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Guidelines on how to prepare your contribution

Here are a few guidelines and criteria to assist you in preparation for your contribution to the First Berlin Forum Innovation in Governance

Paper presenters
- Your paper or extended abstract should be at least 2,000 words, but no longer than 8,000 words in length. Please format your text in line with standard academic requirements:
  o Font type: Arial or Times New Roman; Font size: 12 pt
  o Line spacing: 1.5
  o Margins: 2.5 cm
- Your paper or extended abstract may also be a “work in progress”, i.e. if parts of your paper only appear in note form, this is also OK – it is better to send a preliminary version than no written material at all!
- Please include your name, affiliation and contact details on the paper – all submissions will only be circulated internally, i.e. amongst Forum participants and the Scientific Committee
- Please send your paper or extended abstract to crowe@ztg.tu-berlin.de by Friday 30 April 2010.
- Each paper “slot” at the Forum itself has been allocated 40 minutes. Your allotted presentation time will therefore be 20 minutes. Please bear this in mind when preparing your presentation, as in the interests of promoting good discussion, we will be strict. The rest of your slot will be allocated to discussion (short response by paper discussant and open plenary discussion)
- Powerpoint presentations are welcomed. A laptop and projector will be available. Please send a copy of your presentation to crowe@ztg.tu-berlin.de by Monday 17 May 2010

Poster presenters
- We will provide partitions on which you can mount your poster. We would prefer your poster to have the following dimensions (please no larger):
  o European size A0 (841mm x 1189mm; ~ 33.1" x 46.8")
  o Orientation: portrait
- Your contribution at the Forum consists of two parts:
  o Flashlight: you will have two minutes to announce in the plenary a) the topic/case that your poster presents and b) answer the question “What requirements and challenges for a theory of innovation processes in governance can be derived from my study?” The order of presentation will be according to presenter surname in reverse alphabetical order (i.e. starting with Z, moving forward to A)
  o Poster session: we ask you to stay close to your poster for questions and comments
- All poster presenters are warmly invited to attend the paper sessions on Friday 21 May.
- Please note that we cannot cover any costs incurred in the preparation of your poster. It is also your responsibility to transport your poster to Berlin.
Discussants

– We have already provisionally assigned you as discussant to a specific paper. Full details can be found in the preliminary programme.

– When the paper presentation is finished, you will be asked, in your capacity as discussant, to comment on the paper.

– Please restrict the length of your comment to **five minutes (absolute maximum)**. Your comment should highlight between one and three key points from the paper presentation which you think should be discussed further with a view to gauging the conceptual repertoire available for studying the emergence and development of new forms of governance.

– Full papers/extended abstracts will be circulated as soon as possible after Friday 30 April to provide you with enough time to prepare your contribution.

For all paper presenters, poster presenters and discussants, we plan to reserve a table at a restaurant close to the Forum venue for Thursday evening immediately after the reception. Please let us know if you would like to come! Please note, however, that we cannot cover costs for the dinner.
ABSTRACTS for keynote lectures
Arie Rip  
University of Twente  

Patterns of innovation journeys, also of policy instruments?  

If policy instruments are innovations in governance with a life of their own, at least to some extent, it is necessary to mobilize what is known already about innovation journeys for technological innovation, and see what one can learn from (and perhaps add to) those insights. An entrance point is to position policy instruments as social technology. But technology is not a simple and unified whole (even if we talk about it that way). There are various ways to decompose and disaggregate ‘technology’. What I will do is focus on innovation journeys, and in particular, show that there are actually a limited number of main patterns of innovation journeys.  

Science, Technology and Innovation studies tend to focus on the innovation journeys of industrial process and product innovation. Another, and age-old, pattern of innovation journey occurs where natural processes are exploited and modulated, as in agriculture (now also environment), where the success of the innovation depends also (and often mainly) on what living, evolving beings and systems are doing. Phrased this way, many medical treatment innovations fall under this heading as well.  

The two other patterns that I distinguish are, first, infrastructures (nowadays including energy), where socio-technical landscapes have to be changed, many actors are involved, and there is a long-term horizon rather than simple market considerations. And second, a pattern that is more recent, in Information and Communication Technologies, with the combination of hardware and software (up to services), each of which have own dynamics, even while they depend on each other for eventual success.  

By now, there might be a fifth type of innovation journey, that of social technologies, which can be exemplified by policy instruments, but is not limited to them. What can we say already about the dynamic of this fifth type of innovation journey? Clearly, social technologies are much more (explicitly) linked to ideologies, political cultures and structures than the other patterns, where there is more delegation to technology. Science, Technology & Society studies have attempted to show the implicit ideologies and scripts embedded in technologies. A consideration of how social technologies become black-boxed, at least to some extent, offers insights than might help understand processes of black-boxing technologies more generally.
ABSTRACTS
for
paper presentations
We present a conceptual framework for studying the emergence, development, and global expansion of policy instruments. At the core is a view on policy instruments as technologies of governance which are socially constructed and, over the course of an extended innovation journey, may get embedded in different contexts of political practice.

We build our framework on concepts from policy and governance studies, organisation studies, innovation studies and science and technology studies. Our goal is to devise a genealogical approach to the study of policy instruments which is able to account for the social life of policy instrument and their special momentum. This is to integrate knowledge production, consultancy, and advocacy work, organised around specific policy instruments, into political analysis and explore implications for broader dynamics of governance change within and across specific governance domains.

The paper illustrates the framework with cases from two families of policy instruments, tradable permit schemes (e.g. emissions trading, fishery quotas, biodiversity credits) and deliberative procedures (e.g. citizens’ jury, consensus conference, scenario workshops) and two governance domains as context of implementation (nature conservation and climate protection in the EU and USA).

The following concepts will be developed in the paper and combined into an integrated framework of analysis.

- Public policy (as strategic attempts to reconfigure and control de facto governance)
- Policy instruments as technologies of governance (comprising globalised governance models and working configurations in local governance contexts).
- Innovation journeys of policy instruments (as the process in which instruments become gradually articulated and stabilised in interactions of social scientific model development, policy design and political reconfiguration work in the context of different domains of implementation)
- Emerging constituencies of policy instruments (extending transnationally and comprising heterogeneous actors who engage with the instrument, develop specialised knowledge, skills, standards and organisations, and add momentum to the innovation journey, be it as promoters or opponents of an instrument)
- Co-evolution with governance domains (as the transnational dynamics of policy instruments interact with established patterns of policy-making, problem framing and political struggle for authority in the context of specific problem areas and jurisdictions)

For concluding the paper we highlight some of the methodological challenges that we have to meet in putting this framework to use for empirical case studies of innovation journeys of governance technologies.
Regulation Policy: Explanation of its Genesis, Continuity and Change

For initiating innovation in Governance and eliciting its alternative future paths, an understanding of contemporary policies is crucial. Such an understanding can be generated with respect to the genealogy of governance processes by the means of analytical reconstruction and tracing of the emergence of policy paths, its continuity and change. Exogenous explanation patterns have to be used as well as endogenous ones. The latter become especially explicit in analyzing the interplay of interests, motivations and actions of actors, public and political discourse, and institutional settings of decision making.

Such a concern requires an analytical approach which integrates policy analysis, conceptions of path dependence within the historical Neo-Institutionalism and discourse analysis in order to have analytical instruments that are more sensitive for different degrees of rebuilding policy paths. What appears as continuity on the institutional level may already be changing on the level of discourses, e.g., new interpretative patterns can enter the social knowledge resources. A differentiated description and explanation of the inner functioning of stagnating, reform oriented and revolving policy paths is thus viable. Such a proceeding allows conclusions regarding the issue of which actors at which point of time have to start what kind of activities concerning a sustainable development.

The paper demonstrates by using the example of the implementation of regulation policies for green genetic engineering in Mexico and Chile, how hierarchisation and prioritisation of impact factors on policy paths as well as the elaboration of necessary (though not sufficient) preconditions for a change of regulatory policy paths generates ideas how to initiate successful innovation of governance in the sense of sustainable change processes. As an example the transformation of the public regarding sustainability — such as the emergence of new story lines and its reproduction by an increasing number of actors — is a precondition for a long-term manifestation of these story lines in institutional arrangements and for the establishment of new political and social practices. In this context it is possible to anticipate, how policy change has to be arranged to follow the desired path.
Thus the article presents an approach to elaborate the how and why of continuity and change of policy from an interior view by using comparative case studies. It positions the presented analytical approach theoretically, for example in its relation to the approach of discursive Neo-Institutionalism as well as to other research traditions with focus on continuity and change of policy. That way the article serves the purpose of the forum to discuss new approaches for studying innovation of governance.
When Translation Fails: Governance as Fashion, Security and the United Nation Peacebuilding Commission
Proposal for the First Berlin Forum Innovation in Governance “Studying the emergence and development of new forms of governance”, 20–21 May 2010, Technische Universität Berlin

Security is often projected by governance researchers as the field most resistant to innovation. The reasons given are conventional some variation of the Schmittian argument that policies dealing with the exceptional (e.g. violence) remain with the sovereign. Yet one of the most innovative recent international organization experimenting with various innovative ideas of governance we can find exactly in the field of international security: The United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). The mandate of the commission is overcrowded with references to recent governance innovations: a multi-stakeholder model, transparency, participation, country ownership, coordination and policy harmonization, or compliance through mutual trust, to mention only some. Yet, the body (at least in its two initial working years 2006 and 2007) is largely a dysfunctional one. In other words, it is a case of failed innovation in governance.

The paper follows the argument of organizational sociologist Barbara Czarniawska to understand innovation as fashion. Fashion means that a new idea is on the one hand imitated to a sufficient degree, but allows for identity through alterity on the other. Fashion moreover directs our attention to the processes in which a fashion is translated into local practices. Following such a perspective, which anchors both in Georg Simmel’s sociology as well as the sociology of Translations (or Actor-Network Theory), I develop two arguments of why the innovations failed in the case of the PBC and why the organization remains dysfunctional. That is, firstly, a failure of local translation. The organization failed in translating the innovations in a way that they correspond to the (peacebuilding) problems the organization was tasked to address. Secondly, the multiplicity of innovations. The commission experiments with too many new governance ideas at once. The ideas clash to a high degree. In the paper I reconstruct the translation processes and discuss why and how different innovations clash.

The paper advances the discussion on innovation of governance in two ways. It firstly elaborates a theoretical framework of innovation as fashion. Secondly it studies an empirical case of the failure of innovation. It hence addresses the question of how innovation processes in governance can be conceptualized and the discussion on what the appropriate methods to follow innovation processes through time and space can be.
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The Phenomenon of Educative Conduits in the English Planning Sector, and their Potential Meaning in Governance Relations.

Authors: Zan Gunn & Jean Hillier

Abstract

In the midst of devolution, public sector modernisation and the reform of the planning sector in the UK, central government has introduced a number of new conduits to convey key transformative messages to a planning sector required to understand the significance of the changes set out by government, and to act accordingly. This paper presents and explains this recent phenomenon of new educative conduits (new organisations, official educative guidance on new methods of working etc.) currently occurring and becoming embedded in the English planning system. In so doing, it shines a light on a new constellation of actor and actant networks seeking to change practice in a particular field of professional and public sector practice; and it explains why this is viewed as a new ‘technology of governance’ and a departure from previous governance practices.

Having established the phenomenon of educative conduits as a new governance technology, and using Healey’s (2006) analytical schema of levels and dimensions of governance and structure and agency depicted in her ‘transformation initiatives in governance dynamics’ diagram (2006, p.306), this paper traces the historic development of particular accepted educative practices to explore how these practices gained traction and acceptability within a profession. It proposes that these educative conduits, initiated to facilitate reform, are proving so useful that they are becoming established as part of the newly reformed planning sector context as places planners can go to seek advice, effectively institutionalising these conduits as the recognised and ‘routinized’ modes of transformation delivery in this particular sector. This paper then questions the roles and relationships this casts between educators and professional practitioners.

In presenting this case it is hoped this paper will facilitate the workshop by providing a window into a professional sector currently in turmoil as it tries to accommodate new institutional geographies, culture change, and new professional practices. It also offers a particular approach to analyse transformation initiatives in governance – Healey’s (2006); and it seeks to present a case of a new technology of governance designed to facilitate change (innovate) which itself is becoming institutionalised into new modes of operation and which needs further theorising and analysis.

(word count: 360)
The Governance of Public Epistemologies

Proposal for the First Berlin Forum on Innovation in Governance
(Thursday 20 - Friday 21 May 2010, Technische Universität Berlin)

Holger Straßheim
Humboldt Universität Berlin
Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

holger.strassheim@sowi.hu-berlin.de

Current research shows that the modes of political expertise and knowledge production across countries are subject to multiple transformations (Weingart and Lentsch 2009). On the one hand, one can observe the scientization of public policy and the increasing relevance of evidence-based instruments like benchmarking, monitoring and peer reviews. On the other hand, science is being politicized by counter expertise and civil society pressure. Knowledge entrepreneurs and contract research organizations take advantage of commercial strategies and, as a result, further intensify the competition between experts. While some authors maintain that science still functions as the societal force of rationalization, others predict the emergence of a more interactive and transgressive mode of public knowledge production. By turning to the concept of knowledge orders (Jasanoff 2005; Weingart 2003), we move away from a priori assumptions about the authority or legitimacy of science in society. Instead, the question is posed how knowledge becomes to be perceived as reliable and how in a given society knowledge claims are used as a basis for making collective choices. Knowledge orders are governance arrangements between science, politics and economics. They establish a certain public epistemology which influences the production, circulation and objectification of publicly relevant knowledge and the institutionalization of specific practices and procedures. Comparative studies have shown that countries like the US, Germany or Great Britain vary significantly in terms of expert styles, public accountability, forms of objectivity, participation in public knowledge production and science-policy interaction. The main assumption of this paper is that knowledge orders also affect the emergence, stabilisation and expansion of new forms of governance. Especially Alfred Schutz (1976 [1959]) and John Dewey (1939) have argued that the social production and distribution of
knowledge is tightly coupled to processes of valuation and interest formation. Following this line of thought, knowledge orders constitute a specific order of worth (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006). They at least partly determine by which practices or procedures a newness, novelty or invention is being identified as publicly relevant, remarkable, worth to be preserved, valuable and thus innovative.

The paper has two goals. Firstly, the concept of knowledge orders as orders of worth will be outlined. Secondly, the paper will point out what the currently observable transformations of these public epistemologies could mean for the formation of innovations in governance.


A social movement of clerks
Governance innovation in the Netherlands

S.H. van der Arend - Delft University of Technology (s.h.vanderarend@tudelft.nl)

Proposal for a paper presentation at:
First Berlin Forum on Innovation in Governance

Abstract
The emergence of so-called new modes of governance, such as network governance, participatory planning, and interactive policy, is mostly explained as a rational response to autonomous, structural changes. Recurring examples of such changes are globalization, the withering away of the nation-state, the growing complexity of society, the emancipation of citizens, and increasing inter-organizational dependencies in the public sphere. However, the rise of any particular mode of governance in a specific context can only occur with the active support and strategic actions of sufficient loyal advocates.

The paper at hand reports on an extensive study into the rise and development of the discourse of interactive planning in the Netherlands. Indeed, this discourse enjoyed the backing of several active advocates, at least for a certain time. During this period, the advocates (and critics) of interactive planning innovated its language and meanings into a more or less coherent frame of reference, while simultaneously organizing themselves into a network. Some of the advocates made an effort to upgrade this network into a ‘social movement for democratic renewal’.

Therefore, the theoretical inspiration for this chapter is sought in the tradition of social movement research, in which subsequent theoretical strands have pointed out several features of social movements. Early social movement researchers focused on the individual grievances fueling what they saw as irrational outbursts of collective action. As a critique, ‘resource mobilization’ theories pictured social movements as a normal, rational form of interest politics. These theories call attention to the conditions advancing the establishment and prosperity of social movements. The ‘cultural turn’ in social sciences propelled a relatively new school of researchers. They highlight the role of relations, identities and meanings in social movements. In this paper, all three approaches are employed to describe and explain the rise, demise, and results of the alleged social movement for interactive planning.

The formation of the early advocacy network started when scholars had crafted a variety of ideas – about organizing decision making processes, effective network governance, and enhancing democracy –, into one novel concept: interactive planning. Besides policy researchers and administration scientists, this concept particularly charmed consultants, governors and midlevel bureaucrats. It made them believe they could make better, more effective policies in a more democratic way, thus effectively contributing to a democratization of the relation between government and society. As time went by, however, this ‘discursive link’ between democracy and efficiency proved hard to maintain. The advocates themselves were the first to rebuff interactive planning. They proclaimed that its ‘instrumental meaning’ had come to overshadow its idealistic, democratic side, rendering it into a ‘public support machine’. The network of advocates fell apart into smaller coalitions promoting various other concepts for effective planning and citizen participation. Interestingly, while the social movement for interactive planning broke down in disappointment, the concept itself was still thriving in the public domain.

Social movement theory, combined with a practice-oriented research approach, gives a critical outlook on governance innovation, highlighting the political, cultural and contextual aspects of changing modes of governing.
In this paper, I propose to use the concept of ‘regime of exception’ to theorize about governance innovations. A ‘regime of exception’ is broadly defined as a system of governance established by extraordinary measures that enforce an alternative set of procedural rules and structures to deliver a policy, program or project. I first advance the hypothesis that every novel governing practice that seeks to improve governance capacity operates as an exception to existing patterns of governance. Building on the concept of ‘state of exception’ (Agamben 2007), I then scrutinize this hypothesis by deconstructing the appeal and implications of embedding novel governing practices in existing patterns of governance.

The field of urban studies provides a prolific range of cases through which an examination of the practices, patterns and mechanisms of governance innovations are possible. In fact, despite the increasing calls for more efficient, effective, flexible and inclusive forms of urban governance, many scholars show skepticism about the actual changes (and improvements) in governing capacity that specific novel governance arrangements achieve. This has been the case particularly in efforts to improve the quality of city spaces through large-scale urban projects, where calls for strategic partnerships among relevant stakeholders seemingly fall short of the standards they are held up to. Salet and Gualini (2007) analyzed different strategic urban projects in European cities and assessed the innovative practices of democracy developed in different cases. The authors noted that, while the dimension and scope of the projects would, in principle, require the “commitment to addressing targeted, ad hoc experiments in local democracy,” the reality was “unfortunately different,” as “innovative forms of democratic legitimation [are] still the most embryonic dimension in current practices … of large-scale urban projects” (Salet and Gualini 2007, 273-4). Swyngedouw et al. (2003, 20) noted that large-scale urban projects are often delivered by resorting to “‘exceptional’ procedures and institutional arrangements.” The authors found these exceptional measures problematic, because the alternative arrangements thus created possessed “considerable decision-making and developmental powers [and] operate[d] in a shady political arena with little accountability and only limited forms of democratic control” (Swyngedouw et al. 2003, 20-21).

This paper takes on a specific case of urban governance innovation in Portugal to explore how the concept of ‘regime of exception’ can be deployed to theorize about governance innovations in general terms and to explore how the use of exceptions to existing practices changes the underlying, taken-for-granted assumptions of the culture and practice of urban governance.

References
Institutional Innovation for Sustainable Technology

Udo Pesch
Delft University of Technology

This paper introduces the notion of 'institutional innovations', which are defined as attempts to open up dominant institutional structures with the aim of facilitating the creation and societal uptake of sustainable technologies. The notion of institutional innovation builds forth on the assumption that to create a sustainable society, new sustainable technologies have to replace current technologies. This means that so-called 'system innovations' – involving socio-cultural, institutional, and technological changes – are necessary.

In many cases, there is no absence of promising new technologies, but the proliferation of such technologies is hampered by the resilience of existing institutional barriers. In fact, sustainability problems can be seen as those problems that cannot be managed the dominant institutional framework that is composed by the domains of state, market, science, and civil society. Therefore we need, apart from technological innovations, institutional innovations.

The potential of institutional innovations will be assessed by an analysis of two types of projects that are aimed at the development and stimulation of sustainable technologies – so-called 'institutional experiments'. These two types of institutional experiments share the characteristic that they are based on the involvement of actors from different societal angles, this means that boundaries between the institutional domains of the state, market, civil society, and science are deliberately crossed. The first type of institutional experiments concerns participatory forms of decision-making oriented towards the production of new technologies. The second type relates to local activities that pursue global sustainable goals.

The question for successful institutional innovation does not just involve effective crossing of institutional boundaries. Institutional domains hand over the conditions to assess the legitimacy of an individual's actions and decisions, which means that crossing
boundaries between institutional domains might obscure the relationship between an individual's decisions and the institutional context. In other words, institutional rigidity prevents sustainable innovation, but porosity of institutional boundaries affects the legitimacy of alternative approaches to produce innovations.

This paper will address this tension, and it will explore the conditions of institutional innovations. It does so by taken account of the next two considerations. First, is the conjecture that if institutional experiments fail to attend public legitimacy as an essential issue, they will not be successful – and may even have a counterproductive effect. This concern implies that institutional experiments should not only convey an institutional form with newly established normative practices, but they should also warrant that these normative practices relate to larger institutional forms in a legitimate way.

At the same time it has to be realized that the separation of institutional domains has never been absolute – as has been forwarded by the 'boundary work'-approach. Institutional boundaries are not cast in concrete: they have always been ambiguous, permeable, applied in ad hoc and ex post fashion. Responsibilities between actors are often divided during concrete interactions. Therefore the normative content of the crossing of institutional boundaries can only be established upon a case-to-case basis.
From West Coast Timber Supply Area to Great Bear Rainforest: Exploring power in governance innovation

Co-Authors: Michele-Lee Moore* and Ola Tjornbo*
*McConnell Fellow, Social Innovation Generation (SiG@Waterloo)

The concept of power is essential to understanding governance innovation in complex systems. The emergence of social change that genuinely challenges and alters existing governance frameworks often involves the (re)integration of marginalized social groups and alternative discourses into mainstream institutional settings that actively resist this challenge. In order to achieve both disruption and reconciliation, change agents have to find means of accessing different and often novel sources of power, and must become skilled at employing this power for a variety of strategic ends. The case of the Great Bear Rainforest in British Columbia, Canada provides an example where innovations in governance emerged and can be better understood by using power as an analytical lens.

Forestry management in British Columbia has been contentious for decades, peaking with the protests of Clayoquot Sound over clearcut logging practices which resulted in the largest mass arrest in Canadian history. Avoiding a repeat of Clayoquot Sound in the West Coast Timber Supply Area required federal, provincial, local, and First Nations governments, private industry, transnational environmental NGOs, labour unions, and foundations, to cooperate and develop an agreement – a process which resulted in key governance innovations. These innovations, which include using ecosystem based management as a framework for an integrated community economic development and land management plan, along with a government to government negotiation model for First Nations and the Province, represent a significant shift for resource management.

Critical to realizing the extent of the transformation is an understanding of how the agents that produced the governance innovations needed to disrupt the existing structures of legitimation (rules), domination (resource and authority allocation), and signification (interpretation and meaning) and how they leveraged various sources of power. The subject of power however, is too often neglected in discussions of governance transformation. Ultimately, substantive theorization about power, an issue commonly debated in the broader scholarship on global governance, remains limited in the emerging domain of complexity governance. This oversight can impede both our understanding of the sources of power and the actors’ ability to leverage those sources to achieve positive change.

Using the taxonomy developed by Barnett & Duvall (2005) to dismantle the nature of power into categories of compulsory, institutional, structural, and productive concepts, this paper will provide an examination of power used by the different agents to disturb existing governance structures and how new constellations emerged that created the space for innovation. Based on empirical research using grounded theory, the paper will explore the emergent and nonlinear dynamic of the West Coast Timber Supply Area as it transformed into the Great Bear Rainforest and will suggest that the interplay of structural, institutional and productive forms of power provides a pivotal part of the explanation for the resultant complex governance innovation. By drawing on recent work in global governance scholarship,
this paper yields meaningful insights for complexity governance regarding the power that cuts across the institutional contexts and drivers of innovation.
ABSTRACTS
for
poster presentations
Innovation in Governance as a Practical Accomplishment: The Case of Web-based Patient Feedback

This poster will illustrate what it practically takes to bring about innovation in governance. It will do so by telling stories from an ethnographic study of an organization that set out to improve the British healthcare system by introducing web-based feedback. Following the example of commercial services like Amazon or TripAdvisor, the organization asks patients, relatives and staff to share stories about the care they received on a public website and offers providers the possibility to respond.

While most existing studies have portrayed web-based feedback as an innovative tool for making hidden qualities transparent, holding its subjects to account and fostering public participation and engagement, this poster will offer a different approach. Drawing on my experience of becoming a moderator at this organization, I will explore the hard work and mundane practices that go into soliciting, editing and marketing web-based feedback. I will recount moments of contestation and resistance that occurred when providers or users disagreed with the presumptions of identity and audience implicated in stories and conversations. And I will report on members’ attempts to “scale” the model and generate “change” in a complex institutional environment. These observations will provide an opportunity to engage with the complex relations of accountability enacted in the day-to-day negotiations among moderators, patients, relatives, doctors, nurses, managers, web developers, computers and a database – and the shifts in these relations that the members of the organization aim to bring about.

Drawing on recurring themes in Science and Technology Studies (STS) such as ambiguity, authentication and the configuration of users, the poster will suggest that innovation can be usefully regarded as a social process that entails a shift in accountability relations, reconfiguring audiences, identities and expectations. As such, it does not depend on antecedent variables like power, knowledge or novelty, but – like governance – involves a complex range of socio-material practices that bring it into being.

Malte Ziewitz
Institute for Science, Innovation and Society
Oxford University
malte.ziewitz@sbs.ox.ac.uk

Bridging Ecosystem Service Priorities: Investigating Social Networks for Water Management in a Heterogeneous Landscape
By Kaitlyn Rathwell and Garry Peterson

Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University

Abstract

Water quality is produced at the basin scale but is influenced by many local land management decisions. In order that efforts made by some to improve water quality are not offset by continued pollution from elsewhere, effective water management requires coordination from the local to the watershed scale. We use a case analysis, of two watersheds in Québec, Canada to examine how social networks among local governments shape their water management activities. We demonstrate the importance of collaborative network links for management activities, such as the implementation of buffer zones and municipal water quality education programs. We examine the role of bridging organizations, which collaborate with different local groups on resource management activities and in so doing provide a structural link between actors who would otherwise remain disconnected. Because these bridging organizations work with spatially distinct local governing units, we are able to identify patterns of social networks across a landscape. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to exemplify the role of the bridging organization in a spatial context. There exist clear differences in the social networks of municipalities depending, primarily, on their orientation to the production of particular ecosystem services. Municipalities with ecosystem services promoting tourism have more robust social networks for water management than municipalities orienting ecosystems to agricultural production. This results in inconsistent and inefficient water management efforts at the watershed scale.
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Habitus and Innovation –
The administration practice in the field of prostitution and trafficking for sexual exploitation

Based on the research project “The Regulation of Prostitution: Saxony – Poland - Czech Republic” at the Institute for Political Sciences of the University Leipzig I studied in my doctoral thesis the public administration practice in the field of prostitution and trafficking for sexual exploitation. The focus of the analysis lies thereby on the habitus formations according to Bourdieu’s concept of habitus and the innovational potential of social actors in relevant governmental institutions and non-governmental organisations, both inland as well as in the border regions. I am using qualitative expert interviews to explore the schemes of perception, thought and action of members of the executive authorities, for example local police officers, social workers, public order and health authority officers. Administrative work, organisational structures and processes are thereby regarded from a social constructionistic perspective. In which way is the issue perceived and interpreted by the social actors? How do they categorise and label the subjects (the prostitutes, the customer, the operator of brothels and so on)? What is seen as the main problem? Which methods of working and operating do the social actors realise? How do they their occupational and organisational role take? In which way the social actors deal with other institutions, organisations and social systems? My analysis reveals that not only on the institutional level but also on the individual level different ways exists by which administrational actors construct the meaning of the subject (“definition of subject”), define their role (“definition of self”) and determine the organisational relations and networks (“definition of environment”). Moreover, against the background of the room to manoeuvre at a local level, the study shows that the heterogeneous and varied occupational dispositions as well as the professional and social skills of the administration officers influence the forms of governance. Here one may generalise different kinds of occupational and general habitus formations. For each of the empirical emerged dimensions “definition of subject”, “definition of self” and “definition of environment” exists a traditional government-like type and a new governance-like type of perception and action. Consequently there can be differentiated between an unidimensional vs. multidimensional point of view, a disciplinary-separated vs. a cross-disciplinary expert problem solving and a closed, functionally self-evident vs. an open-minded, functionally not obvious collaboration. Theoretically speaking a tension between the governance concept with its institutionalistic and structuralistic origin and elements at the macro level on the one side and a subject oriented understanding at the micro level on the other side can be
seen. But as a result of my analysis, an actor-centred interpretative perspective and the method of qualitative interview allow an appropriate explanation of the emergence and development of innovation and new forms of governance. In doing so and by considering the cognitive dimensions of the patterns of action and interaction, the criticized subjectlessness of the governance concept can be overcome.

Dr. Claudia Vorheyer
Universität Zürich
Soziologisches Institut
Andreasstrasse 15
CH-8050 Zürich
vorheyer@soziologie.uzh.ch
First Berlin Forum Innovation in Governance “Studying the emergence and development of new forms of governance”, 20-21 May 2010, Technische Universität Berlin

Abstract – Proposal for paper presentation

**Transformation of Metropolitan Governance of Spatial Development – The Case of the Metropolitan Region Hamburg**

*Sabine v. Löwis, HafenCity University Hamburg, Doctoral student*

*sabine.loewis@hcu-hamburg.de*

The paper wants to introduce an approach, results and conclusions describing the development and emergence of metropolitan governance structures of spatial development in the Metropolitan Region Hamburg (MRH). The case study was undertaken in an exploratory way on the background of theories and approaches of organization and innovation science applying methods and approaches used and discussed by Van de Ven, Angle et al. (2000). The study was taken backwards 20 years examining administrative documents, minutes, strategy papers, secondary literature on and in the metropolitan governance Hamburg as well as conducting interviews with participants in transforming the metropolitan governance during that time. Three steps were taken:

- defining criteria to analyze metropolitan governance in time and space (1)
- analyzing and describing metropolitan governance of the MRH empirically (2)
- characterizing transformations, developing conclusions about the “how” and “why” of change (3)

Ad 1) As criteria for tracing change a meso-level governance (Schimank 2007) concept was developed addressing governance analysis (Altrichter und Heinrich 2007, Benz 2004, Benz 2001), mechanisms of metropolitan and urban governance (Blatter 2007, Blatter 2005, Blatter 2008) as well as descriptive forms of city-regional organization and planning (Heinz 2000). The governance model includes aims, goals (1), actors and constellations of actors involved (2), formal and informal rules and resources of the stakeholders (3), multilevel governance issues (4) and finally modes (5a) and mechanisms (5b) of metropolitan governance.

Ad 2) 1990 the three federal states Hamburg, Schleswig-Holstein and Lower Saxony decided upon a trilateral coordination process of spatial development in the MRH. Since then scope, strategy, organization and institutionalization of the coordination have changed from territorial focused policy of spatial development to a more marketing related focus. In the empirical study these transformations are traced and described according to the governance criteria mentioned above.

Ad 3) Transformations were analyzed and interpreted with the help of organization science theories, innovation science and learning organization approaches as Poole, Van de Ven et al. (2000), Weick und Quinn (1999) or Wiegand (1996). Concerning the character of transformation a change between stable forms and very dynamic phases interrupted by phases of fundamental changes could be observed. Reasons of change are variances in actor constellation, internal governance needs which called for change, windows of opportunities which allowed certain actors to initiate change, context issues as incentives for change, etc..
The results reflect a single case study. Concerning the change process described, more case studies should be taken to further analyze and develop ideas about innovation in urban and metropolitan governance. The used criteria can be applied in other case studies, as well as the concepts used for interpretation. Tracing change backwards by analyzing minutes, interviews, documents, etc. is well possible, but a richer analysis may be an added real time longitudinal study of metropolitan governance change.
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Abstract

Policy designs are travelling in space and are specifically moulded by each local context of application. But what features of such local ‘contexts of application’ (which I understand rather as ‘sites of development’), are important for the shaping of policy designs? And what role do these particular sites play for the general (i.e. non-local) development and biography of the policy designs?

We studied the role local ‘sites’ can play for socio-technical transitions (Späth and Rohracher 2010). Departing from the ‘multi-level framework of innovation’ we highlighted the importance of variation within socio-technical regimes, which results from or is facilitated by the fact that the regime is occupying a multiplicity of sites with varying characteristics. We suggest that the extension of a regime to sites that feature particular characteristics can be crucial for the further development of the regime, e.g. by providing a showcase of feasibility under particularly feasible conditions etc.

I wonder whether policy designs can be compared to such regimes. Can the term ‘regime’ e.g. be replaced with the term ‘policy design’ in the paragraph above? This poster will reflect on the degree to which the same aspects are relevant for the moulding of policy designs in local sites of development as for local deviations of socio-technical regimes.

For analysing two empirical cases of socio-technical regimes, we firstly differentiated important spatial aspects in three ‘spaces’ (i.e. systems of referential positioning): (a) The discursive space, (b) the space of actor relations, (c) the space of institutions.

This from-the-scratch approach seems necessary to me since processes of regime variation in particular sites and the role of various proximities therein has not yet been sufficiently conceptualised within the literature on socio-technical transitions. This should be discussed.

Jan Schrijver  
Universiteit van Amsterdam

Developments in policies concerning the innovation of public administration 1968-2008: government or governance?

For once I propose to follow those public administration scholars and policy scientists who claim that a shift is going on from the classic government model to network governance. Supposing that this is the case, and there is ample evidence around us to accept this proposition as a strong hypothesis, I would suggest that the ministry that aims to improve the quality of public administration will probably reflect this shift in its policies. I am referring to the ministry of the Interior in the Netherlands, where I have been working since 1976.

This ministry has developed the active innovation of the Dutch public administration as an explicit policy ambition since approximately 1968. Before that, the structure and functioning of the government organization were more or less taken for granted. But since the seventies of the 20th century intergovernmental relations, the coordination of silo-policies on national level, the scale and functions of regional government and the efforts to meet the complex challenges from cumulating urban problems, etcetera were all objects of pro-active strategies from this ministry. Good governance had become its core business.

It is not very easy to establish at first sight whether the ministry of the Interior has indeed taken notice of the new governance mode and gradually given prevalence to the paradigm of network governance in its policies. The first thing that can be said is that there is no obvious switch in the approach of the ministry. Instead, the policy utterances rather seem to be ambivalent on the matter.

To make a more thorough analysis I construct a framework of operational criteria to discern government form governance. E.g. the degree to which social partners are implied in the group of relevant actors, the degree to which social constructivism is accepted as epistemological foundation of human interaction, vertical (hierarchical) or rather horizontal forms of communication used, etc. As a next step I take one of the major fields in the steering policies of the ministry, e.g. decentralization. In this decentralization field, I select all 15 or so memorable new ideas and projects that were initiated during the last three decades. These ideas and their follow up in the years afterwards, can be qualified as rather leaning on the old government mode, or as revealing traits of network governance.

By analyzing the history of these projects, I will show that most governance-like initiatives tend to be stopped, are never repeated or not even reach an official status, whereas those following the government-paradigm are more successful or at least are granted a second chance.

This result for the ministry that would be expected to move in the forefront of governance thinking, contrasts with other public organizations in the field, where more of a shift in this direction is evident.

In my concluding effort to explain my findings I take refuge to the theory of organization change by Ralph Stacey.
Surpassing the United States in 2008 and now accounting for more than 384 million users the People’s Republic of China has become the world’s biggest internet nation. However, the World Wide Web (WWW) in combination with 3G mobile networks poses a major challenge to the degree and nature of social control and political power, which is exercised by the Chinese government in accordance with its autocratic regime type. Online, a new ‘civil society’ has emerged that for instance has effectively blocked official attempts to restrict online freedom and traffic of mobile text messages. Turning into an integral element of China’s complex political landscape, the so called ‘netizens’ have on the one hand conducted numerous cyber attacks abroad, are collaborating with state agencies to identify corrupt cadres, and have effectively been manipulated by official propaganda with respect to other issues like Tibet or the Olympics. On the other hand, environmental pollution, han-nationalism, local corruption or debates about ‘netizenship’ in general and sexual liberalness within the WWW in particular all displayed an increasing autonomy from state interventions.

My presentation will explore what kind of means of governance have been invented and applied by the Chinese government in order to cope with respective challenges. Central to this enterprise is not only simple censorship or restriction of information as illustrated by the ‘great firewall’, which is thought to shield Chinese internet users from politically sensitive foreign online content, but also elaborated discursive management as well as a hidden system to manipulate public opinion. My argument is based on the thesis that the emergence of the internet sphere implies a fundamental change of knowledge structures. Obviously, new information and communication technologies have made not only the circulation of ideas, images and news much more faster, but have also given rise to a new ‘public’ player in China’s politics, that, in turn, forced governance to be more responsive than ever. This innovative mode of governance is definitely not limited to the case of China and could be labeled ‘postmodern authoritanism’.
Abstract
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Innovation in governance at the United Nations: Cumulative effect of non-state actor involvement with transnational repercussions

The Berlin Research Group on innovation in governance has a strong background in the study of tradable permit schemes like emission trading as a novel design in policy instruments. The second focus on deliberative procedures is less well developed. The aim of this paper is to help close this gap with research on the emergence of the multi-stakeholder approach at the United Nations. The UN offers a particularly interesting opportunity to explore conceptual foundations for the study of innovation in governance because the way it is addressing global issues appears to be in a state of upheaval. In its social and economic work, the UN convenes conferences and summits to create common understandings of global issues, such as climate change, human rights, or the emergence of the Information Society, and broad consensus on practical solutions for inherent problems (Dunn 1996; Friedman et al. 2005; Selian 2004).

The Rio ‘Earth Summit’ is perhaps the most prominent example to indicate that UN global conferences create norms around which actor expectations converge. As the door of multilateral government debate has opened to a broad range of issues and subjects, arrangements were introduced in the conferences that facilitate deliberation with an enlarged scope of participants (Dodds 2002). More recently, the UN World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), held in Geneva (2003) and in Tunis (2005), has been the site of experimentation with the innovative multi-stakeholder approach to global governance. It was the first time that non-state actors were officially invited to participate in the deliberations of a UN conference.

The Summit was raising hope to materialize the multi-stakeholder approach to global governance in the UN: improving overall problem-solving capacity and increasing societal participation and control. The gap between rhetoric and reality, however, was significant. Civil society actors in particular were disappointed with their limited impact on the policy process (Dany 2008). WSIS was seen as just another event of global politics in which the wheel of participation had to be reinvented (Selian 2004). WSIS is nonetheless presented a
“meaningful exercise in global governance” (Mueller et al. 2007: 293). It has opened a space in which to explore new ways of dealing with global issues (Raboy 2004).

This mixed record of the multi-stakeholder approach at WSIS illustrates the essence of the innovation in governance perspective as it is employed by the Berlin Research Group on the topic. Realization of the multi-stakeholder approach at WSIS interacts with existing institutional configurations in the UN like “executive multilateralism” as the constitutional decision-making mode (e.g. Zürn 2004) and the organization “templates” of the conferences (Emmerij et al. 2001). In this dynamic, legacies play an important but non-deterministic role. The paper’s argument goes that emergence of the multi-stakeholder approach is the cumulative effect of non-state actor involvement in the UN over the last three or four decades in which processes of institutional entrepreneurship were instrumental. Combining this dedicated attention for different actors, their interests and relationships with a historical perspective reveals the conditions under which the rise of a transnational regime in the UN is likely (and under which it is not).
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Rating agencies not only evaluate the creditworthiness of corporations, but also of sovereign states. The rating of countries is partly based on economic information, but also includes political aspects of the country. Therefore, rating agencies are often criticized for their normative and sometimes coercive influence on governments and described as an example of new private transnational governance actors. By judging political actions, they can take the role of veto-players or even rule makers that shape the political decision making of these countries. While traditional governance actors, like national governments, are usually legitimized by democratic election procedures, new forms of governance actors, like rating agencies, have to gain legitimation by other means. This project argues that one way to understand these new governance actors is to analyze their legitimation strategies. How do rating agencies manage to constitute, preserve and legitimize their power to influence political decisions? Analyzing statements by Moody’s and Standard&Poor’s during the Argentinean financial crisis in 2001 and the current crisis, this project argues that rating agencies construct an image of scientific soundness and objectivity, and copy the legitimization strategies of scientific institutions. Legitimation is thus not achieved through democratic processes or efficiency, but through expertise. Legitimation through epistemic authority can be seen as an example for the increased trust in scientific knowledge and ‘scientification’ of governance.
Innovations in governance can be brought about by many dynamics. Among the more obvious ones lies the emergence of a new object of governance. Policy indicators are inspiring many reflections in an array of disciplines and approaches; most of them being directed towards issues related to the technical robustness and statistical validity of individual indicators, as well to the consequences and repercussions of their insertion into public and private management. The quite recent re-emergence of the quest for the adequate indicator(s) of development, wellbeing and quality of life brings about the opportunity to explore indicators differently, i.e. as an object of governance. In this sense, we relate our study of the governance of indicators to such endeavors as the Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission (2009) on the 'Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress', the OECD Worldforum (2009) on 'Measuring the Progress of Societies', the European Institutions’ process (2007/09) on ‘Beyond GDP – measuring progress, true wealth and the wellbeing of Nations’. All of these ‘processes’ include in their reasoning – often in their raison d’être - an initial questioning of the (relatively) unexplored relationships between processes of policy-making and indicators. Indicators are per definition policy tools, and are per definition developed to contribute to the steering of public action. Current discussions in different policy arenas on the necessary renewal of our policy indicators show however that the debate, choice, underlying philosophy, configuration, communication… of policy indicators are becoming themselves objects of steering: indicators are entering the realms of reflexive governance and the existence of a ‘politics of policy indicators’ becomes more overt than ever.

The paper presents a perspective to study this governance and politics of indicators: the exploration of how policy actors conceive the use/usability/impact/influence of indicators on policy framing and policy decisions. The hypothesis being that it is the conceptualizations of policy actors of how indicators are (mis)used in policy making, in other words how policy actors project and conceive the influence-pathways of indicators, which determine the importance and direction which policy actors give to the quest for alternative development indicators. Or: elements of the governance of indicators can be revealed through exploring the policy actors’ conceptualizations and experiences of the use/influence of indicators.

We present in a first instance a theoretical framework allowing to understand use- and influence-pathways of indicators. The second part of the paper will develop on empirical evidence currently gathered in the specific domain of how European-level policy actors conceive the use/influence of composite indicators (i.e. indexes and indices) of the sustainable development policy arena. We conclude with a discussion of what the ‘use’-perspective of policy tools could contribute to the study of innovation in governance; how far is the use-aspect making part of the emerging object of governance which are alternative indicators.

The paper’s developments are partly building on an ongoing EU-level research project (Policy INfluence of indicaTors – POINT, FP7).
Discussant
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Broadly speaking, I am working on the relationship between environmental governance and (political) economy with a focus on emerging and alternative policy instruments and policy tools. More particularly, my research activities are directed towards the exploration of institutionalisation, evaluation and use of environmental policy instruments and policy tools such as indicators, prospective exercises, planning and evaluation. Current projects of relevance of my research group include the POINT-project (FP7; coordinated by NERI-Dk) on the use of indicators in policy making. On another issue, but linkable to the Berlin Forum, we are coordinating a Belgian project which is exploring the applicability of Transition approaches and Transition tools to the policy domain of ‘changing modes of consumption’, i.e. exploring the applicability of Transition mechanics to innovations which are much ‘more socio’ than ‘technical’. One of the overall questions of the project being whether and how Transition approaches could be considered an alternative/emerging policy instrument in the consumption domain. Within this project, we are empirically investigating the governance of ‘consumption niches’ with a case study on local food networks. This case study raises an additional question of interest: how to explore the governance of consumption niches (i.e. of local food networks) which have often emerged as counter-reaction to the “over-” and “mis-” governance of the mercantile food production and distribution sector, i.e. which are consumption networks which want to escape the governance by the public actor, which at best see themselves as selfgoverned networks of citizens.
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