

Thursday 31/1/08

**9:30- Presentation of the Integration Exercise and program of the day**

**Marisol García (Universitat de Barcelona)**

[link to WP3 presentation.](#)

**10:15- Drawing on WP1.5 look at governance as a field of social innovation and empowerment.**

**Andreas Novy (Wirtschaftsuniversität, Vienna)**

[link to democracy and governance presentation](#)

- Relations between democracy and governance.
- The idea of social inclusion (linked to democracy as all people participation)
- Governance related to social exclusion: An elitist approach; social exclusion vs. social justice; linkage to democracy
  - It is necessary to define a dialectical approach between top-down and bottom-up experiences. There're experiences with support from central government which are doing a lot for social innovation.
- The concept of governance leaves us to deal with the fluid concept of frontiers.
- The need to relate the local into the national and the EU. The need to relate the local with other localities, fostering alliances between university and users or between the users among themselves. Users experience based knowledge with scientific knowledge.
- Social Innovation is related to processes and outcome. When it is possible different forms and different outcomes? What conditions make it possible?
- Relational way of thinking.
- Representative vs. direct democracy. No sufficient when representative democracy has problems of social inclusion. In some economic context they have come to terms with the fact that voting is not enough.
- Therefore is important to stress democratization of daily life and work. (Content dimension) The broader understanding of democracy in a socio-economic context (in schools or workplace)
- The local level emphasis in the definition of democracy. Emphasis in how in most cases there's a combination between top-down and bottom-up initiatives (table)
- Defining governance is related to:
  - in an analytical perspective: more relational forms of organizing society, a concept that allow to deal with those new forms of organisation (recipients and actors, studies in federalism do not analyse enough central state)
  - in a normative perspective: good governance, best-practices...

The relation between the two is cut fixed.

Government

- The political consensus after the 45' was based in a wide understanding of social democracy.
- Crisis of wider understanding of democracy (1970s-onwards): Crisis of welfare state; Also inside political left, social inequality as an accepted feature of occidental democracies.
- Democracy limited to its procedure dimension: Civil society involving.
- Dialectical approach linking institutions. What is needed to broaden the horizon of specific experience?
- The need of SCS alliances with university, administrations, local councils...

Scale

- The idea of scale (up-scaling bottom-linked initiatives) is more dynamic than the idea of level. Offers a more relational understanding: (example of an artist who is international and localises himself and get support from different scaled institutions.)
- Which is the most centralised level? the nation or the EU gov.?

- It is necessary to strengthen the state but it is also necessary to strengthen the public sphere (not just market) (initiatives that are aiming at public interests)
- Experimentation is a necessary approach: Combined universalistic with diverse experience improving participatory methods at the local level.
- Preliminary results (Experimentation linked to democratization) Cooperation from below between different experiences and the broad understanding of democracy.
- Democratic governance: Porto Alegre experienced (budgeting) outcomes are new forms of democracy more needs oriented

**10:45-11:30- Develop of a governance-focussed reading of social innovation across each existential field.**

**(Marc Pradel i Santi Eizaguirre, Universitat de Barcelona)**

[link to WP3 IE Lisboa](#)

11:30-12:00 Coffee break

**12:00-12:30 Comments on the draft IE**

**Joachim Becker (WU-Wien):**

- In relation to the state, governance has been seen as a process of coordination and consensus. Conflict disappears from the picture.
- There is a necessity to bring back dissidence. For example in social innovation dissidence could be important.
- The relation between civil society and the state: Both definition of Civil Society that were presented in the conceptual distinction are too broad. Civil society is part of the political sphere. On the one hand, civil society aims to forming social norms, on the other hand, it wants these norms to be adopted at a legal level or to be transformed into policies. Civil society organisations are embedded in in-equal power relations. Usually, the civil society organisations of the disadvantaged or poor are in relatively weak position. Parts of civil society are dependent on state funding what circumscribes their autonomy in regard to the state.
- Relations between civil society and the market: Other parts of civil society organisations rely on commercialised services to finance themselves. If civil associations are related to the market, they may have different constraints. Business organisations are very different and inserted in capitalist relationships, selling is a price mechanism and has an exclusionary character.
- Civil society defined in a narrow way as a political culture. The question here is how they can have influence in institutions (Bobbio);
  - Who is involved in decision making process.
  - Which areas are covered in a (democratic) decision making process?
  - Who and How is innovative in policy-making?
- This obviously implies dilemmas respecting civil associations, capitalist business and improvement.
- Porto Alegre and Montevideo had been effective in the reproduction sphere but not into the production sphere.
- The question of social economy and labour has to be treated at the macro-level.
- The qualitative handicap of participatory modes of social innovation in the field of local government is the fact that they are often limited mainly to project based groups. Focus groups are usually targeted therefore there are not universal practices. This implies esp. to progressive local governance in Europe. In Latin America, the approach is often universal (e.g. Participatory Budget in Porto Alegre or decentralisation in Montevideo). Porto Alegre is an example of making possible that groups who did not participate now do. This examples show that democratisation changes power relations.

- The productive sphere does not change... So employment is not rooted although services are implemented (Latin American examples)
- When we talk about participation it is important not overlook the market and material conditions of the population.
- A challenge issue is also to democratise the macro-level institutions.
- EU: Competition is a key word, but competition and social inclusion are contradictory.
- Public management is hostile to social innovation (in macro-level and micro-level institutions). E.g. targets are rigid and usually defined in regard to past performance.
- Bureaucratisation presents difficulties to pursue social innovation.
- Social innovation has to face serious dilemmas: Commercialisation gives little space for social inclusion.

### **Flavia Martinelli (Academic, Italy)**

#### **1. General comments**

Very good, thorough, and rich integration exercise. Paper well structured and clear. The first part (theoretical survey in sections 2, 3 and beginning of 4) is very effective in identifying the relationships between the main themes of KATARSIS, i.e. between:

- governance
- civil society
- social inclusion/exclusion
- Socially creative strategies (SCSs) in the framework of social innovation theory

On the other hands, it needs polishing and tying up, better stressing the elements from the literature that will be used in the subsequent analysis of EFs. It also needs some language polishing: when dealing with theory greater language accuracy is needed.

Section 4 is a very good zooming in into social innovation, through and by EFs. The conclusions identify the main dimensions for the subsequent analysis of SCSs. On the other hand, it remains a bit fragmented: it is too rich, in a way, and one loses track of the argument(s). Some choices need to be made and the less relevant considerations may to be dropped. The main elements stressed in the conclusions could actually be used to “structure” the narration from the beginning of the section. A few concrete examples as illustrations would also help.

In section 5 the reading of governance along the dimensions identified in section 4 is fully developed, making sound use of empirical evidence to illustrate the theoretical instrumentarium. On the other hand, the stress on the context-specific nature of governance and the great diversification of the empirical evidence presented somewhat lead to *indeterminacy*. The identification of a few major/recurring categories/types would possibly improve the presentation.

Overall, the paper is perhaps too rich, which makes it prone to fragmentation and lack of focus. It would be useful to keep track of the main theoretical statements made in Introduction.

#### **2. Specific/detailed comments**

##### *Section 2*

At the beginning of section 2, the definition of governance is a bit too narrow, i.e. only refers to the “change” dimension (i.e. the fact government mechanisms have changed, from just the State to a more enlarged system). A few more lines – or a footnote – referring to the debate, i.e. the way it is defined in WP1.5 would be enough.

Very good point about how governance has become “normative”. Could be further emphasised.

Leubolt et al. in the Table on page 6: I do not agree the fourth mode (column 4), i.e. *the market-based governance mode*: it is a very idealised view, which buys the neo-liberal discourse about the market bringing competition. In fact, deregulation has only brought further concentration, oligopoly and even monopoly powers. Less choice and less transparency.

Excellent critique of Brenner.

Good synthesis of institutional analysis of governance.

#### Section 3

It would help to further clarify the difference between exclusion FROM and exclusion THROUGH governance (it was better explained in PPT presentation than in the text).

Page 17: Exclusion from education and training does not necessarily lead to exclusion from labour market. Perhaps from the “primary” labour market, but perfectly functional to the “secondary” labour market, i.e. the “servants” society....

#### Section 4

The difference between governance as a *framework* for Social Innovation and governance as a *form* (rather than “field”) of Social Innovation is very relevant and should be further clarified/elaborated.

With regard to the labour market (p.22) a major issue should be tackled, i.e. whether we should accept flexibility as inevitable and hence consider unions that defend long-term employment as corporatist and conservative.

The discussion on social capital could be integrated earlier, in theory.

#### Section 5

I have problems with the use of the term “structures” when dealing with governance. Personally I would prefer the term “institutions”.

### 3. Elements to valorise throughout the paper

They could actually be used to structure the narration and anchor the empirical evidence.

- *Complementarity* between *representative* and *participatory democracy* (mentioned in Intro). Very important.
- *Tension/dialectics* between institutionalisation and innovation, *bureaucratisation* and *creativity* (also mentioned in intro and other parts).
- *Duality* (a bit more problematic in my opinion) between *intra-group* (community) solidarity and *inter-group* (societal) solidarity. Involves at one extreme the excluded/self-excluding group (ghetto) and at the other extreme the cosmopolitan, multicultural society.
- Related to the *tension/dialectics* between *universal/automatic* regulation and funding vs the *selective/meritocratic* regulation and funding of initiatives and services. This tension is particularly observed in the shift from centralised universal provision of services to local/third sector provision (the shedding of social responsibility by the central state). It involves a major question: i.e. whether we should passively accept the inevitability and desirability of such a shift. For example: people working in the third sector are poorly paid and protected; this is a form of outsourcing and means that the costs of reproduction is lowered through the intensification of bottom-up self-exploitation. The uncertainty of funding also undermines the sustainability of bottom-up initiatives.

Here I think that the mediations presented in WP1.5 (Novy et al.) can be of great help: a) the need to *combine* the universalistic approach of the Welfare state with the community approach; b) the need to valorise participation at the local level *together* with representative democracy; c) the need to strengthen the *public sphere* (different from old Central State).

### 4. Final recommendations

“Prune” the paper, eliminating less relevant elements and focussing on fewer, main elements/categories/dimensions/types. Use these to structure the presentation. Draw “lessons” from the case studies and the empirical evidence for recommendations (I guess this is the next stage of the project).

**Pasquale De Muro (Academic, Italy).**

[link to lisboa – De Muro](#)

-Concept of Governance: a review of different approaches. There is also an institutional economics perspective. It stresses the coordination mechanisms.

-The state has a hierarchical role.

-The market is not an actor, is a coordination mechanism, that is used by different actors: government, private sector, civil society organisations. There is a rhetorical conception of the market as an actor but it is not an actor. Private sector is an actor.

-Different types of governance :

Has different conceptualisations in different existential fields. Which conceptualisation has been used in each existential field it is not clear.

-For example, the market never is self-regulated. It is never self sufficient. When we talk about the market we have to stress which conceptualisation we are using.

-It will be more insight if we introduce different theoretical approaches.

Decentralisation:

-We must pay attention to the modalities of decentralisation. Different types give different outcomes. For example in Italy decentralisation do not always create more SCS because there is a strong asymmetry between the responsibilities and the resources that local government have got: often the local resource available are not sufficient to “replace” what central government decentralized.

-Participation as a coordination mechanism.

-In general, there are several increasing levels of participation that have different implications and different results: information sharing, consultation, decision-making, initiating action.

-There are many myths about the experience of Porto Alegre. We should look at that experience with interest and sympathy, but we should better understand both the dynamics and the result of that experience. In terms of participation, for example, only a relatively small part of the population participated to the assemblies. In terms of results, social exclusion still is a major problem in Porto Alegre.

-We must talk about social exclusion and poverty. Social exclusion and poverty are not always the same phenomenon: you can have poverty together with social inclusion. Social exclusion is useful to analyse the dynamics of relational poverty.

**12:30-13:30 Discussion.**

**Thomas Mirbach (Lawaetz Foundation, Hamburg)**

-The concept of governance in the practitioners view. It is necessary to analyze more about constraints of innovative structures.

-It is necessary to be more clear in defining what is an innovative view. The analytical tool is limited. It is necessary more closeness between the academics and the practitioners. It is necessary to manage dilemmas addressed to, or of interest for, practitioners.

**Helga Leitner (Academic, USA)**

- Interested in how local associations interface with the state and the economy, influencing governance on the agenda by organising the problem of cooperation.
- In the case of neighbourhood associationism there are actions to satisfied agendas by local authorities but also following their own agendas in their own way. (local needs).
- What motivates participation? Social cohesion; Politics of recognition; Politics of care (an alternative vision of caring about each other).
- Challenges of local initiative: visions are contradictory, great need of negotiating differences struggles between groups.
- The challenge of being autonomous. Any organisation has to deal with conditions which are always changing.

**Juan-Luis Klein (CRISES, Université du Québec à Montréal)**

- Governance is a social problem (an economic) How those who are likely to be excluded can participate more? How the participation of this groups can make a difference.
- Social struggle: tension between groups emphasizes to make the lower class participate at the process in order to have more influence.
- Quebec experience: Civil society organisation mediating to allow social groups to have a part in the decision making process.
- When local groups can build mediation to empower other groups.

**Andrea Binder (LA21 Vienna)**

- Which institutions can mediate?
- Civil Society: People have conflicts and have clear disagreement, about what is the outcome of governance

**Pavlos Delladetsima (Academic, Greece)**

- The core arena is the municipality. How to emphasize its role.
- Funding that becomes sustainable.
- Accountability, flexibility and insecurity.

**Helga Leitner (Academic, US)**

- The challenge of being autonomous. Any organisation has to deal with conditions which are always changing.

**Frank Moulaert (Newcastle University)**

- Planning theory has done some insights in governance debates.
- Different types of management, modes of governance.

13:30 Lunch

*Afternoon: the role of participation; the importance of context (and scale) and the importance of timing in user's experience*

**Chair (Montserrat Pareja, Universitat de Barcelona)**

**Pere Picorelli (INCASOL, Catalunya)**

[link to BDA-INCASOL](#)

- The innovations of the Better District Programme in terms of policies. 3 types of improvement:
  - intergovernmental relations: investment allocation is decided at the local level.
  - implementation at the local level has changed the way local councils operate. They have been forced to work in a more transversal way.

-Civic engagement. High heterogeneity of projects. Allows to implement policies according to the local culture.

-Challenges of implementation:

-districts that gave to define the problem because they have not thought about it before.

-coordination of levels of governments

### **Ronald Pabst (Mehr Demokratie, Germany)**

-The possibility to change decisions with referendums.

-They operate at all the levels of participation.

-The right to choose who gets into Parliament, the need to open lists. The right to choose the persons in the list.

-Regions operate differently, different ways in which people can influence.

-Who are the candidates? Those who are linked to the community not always have the chance to get elected.

-Local referendum. Direct democracy. Signatures collected can push for a referendum.

-More democracy at the local level and distribution of power. The design of procedures matters. Link between the content of democracy and distribution of regimes.

-The need to present the issue to people, talking in newspapers and books.

### **Andrea Binder (LA21 Vienna).**

[link to LA21 presentation](#)

-Decentralised processes at the district level of local agendas.

-District councils decide if they want a LA21 process.

-Targeted projects for a sustainable development of the district in cooperation with politicians and the administration. Combining representative and participatory democracy.

-Citizens have to wait long time for institutions to make decisions.

-Difficulties in finding a consensus.

-Positive dialogue between politicians and citizens.

-LA21 is considered a scheme district council, with conflicts between representation and citizens.

-Empowerment. Difficulty to address questions beyond the responsibility of the district.

-Informal networks are very important. Citizens who cannot work intensively get cut off.

-LA21 is a top-down organised setting. It is not a network of equal partners. Little reflection concerning new forms of distribution between politics and civil society.

### **Sébastien Lailheugue (AFIP, France)**

[link to AFIP presentation](#)

-Aims to tackle down racist discrimination.

-Developing programs and services for ethnic-minority graduates.

-Promoting equal opportunity in various scale.

-Integrating the institutions and creating a mechanism of collaboration.

-Creating new initiatives and involving new partners.

-Building a collective strategy.

-A local initiative creating a link between associations, companies and local institutions.

**Carme Fructuoso (Ateneu Popular de 9 Barris, Barcelona)**

[link to Ateneu presentation](#)

- Innovation to achieve better conditions
- Management: solidarity / justice / social cohesion
- Work through networks. *Trans Europe Halles*.
- Artistic main axis.
- Occupation of the factory as a place for the republic popular idea of collective engagement.
- Engagement is a problem. How to create adequate mechanisms to include people in social exclusion.
- Problems to use different language at the different levels.
- Participation fatigue.
- There is a generational question. Meetings (assembly) is of no interest for young people. New languages demand for immediate results.
- There are permanent ideological conflict inside the initiative, the aim is to keep what is in common to construct new discourses. They try to keep independent of any political orientation in order to access to people.

**17:00- Summary of the pulling together**

**Derrick Purdue (University of Western England):**

Two useful concepts that should be part of the discussion on governance, plus an observation on the nature of civil society and another on activists and networks:

**1)** Metagovernance: the move from government to governance, does not mean that government disappears, rather government takes on new (metagovernance) roles, overseeing the co-ordination of the governance partners in partnerships and usually occupies the role of leading member of partnerships, and certainly maintains a very powerful role in relation to the third sector.

**2)** Governmentality: Derived from Foucault, governmentality indicates that government shapes the 'mentality' of its subjects / citizens into the form which fits into the type of governance. So power / knowledge discourses embodied in professions and expert systems as well as state bureaucracies are mobilised. So it is argued that emphasis on 'active citizens' and the participation of civil society in the new governance structures is about producing self-activating, creative, entrepreneurial citizens, which the current liberal or neo-liberal forms of governance require.

**3)** However, civil society is a bottom up creative arena of active citizens which predates current governance structures. Is civil society a bottom up pressure that acts as one of the drivers for the shift from government to governance? Does this reduce civil society to simply an underpinning support to a well functioning democratic governance (as some literature on social capital implies) or does civil society maintain an older orientation as a critique of the state presenting itself as an alternative source of moral and political authority.

**4)** A speaker from the floor pointed to the importance to civil society organizations / projects or socially creative strategies of both resources and recognition. The drive for resources often powers engagement with governance structures, whereas the dialectic of recognition works both within and outside of governance. Experience of

Programmes in the UK which include networking opportunities demonstrates that getting local activists out of their own small patch to meet others working elsewhere is greatly valued and the week long meeting in Lisbon also demonstrates that networks across the practitioner / academic divide are equally useful.

#### **Andy Pike (New Castle University)**

- What is a new combination of development and solidarity.
- Local initiatives (local aspirations) Do they connect with more universal ideas. Reflection needed about what form we give to this kind of development. Also reflection on the political content. (Not all of them are progressive, there are also conservative movements)
- Cross-scaling themes: How to think in a more plural way about the relations between civil society- state- market. How we want to deal with changes.
- Does this involves new institutions or are reforming old institutions.
- Difficulties of trade unions to adapt to more pluralistic-context incorporating new movements.
- The idea of multi-scalarity is more useful than the idea of multilevel. Scales are constructed by agency. Actors are the agents in structures.
- How we construct the links between scales?
- Importance of experimentation. Experimentation to value diversity, what is common, what could work elsewhere. Transferability.
- The need of assessment and evaluation of this kind of initiatives. A new matrix of social evaluation is needed with the question of how to access into this initiatives and how much wellbeing they produce.

#### **John Pløger (Roskilde University Centre)**

##### **General comments**

As the meeting showed, the paper is really good on empirical descriptions and the conclusive chapter mentions several interesting dilemmas we have to confront. My comments builds on what I had pre-paired for the meeting and reflections after the meeting especially influenced from hearing from the activists.

From them we learned a lot about what social innovations could be, but they also made me wonder what governance means *to them* and *how they have met governance-means* in practice. I think they could learn us a lot about how governance improve or hinder innovative power and practices. Let me give one example: - the Wales guy (PROMO) told how his organisation thinks 'profit first', that would be impossible in Denmark if you have public funding. Such enterprises seem to me on the other hand to be important, because they more radically can focus on the subject, subjectivities and self-confidence than the Danish public system.

The paper describe and underlines several obstacles to social innovative practices made by governance-thinking and practice. On the other hand governance seems to be the 'best' contemporary solution here and now, because it – at least – gives opportunities for local participation and 'power'.

### Some thematic comments

We might say that social innovation and inclusion within a governance-system will have to work around the following scheme:

<i>On social innovation and inclusion</i>	<i>Means to success</i>	<i>On governance</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Knowledge <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Work <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Networking	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bottom-up <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning skills/capacities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use experiences	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Participation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rights/democracy

The policy framing social innovation and inclusion can be said to build on two hegemonic discourses:

- 1) Work (opportunities), knowledge (empower people) and networking (empowering civil society).
- 2) The idea of social innovation builds on empowerment through skills and self-confidence.

But they also may point at the limits if not related to social policies and a more permanent politics on what role the 'activist groups' can have and must have. I would here point at some important issues (already mentioned or indicated in the paper):

- ◇ Innovation must be a 'permanent' process for those involved, meaning that people that must be included also need a 'future in the present'. There must be 'a life' after being part of a social inclusive project.
- ◇ Self-management is crucial: - the culture & arts innovatives, community projects, and eventually the development of a local (social) economy must play a role here, especially from the real marginalised (drug-addicts, alcoholics, people with psychological problems etc).
- ◇ And not to forget, as Jean writes, 'innovation often emerge in conflicts', meaning that one of the crucial points is to move social politics and community programmes from a project thinking to a process-thinking.

Furthermore, as the paper mention, if innovative practices develop in the subfields, then society may have a governance problem? Governance is dependent on order and structure and the whole idea of social innovation?

The project therefore moves within several governance problematics that may be important for the conclusive comments and suggestions:

- ◇ Public-private governance vs public-public governance
- ◇ Institutionalised projects vs civil society projects
- ◇ Projects vs process.

All of these problematics give some tensions that can influence the outcome of any innovative such as a conflict between a transversal approach vs a transformative and on what scale the initiative can work on and from. For instance as mentioned the possible between the institutional public setting and private (profit oriented) initiatives.

The paper points at a number of possible improvements, and let me mention:

- ◇ Learning spaces (38)
- ◇ Bottom-up action to more efficient (38)
- ◇ Mobilisation of own experiences (39)
- ◇ Giving voice by taking responsibility (40)
- ◇ Social forums (41)
- ◇ Mobilise companies on their social purpose
- ◇ Mobilising housing associations
- ◇ Improve the personal network towards institutions.

And one could add:

- ◇ Mobilising cities and civil society to create local jobs for marginalised people.
- ◇ Debate – at least in Scandinavia – a possible role of profit-organisations.
- ◇ To improve the politics on ‘a future in the present’ to the excluded as subjectivities/individuals and as real ‘choices of opportunities’.

### Minor comments

- p.29 Second paragraph, it is also possible to mention the Danish ‘Urban Regeneration’ projects (‘kvarterløft’ in Danish). They departure from segregation, not poverty, but was also trying to make ‘self-management’ of civil society and housing communities a target to the areas (third paragraph).
- p.29 Last paragraph: - I think it conclusively can be worth mentioning that one of the problems to urban regeneration projects – whether targeting poverty, segregation and social inclusion – fails because they are seen as *projects and not processes*, where the exit-strategies become of outmost importance.
- p.30 First paragraph is an example on this problematic ( general problematic, although you are writing about housing): - Capacity-building in deprived neighbourhoods is limited to here-and-now projects and not to people’s future needs. The projects in Denmark focus on low-skilled, low paid jobs such as gardening, cleaning and low qualified maintenance jobs. There is no work on for instance mental problems, drugs or other kind of problems preventing people from stabilising their life through work.
- p.32 Third paragraph mentioning Scandinavia and “little space for associations”. What does the word association mean here? Some housing associations in Denmark have established ‘citizens-counselling’ offices in neighbourhoods with severe social problems (ethnic problems and marginalised Danes).
- p.34 Last paragraph, line 7: “the right to ride”?

**17:45-Close**