money), sometimes to the detriment of effectiveness
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How to innovate governance to integrate inclusiveness and empowerment?

• Leveraging *technology* is important -> See Modules 6-7

• But we need to go also *beyond technology*. Tackling societal challenges is something *for* people *by* people. It’s not only a rational thing: values, traditions should be respected as part of it.

• In all countries, there is a need to transform the ways of designing and steering public policies for the benefit of – and *with* - marginalized populations/groups, now and in the future.

• One innovation need is creating an *inclusive, citizen-centred and participatory public service culture and delivery* -> see Module 6.1.
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How to innovate governance to integrate inclusiveness and empowerment?

• In order to realize this new public service culture, we have to work the *public organization’s capacity to deliver effective governance*, in other words: we need to *adjust the ‘internal governance’*

• This means: improving the *institutional capacity* for social inclusion of vulnerable groups by integrating *values & tools* related to the two ‘new governance styles’ (network and market governance).

• In addition, addressing the needs of vulnerable groups requires a *change of the mindset of government officials*: flexibility, thinking out of the box, collaboration and learning between different departments
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### Changing Governance Features to Solve Barriers to Inclusiveness

7 examples of 50 dimensions of governance where a shift or addition may be needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Starting point</th>
<th>- - - - - - &gt; Addition or replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical basis</td>
<td>Network governance</td>
<td>Market governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Directive, top-down</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of government</td>
<td>Ruler of society</td>
<td>Partner in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational silos</td>
<td>Keep silos (structure)</td>
<td>Teach silos to ‘dance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional logic</td>
<td>Centralized/pyramid</td>
<td>Informal structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication style</td>
<td>Informing</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation types</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Interdependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values civil servants</td>
<td>Law of jungle</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- **11 Principles of effective governance for sustainable development**: proposed by the UN Committee of Experts on Public Administration (CEPA) and endorsed by UN ECOSOC Council in July 2018.

- Using them to assess or design governance for **inclusion of vulnerable groups** helps to see whether a governance framework is balanced.

- Often, it turns out that the **5 Inclusiveness principles** (of the 11 in total) are the weakest part in governance frameworks or guidance (OECD e.g.).

---


#### Principles and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key governance principle</th>
<th>Upward trends</th>
<th>Downward trends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Contextuality, pluriformity &amp; diversity, peer learning and twinning; digitization, directional innovation, long-term, system-focused policy packages, financial governance</td>
<td>Blueprint thinking, proliferation of ‘best practices’, un-directional innovation (‘all innovation is good’), short-term policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>Sustainability indicators, citizens accounting, result indicators</td>
<td>Detailed performance indicators, output indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusiveness</strong></td>
<td>Collaboration, co-creation, empowerment, local govt.</td>
<td>Patronizing, dependency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Approaches to Engaging Vulnerable Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increasing Level of Public Impact</th>
<th>INFORM</th>
<th>CONSULT</th>
<th>INVOLVE</th>
<th>COLLABORATE</th>
<th>EMPOWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL</strong></td>
<td>To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives and/or solutions.</td>
<td>To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decision.</td>
<td>To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public issues and concerns are consistently understood and considered.</td>
<td>To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.</td>
<td>To place final decision-making in the hands of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROMISE TO THE PUBLIC</strong></td>
<td>We will keep you informed.</td>
<td>We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and issues are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.</td>
<td>We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.</td>
<td>We will implement what you decide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example Tools**
- Fact sheets
- Websites
- Open houses
- Public comment
- Focus groups
- Surveys
- Public meetings
- Workshops
- Deliberate polling
- Citizen Advisory committees
- Consensus-building
- Participatory decision-making
- Citizen juries
- Ballots
- Delegated decisions


Approaches to Engaging Vulnerable Groups

Figure 12. Levels of stakeholder engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Make information and data available to other parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make targeted audience more knowledgeable and sensitive to specific issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage stakeholders to relate to the issue and take action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Gather comments, perceptions, information and experience of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No obligation to take stakeholders’ view into consideration in final outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Provide opportunities to take part in the policy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not entail that participants have an influence over the decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation in decision-making bodies</td>
<td>Structural level of engagement with the objective to develop collective choices. Often embedded in the organisation’s structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Agreed-upon collaboration between stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characterised by joint agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-decision and co-production</td>
<td>Balanced share of power among stakeholders involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD (2015), Stakeholder Engagement for Inclusive Water Governance, OECD Series on Water

Generic Examples of Systemic Level Engagement Mechanisms at Different Stages of the Policy Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Legal/ regulatory</th>
<th>Planning/ Design</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Monitoring and evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Awareness raising efforts on the SDGs  
  • Engagement with groups of the population left behind | • Setting up of formal consultation mechanisms  
  • Resources allocated to engagement mechanisms | • (ad hoc) public consultations for the elaboration of a national SD strategy  
  • NSDC leading the design or revision of the national SD strategy  
  • Participatory planning  
  • Participatory budgeting | • Multi-stakeholder partnerships  
  • Stakeholder coordination in institutional mechanisms for implementation | • Learning networks (sectoral and systemic levels)  
  • Participatory monitoring and review (by governments or oversight institutions)  
  • Participatory development of indicators and data collection |

Source: UNDESA (2018), World Public Sector Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector or issue</th>
<th>Example of engagement mechanisms observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction (SDG 1)</td>
<td>Variety of informal and formal structures for stakeholder engagement. The poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSP) approach resulted in engagement by civil society organizations in poverty policy debates, as per a study that assessed PRSP implementation worldwide. New national networks of civil society organizations were formed around poverty policy, often with sub-committees grouped around sectoral or other special interests. (e.g. Poverty Observatory in Mozambique that included more than 440 different civil society groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition (SDG 2)</td>
<td>Effective structures for multi-stakeholder engagement that include a broad variety of stakeholders used in some countries (e.g. Senegal, Brazil). The literature stresses the key role of advocacy to galvanize and maintain action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated water resources management (SDG 6)</td>
<td>Various types of formal and informal structures: outreach and communication programme between basin agency personnel and stakeholders in the basin (Indonesia); multi-sectoral committees or councils with representatives from national and sub-national governments (Brazil; Costa Rica; Canada); advisory committees with representatives from subnational levels and water user sectors (Australia). Some structures (e.g. multi-sectoral multi-stakeholder committees) played a leadership role and mobilization occurred on water issues (e.g. Brazil), or were considered as good fora for information generation and sharing (e.g. Canada).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy (SDG 7)</td>
<td>Platforms for multistakeholder engagement created in some countries with some initiated by the private sector (IDCOL in Bangladesh). Those platforms involve, among others, civil society organizations (CSOs), civil servants and private sector representatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNDESA (2018), World Public Sector Report

| Integrated transport (SDG 11) | Importance of involving a variety of stakeholders upfront in transport planning, and throughout the planning and implementation process stressed in many reports (mostly in developed countries). Relevant mechanisms/tools for engaging stakeholders in transport planning and implementation highlighted in the literature documenting Australia’s experience. |
| Sustainable consumption and production (SDG 12) | Literature outlines lack of regular consultation mechanisms and processes in some countries (of Eastern Europe and the Caucasus and Baltic States) to influence governments’ decision-making on SCP. Budget made available by a few countries to support engagement on SCP (e.g. Singapore’s plans to finance NGOs’ engagement in networking, promoting cooperation and encouraging exchange of ideas on sustainable lifestyles). |
| Climate change (SDG 13) | Civil society participation arrangements and level of engagement vary from country to country. Establishment of small technical expert groups, and larger participatory events to raise awareness and reach consensus highlighted in literature as common participatory mechanisms for climate change planning. Based on a study in Asia, academia has played an active role in domestic activities related to climate change (e.g. Advisory Panel on Climate Change created in Japan 2008). Private sector and local governments more actively represented than before (e.g. large coalitions of sub-national government such as Under2 led from the State of California; business alliances such as ‘We Mean Business’ that include more than 680 companies and investors worldwide). |

Source: UNDESA (2018), World Public Sector Report

| Ocean management (SDG 14) | Effective participative mechanisms for integrated ocean management outlined in literature. These mechanisms involved active multi-stakeholder participation in the planning process, and public consultations. They involved a diversity of stakeholders (e.g. ocean industry and resource user groups, community interests, NGOs, science and research community, local authorities, general public, aboriginal communities). Active involvement of ocean resource users in marine fisheries planning processes reported in several cases in Europe. |
| Forest management (SDG 15) | Approaches to involving local stakeholders in forestry have multiplied over the years. Great variety of structural arrangements (e.g. top down or bottom up). Some approaches provide local or community stakeholders with an important role in the forest planning and decision-making process and can include devolution of forest management responsibility from the central government to local communities and/or entail sharing forest management roles amongst multiple stakeholders, including the private sector. |

Source: UNDESA (2018), World Public Sector Report

Methods of Innovation for Governance

1. **Institutional innovations** - which focus on the renewal of established institutions and the establishment of new institutions;

2. **Organizational innovation** - including the introduction of new working procedures or management techniques in public administration;

3. **Process innovation** - which focuses on the improvement of the quality of public service delivery; and

4. **Conceptual innovation** - which focuses on the introduction of new forms of governance (e.g., interactive policy-making, people’s budget reforms, horizontal networks)

Source: Alberti & Rabinovitch (2018), Innovation in Public Service Delivery for the Sustainable Development Goals

1) Institutional Innovation

Mexico - Nuevo León’s Council for Strategic Planning
[2020 UNPSA Winner]

• To better meet the need of its citizens, state policy priorities need to transcend politics and be based on assessed needs. For this, a council was established in the State of Nuevo León to formulate long-term policy. **Consejo Nuevo León** is a local advisory/consultative body of the State Executive that plans and evaluates public policies to foster sustainable development and the general well-being of the citizens by integrating the experience and knowledge of people from civil society, academia, businesses and government.

• By facilitating cross-sector collaboration between key stakeholders, the Council addresses state’s most pressing problems such as initiatives on zero hunger and eradication of violence against women and seeks to ensure citizen’s well-being with focus on the most vulnerable populations.

  • [https://www.conl.mx](https://www.conl.mx)

2) Organizational Innovation

Ecuador - Work in Integrated Health Networks
[2017 UNPSA Winner]

• The solution to address inequality and social exclusion due to a severely fragmented health care sector was to have a legal basis in the Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, whereby health was recognized as a fundamental human right. The constitutional amendment stated that health care should be free and guarantees access through the National Health System Organization through the creation of the Comprehensive Public Health Network and private network that complements it.

• The main milestones included: (i) the approval of the Law that governs it (2002); (ii) the implementation of the Comprehensive Health Care Model; (iii) the signing of the Interinstitutional Framework Agreement that consolidates the Integrated Public Health Network and the Complementary Private Network; (iv) the financial administrative decentralization with the Management and Structure Model of the MSP; (v) the renewal of the old Interinstitutional Framework Agreement; and (vi) the approval of structures of subsystems of public providers in the NHS.


2) Organizational Innovation

Ecuador - Work in Integrated Health Networks
[2017 UNPSA Winner]
VIDEO

Source: UNDESA DPIDG Youtube
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wzovkl1xcek&list=UUXk5I1rv3cUgsIOrpLMm7uw&index=42

3) Process Innovation

Seongdong District, Seoul, Republic of Korea – HYO Policy
[2020 UNPSA Winner]

• The ‘HYO Team’ of Seongdong District, Seoul, composed of doctors and nurses, provides home health visits to the old-old in five areas: health checkups, chronic disease management, depression and dementia management, and financial support for medical bills.

• Increased the physical accessibility of welfare services through the building of a medical welfare network, including through partnerships with private clinics, welfare services and care providers at various services points.

Source: http://www.sd.go.kr/eng.do

4) Conceptual Innovation

Spain – Citizen Participation Project
[2018 UNPSA Winner]

- The Madrid City Council was faced with the challenge to establish new models of governance that will lead to more open, transparent, participatory and inclusive governments.

- “Decides Madrid Government” website was created as a channel for listening and communication in which all people can directly and individually raise their ideas and needs and propose public services needed to meet them. The proposals published on the platform have a space for discussion open to all citizens to exchange views, discuss their needs and improve them.

- Since 2015, 362,702 users have registered and participated in more than 5,000 debates, made more than 21,000 proposals and generated more than 4 million votes. Participatory budgets are making it possible to create 517 new services and facilities that the people of Madrid have proposed.


4) Conceptual Innovation

**Participatory Budgeting**

- *More than 1500 cities* are adopting this practice. Local residents can propose projects based on their real needs and vote to select the projects.

- For example, New York City Council - New Yorkers including the vulnerable can make proposals on this online map and they participate in the voting process.

Source: [https://www.participatorybudgeting.org/](https://www.participatorybudgeting.org/)  
[http://ideas.plnyc.org/page/about](http://ideas.plnyc.org/page/about)
Group Work
Group Discussion & Country Experience Sharing in World Café Method 60’

Government roles and governance capacity to promote social inclusion of vulnerable groups in your own situations/countries:

1. How can our national government & governance be characterized in terms of which governance styles appear/dominate/are missing?
2. What kind of innovation seems needed but difficult and what seems easy to achieve?
3. Can we specify the challenges/obstacles and the opportunities for various areas of government action, and regarding various vulnerable groups and groups at risk of vulnerability?
4. Where government is weak/fragile/post-conflict, what starting points for innovation of public services can we find in civil society and (small) business operators?
Group Discussion & Country Experience Sharing in World Café Method

Experiences on capacities needed for social inclusion of vulnerable groups?

1. What capacities needed for public service reform? What are the main barriers in your country’s administrative culture and governance?

2. Where do you see opportunities for change, in terms of leadership, strategic approach, participation & partnership, human resources, knowledge and data?

3. What kind of innovative institutional arrangements could be necessary?
### Key Readings

- **UN DESA (2019), Global Sustainable Development report 2019.**
  [https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/19934IGS_in_DC_summary.pdf](https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/19934IGS_in_DC_summary.pdf)
- **UN DESA (2018), World Public Sector Report**
- **UN DESA, Synthesis reports on the Voluntary National Reviews**
- **Meuleman, L. (2018), Metagovernance for Sustainability, Chapter 1. Introduction: The problem with sustainability governance.**
- **Meuleman, L. (2013) Cultural Diversity and Sustainability Metagovernance .**
  [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-28009-2_2](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-28009-2_2)
- **Chawdhry, U. et al. (2018) Effective governance for sustainable development: 11 principles to be put in practice.**

### Further Readings

  [https://sdg.guide/](https://sdg.guide/)
- **UN DESA/DPIDG/UNPOG, 2018, Innovation in Delivering Public Services to Vulnerable Groups for Achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.**
  [http://www.unpog.org/page/sub5_5_view.asp?sn=238&page=1&BoardID=0008](http://www.unpog.org/page/sub5_5_view.asp?sn=238&page=1&BoardID=0008) (Suggested reading: Chapter 3).
End of Module 6