COGOV

Co-Production and Co-Governance: Strategic Management, Public Value and Co-Creation in the Renewal of Public Agencies across Europe

Practices Sourcebook

Deliverable 8.2

Edoardo Ongaro (The Open University)
Andreja Pegan (University of Northumbria at Newcastle)

With contributions from Djelloul Arezki, Josipa Cvelić, Ewan Ferlie, Tina Jukić, Martin Kitchener, Emmanuelle Moustier, Tatjana Perse, Brittney Regal, Edina Soldo, Jacob Torfing, Sam van Elk, Nicolette van Gestel, Sanja Vrbek, and All the COGOV Team

April, 2022

Partners

Edition information		
Version	Edition Date	
1st version	April 2022	Initial submission to the European Commission

List of Practices

Introduction

This "Practices Sourcebook" - made available [online](http://cogov.eu/practice-sourcebook/)[1] - is another result of the COGOV project. It provides an analysis of an array of key practices – a repertoire of "best practices" or, with a terminology we prefer, "good practices", practices able to tackle extant problems of practitioners - that have been extrapolated from the research produced by the project, as provided through the project deliverables.

Practices are presented in the form of a detailed breakdown of their key components and indications on how to adapt and apply the mechanisms of the practices to the specific circumstances in which public service organisations operate.

This way, a form of _practical knowledge_ is made available to practitioners and scholars all over Europe and beyond. This is an important form of knowledge, as discussed here.

Good practices as a valuable form of knowledge for public management and administration

It has been suggested (Ongaro, 2020) that _knowledge for the practice of public administration comes in three main forms_:

- _'Enlightening' knowledge:_ the social-scientific, 'theoretical' knowledge generated according to the (highest) standards of the scientific community;
- _Problem-orientated knowledge:_ the kind of knowledge that is mostly produced by practitioners engaged in professional social inquiry and driven by societal problems rather than by the generation of additional knowledge _per se_ as in discipline-orientated academic knowledge;
- _Practice-extrapolation knowledge:_ a kind of knowledge that is embodied into _'practices that work'_, i.e., knowledge derived by learning from actual experiences of tackling a problem and improving a public service or process, practices typically contrived by practitioners engaged in public services, that get spotted, showcased and analysed for extrapolation and transfer elsewhere.

The COGOV project has aimed to provide a contribution at all three the levels. COGOV scholars have generated new theoretical knowledge on public management and collaborative

---

[1] http://cogov.eu/practice-sourcebook/

forms of governance (e. g. public value, co-creation and networks – see also the special issue *Strategic management of the transition to public sector co-creation[2]*, in *Policy and* Politics, 49:2, 2021 - guest edited by Jacob Torfing, Ewan Ferlie, Tina Jukić and Edoardo Ongaro - and the forthcoming special issue *Strategizing and collaborating in the digitalization of public administration*, forthcoming in *Public Policy and Administration*, guest edited by Gerhard Hammerschmid, Greta Nasi, Edoardo Ongaro, Lise H. Rykkja, Nicolette van Gestel and Koen Verhoest), while engaging in fieldwork bringing to light knowledge derived from practice (e.g. Deliverable 2.3 and Deliverable 6.1).

Practitioners have also been engaged to share reflections, for instance at the final COGOV conference or through workshops on the role of professionals. The present COGOV Practice Sourcebook enables to take stock of the contribution made at the level of practice-extrapolation knowledge. The research work carried out in the project's Work Packages and contained in the reports produced has in fact also made it possible to detect existing successful practices for the co-creation of novel solutions and the betterment of public services – as well as to co-create novel practices, in the case of WP4, practices that can in turn enable processes of co-creation for the improvement of public services. Eight of the practices presented in this report have been co-created by COGOV partners and researchers within WP4 (EN7, WLS 6, WLS7, NL3, HR2, DK1, SI1 and FR3).

What is the transferable knowledge documented in the COGOV case studies, and how can it be structured in such a way that it can be replicated elsewhere? Drawing on Ferlie and Ongaro (2022, chapter 9) and Ongaro (2020), we suggest a methodology for the extrapolation of practices from one setting to another one, that is, we suggest a method whereby the mechanisms which have made it possible to attain a given successful outcome in one site can be replicated in another site, in another jurisdiction/country. In a sense, the method is about how to learn the 'secret of the success' of a given practice in order to replicate it elsewhere.

---

[22] Available at: https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tpp/pap/2021/00000049/00000002;jsessionid=1u5lriqmlot4m.x-ic-live-02

What is practice extrapolation and how to put it into effect?

How can 'a practice that works' be extracted from one case (source site) and applied elsewhere (target site) to generate similarly successful outcomes? This is the core question of the extrapolation problem, which can also be formulated as follows: how to extract the identified good practice and adapt it to other circumstances to replicate its effects.

We suggest that the method to learn from one practice is to analyse it in such a way to understand both what is the mechanism (or mechanisms) that have made it successful and what are the contextual conditions under which such mechanism produces positive outcomes. It is also important to clarify what is the problem the practice addresses, that is, what kind of 'function' it enables to perform. Finally, it is likely any practice will produce not only or necessarily a 'good' or positive outcome, but there may be also side effects associated with a practice which have to be taken into account too.

Framework of analysis

The framework of analysis (patterned on the analytical protocol wrought out in Ferlie and Ongaro, 2022, chapter 9) is articulated as follows.

The starting point is the identification of the problem for which the practice may be a solution. In fact, a practice is not 'useful' in itself, but always in relation to a problem it enables to tackle. We can see this also by asking the question: what is the 'function' that the practice makes it possible to perform? What does the practice enable to do (that is deemed to be desirable)?

The next step in the analytical protocol adopted here lies in defining what the practice is about and what is the (social) mechanism or mechanisms the practice triggers that enable change to occur. The description of the practice is based on answering two interconnected questions of, first, how the system operates and, second, how the practice operates on the system to take advantage of the way the system operates to attain the beneficial effect expected.

The subsequent step then consists of outlining both the main effects of the practice and any eventual side effects, whether they be positive or negative. In fact, it is not only the main effect(s) of the practice that must be identified, but also side effects matter and must be detected, to the extent this is possible.

Finally, the identification and definition of the key 'context factors' under which the practice produces its effects must be outlined. Practices are assumed to work under specific conditions: in fact, only very seldom practices may be considered as operating 'free of context' (and such practices are very likely to have already been discovered and extensively applied). The final step in the analytical protocol proposed is therefore the definition of the context factors under which the practice works. This is a crucial component of the transferability of the practice: practices work only in 'similar' conditions; or, to put it in another way, practices have to be adapted, and combined in different ways, to fit partly different context factors (i.e.: to produce similar effects as they did in the original case), and in the absence of functionally similar context factors, practices are very likely not to work, or to produce unintended consequences.

The operational protocol
Operationally, in order to detect the practices, for each WP and Deliverable, the Lead Partner has revisited the report for identifying the practices that produced the positive effects. These practices have then been analysed so that it can potentially be used for extrapolation to a 'target site'.

A grid of analysis, in the form of a table, sums up the analytical framework. The practices extrapolated from the COGOV deliverables and other materials are presented through this analytical scheme, in table format, after a brief descriptive overview of the practice is presented. Each practice has been coded in relation to: jurisdiction where it is currently applied; policy sector/ governance level; COGOV Deliverable where more details about the practice can be found (bibliographical references are also reported where appropriate). It is important to notice that the categories used for coding, like the level of governance or the policy sector, are just one set of context factors, and they may not be the decisive ones in

determining the domain to which the practice can be extrapolated; in plainer words, practices at one level of governance/policy sector may well be applicable at another level of governance/policy sector – depending on the nature of the problem and function to be performed, the mechanisms the practice triggers, and the context factors which affect its functioning: all information which are analytical reported in the tables.

The tables display five columns – they outline: 1. The problem the practice enables to tackle and the function(s) it performs; 2. The (social) mechanism(s) the practice triggers to set in motion the causal process producing the effects; 3. The main (positive) effects the practice produces; 4. Side effects (if any); 5. The context factors (conditions) under which the practice operates in producing the effects.

The analysis of the practices was prepared by the Lead partners of the COGOV project; the initial draft has been discussed and critically reviewed by the coordinators of this deliverable (Edoardo Ongaro and Andreja Pegan) and the final agreed text is reported here.

An illustrative example taken from a different piece of research than the COGOV project was provided for illustration purposes to each partner. The example is reported also here for illustrative purposes (theoretical background and fuller details for the mentioned example are provided at pages 238-252 of the book Ferlie and Ongaro, 2022).

Example: Practices for the implementation of a devolution process in the field of agricultural policy in the context of the Italian Regional Government of Lombardy.
The practices are drawn from the case of a process of devolution of competencies and resources from intermediate (regional) to local governments in Italy in the early 2000s. Problem was: in most regions implementation of devolution was bogged down. However, in one case (devolution of public functions in the field of agriculture in the northern region of Lombardy) the devolution process was implemented at speed: so, what caused the smooth implementation there which did not work elsewhere? In essence, the mechanism bogging down the process across Italian region was identified in the social mechanism of "attribution of threat" to the new circumstances, by a range of stakeholders: key stakeholders were opposing devolution. One of these were the staff working in regional government now to be

relocated to local government, who resisted relocation: how was this 'resistance' overcome? The problem in short is that for staff in Italy the fact of being relocated from regional to local government is a reduction of status and material benefits, so staff were (rightly, from their viewpoint) opposing it. In the case of Lombardy, this was countered by: (i) offering some monetary incentives, but these would be themselves not been enough and so what made the difference was (ii) a combination of inducing a belief of inevitability that relocation/devolution was going to happen no matter what, plus careful selection of the personnel to be reallocated (e.g. taking into account family issues by relocated staff etc.) and plus the monetary incentives. Eventually this worked and staff were smoothly relocated. Similarly, other stakeholders were 'got on board' in the implementation of the policy and switched from opposing it to supporting it, through other mechanisms (full theoretical-analytical account at pages 238-252 of the book: excerpt here as attached file). The usage of these mechanisms was made possible by certain context factors (by detecting them, it is possible to assess if/how a practice can be replicated in another context).

In the tables below are presented the practices that have been extrapolated from the case studies, the co-creation exercise and the other materials and empirical evidence produced by the COGOV project team.

The practices detected and analysed are reported in the following tables (accessible online here: http://cogov.eu/practice-sourcebook/)

Practices are accessible online according to the five entries as per the analytical framework:

1. The problem the practice enables to tackle and the function(s) it performs;

2. The (social) mechanism(s) the practice triggers to set in motion the causal process producing the effects;

3. The main (positive) effects the practice produces;

4. Side effects (if any);

5. The context factors (conditions) under which the practice operates in producing the effects.

Digital Government in the Ministry of Justice and Cabinet Office (EN1)

Brief Description
The Cabinet Office's Government Digital Service (GDS) aims to support the digital transformation of the central Government of the United Kingdom. The GDS is a horizontal multi-sectoral centre of excellence in the field of digital, technology and data, collaborating with several central departments in the course of their digital transformation, i.e. building platforms, standards, and digital services. GDS's key feature is to ensure a more user-centric perspective brought in across the Government: the aim is that digitalised work processes now focus on user needs and the delivery of services is improved in response to user research and feedback. The Cabinet Office leads on GDS across government. Individual departments vary in their capacity and maturity in this domain. The practice studies in depth a tracer project within the Ministry of Justice which is active in this field (specifically, user centric redesign of complex paper forms in the field of family law – child custody in cases of divorce). A specialist team set up in MoJ. GDS has the ambitions of maintaining the UK Government as a world leader in serving its citizens online and achieving the most digitally skilled populations of civil servants in the world. In doing so, the GDS collaborates with the UK Government to simplify public services, to set guidelines and develop digital design principles.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Regal and Ferlie (2019). Strategy and Policy: Unravelling the impact of strategic behaviour on public policy. COGOV Deliverable 2.2, pp. 13-18

Problem addressed/ Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
1) Coordinating efforts and initiatives for digital transformation in the UK government; 2) Acting as catalyst for digitisation processes and innovation	1) Issue image: recognition of major problems with the existing non digital service; 2) Coordination tool - a coherent government wide digital strategy and service which serves as coordinating tool; 3) Guiding ideas driving behaviour of operators: specifically, the idea of user centric redesign of work processes; 4) Availability of apt resources (staff and skills): Strong digital capability in some departments now being built up further with recently recruited digital team.	Simplification of complex forms and work processes; User engagement in redesign; Lower legal costs for users; Diversion of cases away from court where appropriate	Nothing in the short term; MoJ initiative is seen as successful so far but has triggered a desire to achieve broader replication	Government wide and central leadership from the Cabinet Office; Some stronger departments have built up ownership and capability;

Open Policy Making - UK Cabinet Office (EN2)

Brief Description
The Open Policy Making policy aspires that policy making is more informed and better designed for both Government and users. It also implies that civil service expertise is balanced by expertise from other stakeholders, including users and their representatives. It is a more pluralist and bottom up approach. Open Policy Making's working themes are: agile policy making (making policy iteratively and quickly), co-design (designing policy with users), open data (using a broad range of data to inform policy), user research (understanding user needs), ethnography (understanding the emotions of users), and how to measure the impact and success of Open Policy Making.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Regal and Ferlie (2019). Strategy and Policy: Unravelling the impact of strategic behaviour on public policy. COGOV Deliverable 2.2, pp. 33-40.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
1) Mobilising external stakeholders for inclusion into policy making; 2) Providing opportunities for more bottom up and inclusive policy making	1) Guiding ideas – specifically new ideas and civil servant skills embedded In the Cabinet Office (so should have a cross government impact); 2) Specialist resources and teams (Policy Lab and Open Innovation Team); 3) Open Policy Making toolkit facilitating new approaches to policy making.	To fulfil the strategic aim of opening up the previously closed policy making process; To develop more links with academics, PhD students and other external stakeholders; 3) To enable change of mind set and ideas;	Little in the short term; Raises the wider question of how to evaluate impact of activity.	Demand led – so the individual departments need to express a need and pay for support as do the cluster of linked Universities; Expert support is then available centrally; Supportive central strategic vision.

Environment and Coastal Change in England (EN3)

Brief Description

Flood and coastal risk have always been one of the high priority areas in the environmental policy sector, where some measure of stakeholder engagement has been institutionalised. In England, flood and coastal management fall under the responsibility of many agencies and organisations. The main policy actors are the Environment Agency (EA), the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA), while Local Authorities and the national Flood Forum have a more minor role. To tackle flood and coastal risk, the "Partnership Funding" approach for funding capital projects to reduce flood and coastal erosion risks in England was introduced by DEFRA in May 2011.The overall objectives of the funding arrangements are to better protect more communities and deliver more benefits by (i) encouraging total investment to increase beyond levels affordable to central government alone; (ii) enabling more local choice, and encouraging innovative, cost-effective options to come forward in which civil society may play a greater role; (iii) increasing levels of certainty and transparency over the national funding for individual projects, whilst prioritising action for those most at risk and least able to protect or insure themselves has led to a number of local projects, e.g. community coastal pathfinder projects.

Related Bibliographical References and Links

Regal and Ferlie (2019). Strategy and Policy: Unravelling the impact of strategic behaviour on public policy. COGOV Deliverable 2.2, pp. 81-90.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
1) Mobilising resources/funding capital; 2) Keeping high on the governmental agenda the policy issue of tackling coastal erosion and flooding risk	1) An international as well as national and local favourable policy environment, enabling environmental policy to remain high on the governmental agenda and mobilise consensus; 2) Ownership of the policy issue by National agencies, which own the agenda and have worked on developing novel participation methods; 3) Cohesive epistemic community (part of the advocacy coalition) - Funded R&D projects have broadened to reflect these broader concerns.	1) More effective inter agency risk management system; 2) Greater understanding of flood and coastal erosion risks; 3) Improved coordination between affected stakeholders; 4) More engagement from affected local communities in understanding and mitigating long term risks	Possible faltering of advocacy coalition related to the very long-term time horizons.	1) Favourable political and policy climate internationally (Rio Declaration; Glasgow conference; EU support), nationally and locally; 2) Supportive ministry and executive agency; 3) Developing knowledge base.

Local Government – Newcastle Urban Green (EN4)

Brief Description
The traditional model to manage green spaces in England involves funding from local authorities. In Newcastle this model was no longer sustainable due to austerity-localism (the devolution of more decision-making powers to local authorities, but in a context where they have less resources at their disposal due to cuts in funding for local government). In the traditional model, the focus is on keeping parks tidy and maintaining gardens and horticulture with a traditional 'maintenance' skill-set. Yet, a high-quality management of parks can also create positive spill over effects on the local economy.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Daly, S. et al. (2019). Repository Practices of Strategic Renewal. COGOV Deliverable 1.2, pp. 47-48.
Daly, S. et al. (2021). Transforming the governance of green spaces: the case of Urban Green Newcastle. International Conference on Public Policy, July.

Problem addressed/ Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Service delivery reform: the transfer of assets (parks and green space allotments) from local authority control to a charitable trust.	1) Local council officers cross-boundary collaboration (parentships) with outside organisations that provided expert knowledge for implementing the practice (from concept to implementation); 2) Local council officers' engagement (online and offline public consultations, drop-in sessions for the public, meetings with key stakeholders: local councillors and the political opposition, professionals, parks and green allotment users throughout the process of transformation (from idea to implementation).	1) Stability to the provision and maintenance of parks and green spaces; 2) Maximizing the benefit of the service - parks (recreation, health, social inclusion and economic development)	The new configuration for governing the green spaces lies outside the local government and it may entail a lowering of the quality of representative (councillors-centred) democratic accountability than when local government used to manage green spaces directly. This negative effect had to be addressed and acknowledged in the transformation phase. A mitigation mechanism was put in place (a charity board with local government representatives).	1) Provisions in the existing legal framework regulating the financing of non-statutory services in local government (pressure to innovation - enabling constraint); 2) Austerity-localism: the devolution of more decision-making powers to local authorities, but in a context where they have less resources at their disposal due to cuts in funding for local government (pressure to innovation - enabling constraint); 3) Policy window: New opportunities in the wider policy environment involving government grants and programmes, and not-for-profit organisations programmes; 4) Widespread awareness that public failure may be imminent failing radical changes are (depleted public resources affecting critically the quality of parks and green space services and stakeholder satisfaction with services)

Local Government – Lambeth Council (EN5)

Brief Description
Lambeth a council in London set up a Cooperative Council Citizen's Commission in 2010 that includes councillors, experts and citizens in the evaluation of the Council's shape and size. The Commission led to the development of a strategy to change the Council into a 'cooperative body' wherein services are co-produced with locals. In the traditional model, local authorities would deliver services under increasing budgetary constraints. Here, they engaged citizens to support the transformation of services to better support communities even under restricted financial constraints.

Related Bibliographical References
Regal and Ferlie (2019). Strategy and Policy: Unravelling the impact of strategic behaviour on public policy. COGOV Deliverable 2.2, pp. 59-65.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Local authorities have faced widespread and sustained reductions to local authority budgets that have reshaped relationships between central and local governments and led to increased inequalities between local governments.

Functions the practice enables to perform: 1. Effecting a high-level strategic shift into a cooperative body; 2. Involving locals (citizens/residents) into a wide array of forms of co-production | Actor certification: an engaged local political leadership provided social legitimacy and signalling to all actors involved.

Ideational basis for change: a greater focus on 'social justice' rather than 'value-for-money' performed a mobilising function, notably for citizens/residents to commit their resources (time, talent and skill) and engage in forms of co-production | The inclusion of stakeholder expertise (community organizations, academic institutions, and citizens) in the design process of local policies. | It also led to the development of the Co-operative Councils Innovation Network to support local citizens in the shaping and strengthening of communities to transform how local authorities work. | 1) Austerity: local authorities have less resources at their disposal due to cuts in funding for local government (pressure to innovation - enabling constraint)
2) Trusting relationships – local political leaders have ongoing, positive relationships with community members |

Waltham Forest, London Borough of Culture 2019 (EN6)

Brief Description
The London Borough of Culture (LBoC) is a flagship policy of the 2018 London Mayoral Cultural Strategy. Waltham Forest is an outer London Borough, and was the inaugural Borough of Culture. The programme centred around a year of varied cultural activity, ranging from high-profile events to small grants.

Related Bibliographical References
van Elk, Sam (2020) Waltham Forest, London Borough of Culture 2019. In B. Regal and E. Ferlie (2020). Patterns of strategic renewals. COGOV Deliverable 2.3, pp. 110-129.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Awkward relational work; Need to build trust and relationships	Withstanding periods of awkwardness or 'raw' emotion (van Elk 2020: 123, 125); Interviewees described how collaborative relationships could get 'a little bit sticky', with awkwardness, misunderstanding and risk common features.	Dealing with these uncomfortable periods seemed an important practice within difficult co-creation and co-production contexts		1. Time frame available for partnership development 2. Staff with relevant competencies
Intermediation: Need to build trust and relationships	Using third parties to create fresh connections (van Elk 2020: 115); LBoC staff identified intermediaries who could introduce them to demographic or artistic communities and help gain their trust.	Relationships between the LBoC team and local communities were often achieved through intermediaries or community leaders		1. Willing intermediaries 2. Resourcing
Helping partners navigate formal structures: Funded organisations frequently found the Council's formal rules baffling: for instance, when asked to pay LBoC funding to another Council department to use a Council-owned venue.	LBoC staff helped partners navigate these structures (van Elk 2020: 116). Helping projects to navigate Council structures became an important task for LBoC staff	Participants sometimes valued the programme's role as an un-blocker		1. Internal knowledge on navigating processes 2. Required extensive time and familiarisation with council systems 3. Dedicated points of contact

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Finding ways to flex goals and structures: The programme was committed to a certain plan and key performance indicators which it had submitted to win funding, potentially limiting the ability to emergently co-create	Staff found ways of adjusting the programme despite these limitations (van Elk 2020: 124-5) Senior staff were described as attempting to identify the 'core tenet' of the initial plan so it could be maintained while its specifics were amended. Others described 'scrap[ing] together little bits of funding' to fund unplanned initiatives.	Made room for greater emergence		1. Pre-existence of plan or commitments 2. Funder understanding of adaptation
Creating open structures: London Mayor aims to make difference to local cultural sector but not significant power over it or funding to provide to operators	Use of 'open' policy vehicles (van Elk 2020: 117) The Mayor's Office's interventions were characterised as creating tools or programmes which they hoped would be appealing to boroughs. The Office was said to aim to create 'a policy that allows for enough flexibility for each of the boroughs to link with their own sort of talent, stakeholders and make it quite locally relevant'	Undetermined at the time of completion of study	Undetermined at the time of completion of study	Undetermined at the time of completion of study

Holiday camp in England (EN7)

Related Bibliographical References
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). [Report on case studies of Public Administrations as arenas for coproduction and co-creation](). COGOV Deliverable 4.1
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). [Archive of Practices](). COGOV Deliverable 4.3.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
In the 2019 and 2020 co-created holiday camps, it was discovered that hunger in holidays without school food was a real problem and that proper meals for the kids rather than just snacks and a limited amount of food packages were needed	To provide proper meals for the kids in the 2021 summer holiday camp, the project enhanced its reliance on donations from private companies, citizens, other churches and charity FareShare. Blended finance combining contributions from manifold public, not-for-profit and private actors helps to mobilize resources for co-creation projects	Positive impact on the fulfillment of physical needs of the kids participating in the holiday camp due to blended financing of nutritious food.	No side-effects observed	A local tradition for charity contributions is an important condition for this solution.
Relying on external public financing meant that food packages could only be given to certain families and not to all families in need	The project decided to enhance the reliance on volunteers and donations and only employ one seasonable employee in order to gain financial independence. Scaling down public funding and enhancing private funding can free co-creation projects from constraining rules and strings attached to public money.	Positive impact on the fulfillment of physical needs of local families and the kids participating in the holiday camp due to enhanced self-management and self-financing.	No side-effects observed	A local tradition for charity contributions is an important condition for this solution
In 2020, an external, national organization was hired to do sports activities with the kids, but it was not a team player in the local collaboration and low trust between the partners developed	Gaining financial independence through voluntarism and donations meant that collaboration with the external, national-level actor was no longer needed. Collaboration between local partners who know each other well and is on an equal footing will generate trust.	Positive impact on the fulfillment of social needs due to more effective planning, communication and execution based on trust-relations between local actors who know each other well.	No side-effects observed	A local tradition for charity contributions is an important condition for this solution

Legislation to support co-production in Wales (WLS1)

Brief Description:
In contrast to the new public management of the UK Government, the devolved Welsh Government aims to foster a 'citizen model' of public governance. This has involved two innovative pieces of Welsh legislation that support co-production

Related Bibliographical References and Links :
Welsh Government (2014) *Social Services and Well-being Act (Wales)*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
Welsh Government (2015) *Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
Williams, H. and M. Kitchener (2019) Devolution in Wales: A distinctively supportive context for co-production. In Pluchinotta, I. and E. Ferlie (eds) *Strategy and Policy: Unravelling the impact of strategic behaviour on public policy*. COGOV Deliverable 2.2, pp. 67-74.

Problem addressed/Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Devolved legislation to support co-production.	Political mandate	1.The Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 embeds co-production principles as a mandatory code of practice. 2. The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 required all public bodies to employ five ways of working including 'citizen involvement'.	Capacity of Welsh Government to monitor and enforce co-production obligations	Commitment to co-production from senior Welsh government politicians including First Minister, and influential civic agencies including Bevan Commission and Wales Co-operative Centre.

Co-production of legislation in Wales (WLS2)

Brief Description
For the first time in the UK, the Welsh Government employed an engaged approach to the development of a major piece of legislation: The Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Welsh Government (2014) *Social Services and Well-being Act (Wales)*. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
Welsh Government (2017) The co-productive approach taken to develop the statutory framework for the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014. Cardiff: Welsh Government.
Daly et al. (2019). Repository Practices of Strategic Renewal. COGOV Deliverable 1.2, pp. 43-44.

Problem addressed/ Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Co-production of legislation	Three groups were set up to provide direction at the strategic level with members from across public services. In addition, technical groups were established to include the public, and independent sector.	Participants were positive about the co-productive approach to policy development.	No side effects observed	Commitment to co-production from senior Welsh government politicians including First Minister, and influential civic agencies including Bevan Commission and Wales Co-operative Centre.

Water Resilient Community' Project in Wales (WLS3)

Brief Description
Welsh Water (WW) is a not-for-profit water company that runs a 'Water Resilient Community' project to benefit the Rhondda Fach, one of Wales' most deprived communities.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Ongaro, E., I. Pluchinotta, H. Williams, M. Kitchener, and E. Ferlie. 2021. "Strategic Management as an Enabler of Co-creation in Public Services." *Policy and Politics* 49/2: 287-304.
Welsh Water. 2018. *Rhondda Fach: Water Resilient Communities*. https://www.dwrcymru.com/en/RhonddaFach.aspx
Daly et al. (2019). Repository Practices of Strategic Renewal. COGOV Deliverable 1.2, pp. 26-27.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Co-production with clients	Community meetings, outreach activity in schools, social tariff, free water audits, client involvement in production of efficiency leaflet.	Increased public awareness of water resilience, customer savings of over £123,000 through reduced bills	No side effects observed	The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 required all public bodies to employ five ways of working including 'citizen involvement'.

Cartrefi Cymru in Wales (WLS4)

Brief Description
Cartrefi Cymru is a Welsh social care organization that has co-produced an innovative 'floating support service' for disabled service users in Brecon, a rural market town in mid-Wales.

Related Bibliographical References and Links and Links
Daly et al. (2019). Repository Practices of Strategic Renewal. COGOV Deliverable 1.2, pp. 34-35.
Cartrefi Cymry Co-operative (nd) Strengths-based Practice. And some platforms to build on.
www.cartrefi.coop

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Co-production with clients	Service users request support as and when they need it, rather than based on the traditional model of delivering a set number of hours.	Service users live more independent and fulfilling lives. Staff benefit from a feeling of doing "what matters", increased task variety, and increased motivation.	No side effects observed	The Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 embeds co-production principles as a mandatory code of practice

Vanguard Approach in Wales (WLS5)

Brief Description
In North Wales, the local Health Board and Council have co-produced an integrated service for older people, based on the Vanguard Approach.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Daly et al. (2019). Repository Practices of Strategic Renewal. COGOV Deliverable 1.2, pp. 38-39.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Co-production with clients	Following the Vanguard Approach, services were re-configured based on "what matters" to clients - established through conversations with clients & service providers	Service users are less dependent on providers as they are taught to utilise their skills so that they can help themselves. Working across traditional boundaries allows providers to pool resources, leading to an improved experience for service users.	No side effects observed	The Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 embeds co-production principles as a mandatory code of practice (see above)

COVID-19 and Heritage site in Wales (WLS6)

Brief Description
The co-creation project created outdoor excavation test pits in peoples back gardens that prompted discussions over the fence.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). [Report on case studies of Public Administrations as arenas for coproduction and co-creation](). COGOV Deliverable 4.1
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). [Archive of Practices](). COGOV Deliverable 4.2

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
COVID-19 lockdown halted face-to-face interaction in co-creation project at heritage site	Creative adaptation and prompt action helped keeping up momentum and create interaction	Positive impact as 36 families participated and kids worked with their parents, learned about heritage, and talked with neighbors. The activity combined delivering public value and promoting heritage. Won innovation awards.	No side effects observed	Good connections to local citizens helped recruit participants in new type of activity

Co-created playground at the heritage in Wales (WLS7)

Brief Description
A co-created playground at the heritage site was subject to anti-social behavior and vandalism. This had the potential to attract negative media attention and undermine the project's goal of reducing local stigma.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). Report on case studies of Public Administrations as arenas for coproduction and co-creation. COGOV Deliverable 4.1
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). Archive of Practices. COGOV Deliverable 4.3.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
A co-created playground at the heritage site was subject to anti-social behavior and vandalism. This had the potential to attract negative media attention and undermine the project's goal of reducing local stigma	The standard inclination to call the police and press charges was declined in favour co-creative problem-solving. The response involved a meeting with the park ranger, the local high school, citizens, the local councilors, and local community police. They decided to speak to the young people involved to discover how they could collectively ensure that people would want to care for the communal space rather than wreck it.	Positive impact on the overall goals as the threat to the co-creation process ended up extending and strengthening it. Now the Hillfort Heritage Center and the playground is used by many local community members. Being adjacent to the newly launched heritage/ community center, it means that the building itself is attracting local people and other visitors.	No side effects observed	A growing feeling of common ownership of the site and local community pride. Enabled local actors to take a constructive stance reaffirming community values.

Regional Network Governance - Labour market policy in The Netherlands (NL1)

Brief Description
Regional Network Governance of the Labour Market - A multi-partner effort to set up 35 regional networks in the labour market which include bottom-up consultations. The intent has been to develop better and tailor-made services, beyond the highly complex, fragmented and risk averse processes of individual public agencies, and to enhance the social inclusion of deprived groups in the labour market.

Related Bibliographical References and Links and Links
Daly, S. et al. (2019). Repository Practices of Strategic Renewal. COGOV Deliverable 1.2, pp. 24-25.
van Gestel, N. et al. (2020). Regional network governance. In B. Regal and E. Ferlie (eds) Patterns of strategic renewals. COGOV Deliverable 2.3.
Regal, B. and E. Ferlie (2020). Archive of promising practices. COGOV Deliverable 2.4, p. 11.
EU Network of Public Employment Services (2017) Strategy to 2020 and beyond
Program Council "Together for the client"

Problem addressed/ Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Problem: Sub-optimal labour market; qualitative and quantitative discrepancies between supply and demand, large group of 'outsiders'; Function: Developing an integrated regional policy for employment services, social benefits and assistance, and jobs for deprived groups.	A central agreement among the key stakeholders (social partners and government, 2013), confirmed by law (2015) and supported by annual national subsidies to promote a collaborative culture among the relevant organisations and realise additional labour market projects.	The setup of a regional framework for collaborative Active Labour Market Policy (Participation Act 2015), in particular for the implementation of the Jobs Agreement Act (2015). Specifically: 1) Consolidating regions/networks around key shared identities and goals; 2) Developing long term relationships (both internally and externally); 3) Formulating concrete, short-term goals that are shared; 4) Developing forms of joint work on aims that necessitate collaboration (rather than collaboration for collaboration's sake); 5) Sharing knowledge in platforms about barriers and solutions in implementation	Possible side effects, or at least shortcomings with reference to the main effect, include: 1) A relatively low level of political and organisational ownership in regional network governance; 2) A focus on short-term projects rather than on sustainable impact and outcomes; 3) A diverse, but often limited cooperation in service provision; 4) Progress to remain strongly dependent on voluntary collaboration between municipalities rather than being embedded into the collaborative framework; 4) The rise of tensions between regional network governance and local principal-agent relationships.	External context: An important context factor is a nationally agreed governance structure and financial system that invest at a regional level instead of mainly in individual organisations, so that stakeholders develop more (financial) interest in striving for joint results in regional networks. Internal (to the network) context: The development of a balanced strategy is needed to bring the different, partly opposing objectives of the stakeholders together (short- and long term; demand oriented or supply oriented) and tackle one problem without magnifying the other.

Creating a Public Value Strategy – The Netherlands Enterprise Agency (NL2)

Brief Description
The Enterprise Agency - Integration of public value (PV) in the organisational strategy of an executive agency of the ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy. The Enterprise Agency (RVO) adopted the 'Agenda 2022' strategy to respond to social challenges and focus on developing integrated services, attracting qualified employees and providing data-driven stakeholder support. The strategy aims at creating public value, referring to the UN sustainable development goals.

Related Bibliographical References and Links
Daly, S. et al. (2019). Repository Practices of Strategic Renewal. COGOV Deliverable 1.2, pp. 16-17
van Gestel, N. et al. (2020). Creating a Public Value Strategy. In B. Regal and E. Ferlie (eds) Patterns of strategic renewals. COGOV Deliverable 2.3.
Regal, B. and E. Ferlie (2020). Archive of promising practices. COGOV Deliverable 2.4, p. 9.
RVO (2018) Agenda 2022, toward a value driven organization: Innovation through connection. See: https://english.rvo.nl/
United Nations. The Sustainable Development Goals for 2030, https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/

Problem addressed/ Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Problem: Sub-optimal socio-economic innovation; fragmented rules and management instead of a coherent approach to social challenges Function: Developing a co-creative approach of socio-economic innovation, e.g. in climate policy, energy transition, agricultural policy (Green deal)	The decision of the strategic board - after broad consultation with the employees - to introduce a PV strategy as an alternative to the previous NPM strategy, aiming to inspire employees, attract new employees and improve internal and external collaboration, achieving efficiency and effectiveness.	The setup of a PV strategy in a large, executive agency, a strategy which is highly supported by staff and executed in parts of the organisation: 1) Constant monitoring of the state of play and sharing of good practices: 2) Creating a digital database of initiatives in line with the new strategy; 3) Using implementation processes knowledge to inform policy makers; 4) Creating and sharing awareness about the PV to add; 5) Stimulating collaboration across organizational and professional borders; 6) Insights in the linkages between RVO activities and in the impact of (diverse) rules on clients	Possible side effects, or at least shortcomings with reference to the main effect, include: 1) A complex internal structure, combining vertical and horizontal management; 2) A missing link between higher management echelons and bottom-up initiatives in the organization; 3) A financial structure (still) leading to a primary concern with implementing individual policy measures; 4) A distance - as an executive agency - to the political leadership that could support the PV strategy; 4) Some frustration among employees due to limited opportunities (time, resources) to execute the PV strategy	External context: Support from the 'authorizing environment' is a key context factor. As an executive agency, the Enterprise agency is largely dependent on their various principals (EU, ministries, provinces, local government) for implementing their PV strategy. Internal (to the organisation) context: Top leadership collaboration, more hands-on management and a transparent culture in the agency are pre-conditions to enable the setting of clear PV projects, as are better financial, HR, IT, organisational conditions to implement these.

Employment policy board in the Netherlands (NL3)

Related Bibliographical References
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). [Report on case studies of Public Administrations as arenas for coproduction and co-creation](). COGOV Deliverable 4.1
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). [Archive of Practices](). COGOV Deliverable 4.3.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
The common purpose of the employment policy board was unclear, meetings were uninspiring and there was a tension between central goals and local needs	Organized meeting so as to allow people to articulate what they wanted to maintain and what they wanted to change led to the formulation of a nine-point plan. Creating a space for deliberation about what is good and bad and what is needed can help to create a joint direction.	Positive impact on participants' awareness of what can be achieved in and through collaborative governance	No observed side effects	The solution merely required facilitation of deliberation
Endless debates about the governance structure prevented the participants from discussing policy content	An open meeting was used to develop a new substantive policy agenda based on a well-prepared overview of past performance. Open meetings enable participants to talk about issue they find important and thus brings energy to the process.	Limited positive effect as there was some good substantive policy discussions in smaller groups, but the external facilitator stood in the way of more positive outcomes.	Unintended negative side effect as external facilitator took up to much time with redundant presentations and failed to ensure final decision-making	The solution merely required facilitation of deliberation

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
The participants expressed a need for a stronger and shared ownership to their joint policy agenda and projects	The solution was to form mixed thematic sub-groups to discuss goals and ideas based on a review of current projects and white spots. Getting the participants to talk about and agree upon new agendas would help to foster joint ownership.	Positive impact on collaborative engagement and creativity of the participants.	Negative side-effect as the add-on event created project ideas that were somewhat disconnected from the review of ongoing projects and white spots	The solution merely required facilitation of deliberation
There was a general and discouraging feeling that meetings were all talk and little action.	Decided to hold board meetings focusing on practical implementation and the planning of concrete activities and next steps. Forcing the board to discuss concrete actions would help to demonstrate the value added of policy co-creation.	Limited positive impact on the innovation ambition of the participants: their mutual relations and aspirations were strengthened.	Negative side-effect occurred because action decisions were postponed.	The solution merely required facilitation of deliberation

Rijeka's eBenefits Advisor for the Social Welfare Programme (HR1)

Brief Description
Since 1993, the City of Rijeka has been providing assistance to its citizens who are facing extremely unfavourable living conditions. These are citizens who have very low incomes and are at risk of poverty, certain categories of the disabled, the seriously ill and victims of the Homeland War, all at risk of social exclusion. Research on the effectiveness of social measures aimed at protection from the point of view of beneficiaries has shown that certain groups of these beneficiaries do not receive the assistance to which they are entitled. One of the reasons for this may be insufficient communication with the administration, insufficient understanding of information (web portal, leaflets, media announcements) or service overload through traditional channels (phone, service desk).

Related Bibliographical References
Intelligent cities change (2021) Citizen participation and digitization of public administration
City of Rijeka (nd) Who can be a beneficiary of the Social programme of the City of Rijeka?
Socijalni Program Grada Rijeka (in Croatian)

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Tackling poverty/extremely unfavourable living conditions of citizens/residents; addressing beneficiaries' access to information, efficiency of the city's social welfare system and improving communication between city administration and residents	1) Mobilising citizens: finding and engaging representatives of citizens and other stakeholders who are willing to participate in the process of co-creation of the eService; 2) Setting up venues (Organizing co-creation workshop) for understanding user's end to end journey with the Social Welfare Programme and exploring key interactions and experiences with the City's programs and other services and co-designing a new eService; 3) Mobilising City officials to reengineer organisational processes to include in the new eService; 4) Brokering: Including the eService into standard eInclusion programme of the City; 5) Continuous learning: continuous adjusting and refinement of the eService elements based on learning from previous iterations and activities performed.	An improved Social Welfare Program by means of a co-created eService, notably also leading to: 1) Personalized eService, 2) Stakeholders engagement, 3) Co-creation, 4) Co-delivery, 5) Digital and social inclusion, 6) Improvement of the Department's practice in providing the Social Welfare Programme, 7) Building and improving relationship among participatory program stakeholders (e.g. citizens, local government officials, NGO representatives); 8) The software platform developed for the Rijeka's eBenefits can be adjusted and applied to any other service of the City of Rijeka or to any other social welfare service provided by the state or any public body; 9) External recognition: Transparency Award - eService has contributed to Rijeka becoming the most transparent city in the Republic of Croatia for several years in a row	No side effects observed	**1)** Internal (to the organisation) and external stakeholders orientation to collaboration and innovation, notably via the eService; 2) Digital skills across the population at large (project sustainability is supported by technological progress in the community, and also by provision of free IT courses for marginalised groups)

Rijeka Local Partnership Program (RPLP) (HR2)

Brief Description
Since 2005, 106 projects have been implemented within the Rijeka Local Partnership Program (RPLP), led by citizens, associations, sports clubs and local committees. The programme includes projects such as the design, management and construction of playgrounds, parks for children, green spaces and improvements in local schools.

Related Bibliographical References
Cvelić, J. and T. Perše (2022). Design Experiment: Rijeka Local Partnership Program. COGOV Blog.
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). Report on case studies of Public Administrations as arenas for coproduction and co-creation. COGOV Deliverable 4.1
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). Archive of Practices. COGOV Deliverable 4.3.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
The RPLP program lacked a formal evaluation procedure that assesses and compares the success and sustainability of the local projects; Co-create a new evaluation framework for RPLP projects with citizens and stakeholders.	1) Setting up mobilizing structures: the set of workshops for the training of the participants on the topic of project evaluation. 2) Actor certification: City officials' engagement and dedication in organizing evaluation training workshops, evaluation team meetings and organizing several types of project evaluation (ongoing evaluation, mid-term evaluation, final project evaluation and ex-post evaluation). 3) Mobilising platforms: getting citizens to participate to the programme and workshops/training.	1) Improved participatory RPLP by means of the addition of a co-created evaluation framework; 2) Valuable knowledge produced by the evaluation that can be used to further improve RPLP; 3) Collaboration with a broad range of actors stimulated needs-based innovation and built ownership over the solutions; 4) Positive impact on future co-creation projects in the RPLP program since there is now a simple and effective procedure for multi-stage project evaluation with a broad-based ownership.	No side effects observed	1) Local organizational capacities were needed to drive the collaborative innovation process 2) Willingness of the organization to implement a new evaluation framework to the program; 3) Willingness by multiple project stakeholders to participate in the development of guidelines for various types of evaluation.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
The RPLP project selection committee consisted of three representatives of non-governmental organizations and the media, but ordinary citizens had no say in the selection process, thus potentially undermining its democratic legitimacy. The practice's function aimed at involve citizens in the process of selecting RPLP projects for funding.	The inclusion of two active citizens with previous experience from RPLP projects as members of the selection committee.	1) The addition of citizens representatives enhances input legitimacy and the fact that they were active and experienced enhances output legitimacy; 2) Positive impact on the democratic legitimacy of co-creation in the future as the democratic anchorage of the whole process of the RPLP is solidified	No side effects observed	Willingness of established organizations to share power with active citizens
Lack of open-access data regarding past projects prevents local actors from getting a comprehensive picture of what has been done so far under RPLP.	1) The creation of a data repository, which is a part of the City of Rijeka e-Services portal; 2) The creation of a GIS database that publish data on a web map	1) Transparency ensured through digital solutions enable local actors to see where past projects were conducted and where there was a need for new projects; 2) Positive impact on the democratic legitimacy of co-creation in the future as the democratic anchorage of the whole process of the RPLP is solidified	No side effects observed	The solution required possession of relevant data and technical skills and collaboration with the Department of Local Self-Government and Administration and the IT Department

Library in Denmark (DK1)

Related Bibliographical References
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). Report on case studies of Public Administrations as arenas for coproduction and co-creation. COGOV Deliverable 4.1
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). Archive of Practices. COGOV Deliverable 4.3.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Many participants in the Task Committee on turning libraries into cultural hubs had a preference for maintaining what you have got and avoiding new and uncertain future developments	The format of the next meeting was changed to allow people to articulate what they want to maintain and what new they may want to add	1) Bringing worries and hopes out in the open and ensure joint appreciation of both prevents the relation between traditional library function and new cultural events from being a zero-sum game; 2) Positive impact on the participants' motivation to try something new and pursue innovation	No side effects observed	No particular conditions for the solution
Facilitators took up lots of space in highly structured meetings and they were the central turning point in the star-shaped debates, thus reducing the space of free and open-ended discussion	A new type of open meetings were created with no fixed agenda, a more withdrawn facilitation and plenty of room for brainstorming and discussion	1) Open meetings helps to prevent oversteering and frees up time for free, open and unhurried discussions that stimulate innovation; 2) Positive impact on the number of new innovative ideas formulated by the participants.	No side effects observed, but it is important to make precise minutes of discussions in order to retain new and innovative ideas	The solutions required willingness of political and administrative facilitators to lose control and give more room for the citizens
Highly asymmetrical distribution of knowledge about the libraries amongst the participants	Organized online site visits to all six public libraries where professional librarians provided information about the libraries and there was time of Q&A	1) Letting the libraries tell about the libraries and letting the citizens ask questions would create a massive knowledge transfer; 2) Positive impact as both the citizens and the elected politicians learned a lot about the functioning and activities of the libraries, thus evening out the knowledge asymmetry	Librarians turned quite defensive and gave the impression that everything had or would be tried, thus reducing the space for innovation	The solutions required extra meetings and local resources for planning of the site visits

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
The meetings in the co-creation arena tended to be all talk and no action	It was decided to do practical testing of a co-created idea of cultural event with local authors in one of the libraries	1) The cure of talk-centrism is to act and show that co-created action is possible and has real effects; 2) The co-created event was successful, but it had a limited impact on the innovation ambitions of the participants due to the unintended side-effect	The event was hijacked by one participant (a local author) and the Task Committee had limited interest in and ownership over the event.	The solution required that the local library had organizational capacity to plan and host the co-created event

Prototyping an e-solution in Slovenia (SI1)

Related Bibliographical References

Torfing, J. et al. (2022). Report on case studies of Public Administrations as arenas for coproduction and co-creation. COGOV Deliverable 4.1

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Potential users were supposed to be involved in the co-creation process, but only in the ultimate stage of testing the prototype of the new e-Authorization platform	Probe the potential end-users' interest in participating in the co-creation of a new service system, gather their ideas and inputs and present them to the project team. An explorative approach to early user involvement would both help to identify interested user and test the value added of their inputs.	Positive impact on furthering co-creation and the assessment of impacts and benefits as the end users demonstrated willingness to contribute to service improvement and the project team referred to their inputs as interesting and helpful.	No side-effects observed	Some prior experience with end-user involvement in technology development is required.
It was planned that end-users should test the prototype, but time pressure due to strict deadlines threatened to squeeze out the planned user involvement.	Different testers were quickly recruited to test a mock-up of the new e-Authorization platform and they were subsequently interviewed. A quick-and-dirty user test of a mock-up would fulfil the purpose and perhaps encourage further user testing in the future.	Large positive impact on goal attainment as the test showed that there were many problems with the prototype. This led to substantial changes and delay of the project delivery.	No side-effects observed	Some prior experience with end-user involvement in technology development is required.
Initially, the project team and its leader had little sympathy for co-creation based on earlier negative experiences	A co-creation ambassador was recruited and supposed to help explaining the concept, eliciting positive experiences from team members and fostering a common language in the team. People often dismiss new ideas and practices because they are uncertain of what it entails and have difficulties seeing the benefits. A dedicated person could overcome these barriers.	Positive impact on the furthering of co-creation as the team members came to collaborate better with each other and appreciate inputs from end users.	No side-effects observed	Sufficient knowledge about co-creation and facilitator skills are needed to play the role of co-creation ambassador.

Co-Ready Tool (SI2)

Brief Description

The Co-Ready tool is an evidence-based Decision Support System (DSS) supporting the assessment of organisational readiness for co-creation. The attributes of the Co-Ready DSS were extracted from the co-creation drivers and barriers identified in (1) the case studies performed in WP2 and through (2) detailed content analysis of 109 WoS papers.

Related Bibliographical References

Link to the tool: https://www.cogov-toolkit.eu/co-ready/presentation

Jukić, T. et al. (2022) Roadmap. COGOV Deliverable 7.1. http://cogov.eu/publications/deliverables/d7-1/

Jukić, T. et al. (2021). Co-Gov toolkit: Transform your public organisation into a co-creation hub. [Computer software]. Ljubljana: UL FU.

Jukić, T. et al. (2022). Organizational maturity for co-creation. *Government Information Quarterly 39*.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice to work)
The academic and political interest in co-creation has manifested itself mainly as a theoretical discussion of the conceptual properties of co-creation, as an empirical research of co-creation sites and handbooks of practical guidelines for practitioners. However, an important aspect has been overlooked, that is, the readiness of public organizations to apply co-creation in their everyday	1) A survey for assessing the organisational readiness for co-creation; 2) The roadmap containing ideas for the improvement of certain organisational aspects with a view to successfully co-creating; 3) The IF-THEN analysis providing an insight as to which features within a specific organisation affect the most its co-creation readiness score; 4) Benchmarking feature: organisations performing	Public administration organisations are enabled to assess their readiness for co-creation. Moreover, after the assessment, the tool offers them a roadmap, developed based on WP2 case studies – with this roadmap, they can get an idea about how to improve their readiness in the areas where their co-creation readiness scored low. Finally, by using the "IF-THEN" feature/analysis	It is important to take into account that Co-Ready is a DSS – thus, offering support in the assessment of organisational readiness for co-creation. Thus, it does not replace human reflection on the specific situational circumstances where decision-making takes place, but it guides and supports decision-makers in their assessments of state-of-art and alternatives as part of the decision-making process. The attributes within the Co-Ready are treated as	Willingness and engagement within a public administration organisation to implement co-creation. This tool needs to be used by senior civil servant with a helicopter view of the situation and the authority to instigate change. In case of large organisations, it is often suitable if the senior civil servant has a good knowledge about the assessed features in the specific department/functional area.

work. As a result, not only we lack a clear idea as to what exactly constitutes favorable organizational features and structure for co-creation, but we also miss practical guidelines for public managers to make informed decisions as to what needs to be changed within their organizations to be more mature (i.e. ready and capable) to successfully implement co-creation. Function performed: supporting the (self-) assessment of organizational readiness to co-creation.	assessment with the Co-Ready can learn where they stand with regard to other public organisations (they can compare their result with the average readiness score of other public organisations that used the Co-Ready tool and filter it by country and/or type of organisation). Mechanisms 1-4 belong to the ideational bases for change	offered by the tool, they can see, how the improvements in specific co-creation readiness fields affect their overall readiness for co-creation. It is expected that public administration organisations which will use the Co-Ready tool, will be better equipped for co-creation initiatives as they will gain an insight into the most critical organisational features which may affect the success of co-creation initiatives in the organisation.	independent factors. Due to analytical reasons, Co-Ready reflects a disaggregated system, which in practice exists as a whole. In contrast to reality, where the attributes identified represent interdependent factors forming a system, the Co-Ready offers a more simplified version of the reality – focused on specific features organisations (should) have, not on their interdependences within the system.	The Co-Ready supports assessment of co-creation readiness at the level of the whole organisation; however, in certain cases (due to organisation size, different kinds of services, etc.), users might find it more suitable to use it at the level of an organisational unit. Suitable time needs to be devoted to read the Manual for the tool usage and for reading the Roadmap, as well as to perform IF-THEN analysis.

Co-Serve Tool (SI3)

Brief Description

Tool supporting the assessment of public services in order to identify those that are most suitable to be renewed based on co-creation principles.The attributes of the (evidence-based) Co-Ready DSS were extracted from the co-creation drivers and barriers identified in (1) the case studies performed in WP2 and through (2) detailed content analysis of 109 WoS papers. Co-Serve enables also benchmarking of different public services (provided by the same user) in order to identify the most suitable one for the renewal through co-creation.

Related Bibliographical References

Link to the tool: https://www.cogov-toolkit.eu/co-serve/presentation
Jukić, T. et al. (2022) Roadmap. COGOV Deliverable 7.2. http://cogov.eu/publications/deliverables/d7-2/
Jukić, T. et al. (2021) Co-Gov toolkit: Transform your public organisation into a co-creation hub. [Computer software]. Ljubljana: UL FU.

Problem addressed/ Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice to work)
Not all public services are equally suitable for renewal based on co-creation principles.

Co-Serve is a multi-attribute decision support system for assessment of service readiness for co-creation. | 1) The assessment survey as the basis for assessing service readiness for co-creation; 2) Benchmarking feature supporting comparison among different public services (assessed by the same user/provider) in order to identify the most suitable one for the renewal through co-creation. | Implementing co-creation in the process of renewal of (the most) suitable public services increases the chances of successful outcome | Co-Serve assessments merely draw attention to potential problems that might challenge the process of co-creation. They should not be taken as an ultimate judgment whether a service should (or should not) be renewed through co-creation. The final decision and responsibility is in the hands of the users of the tool. | Willingness and engagement within a public administration organisation to implement co-creation (i.e. to use the tool).

Co-Serve should be used by a public servant who is an owner of the service assessed.

Suitable time needs to be devoted to read the User manual. |

Co-Renew Tool (SI4)

Brief Description

Tool supporting the process of renewal of public services based on co-creation principles (i.e. by involvement/participation of service users). Precisely, this implies automatic gathering and interactive analysis of large sets of data from service users. Co-Renew is a highly dynamic tool, the idea of which originates from the Customer Journey Mapping approach (CJM). The latter has been largely used in the private sector and received attention in the public sector in the last two decades.

Related Bibliographical References

Link to the tool: https://www.cogov-toolkit.eu/co-renew/presentation

Jukić, T. et al. (2022) Web-based Toolkit. COGOV Deliverable 7.3. http://cogov.eu/publications/deliverables/d7-3/

Jukić, T. et al. (2021) Co-Gov toolkit: Transform your public organisation into a co-creation hub. [Computer software]. Ljubljana: UL FU.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice to work)
Traditional co-creation methods and techniques (e.g. workshops, meetings etc.) enable involvement of a limited number of co-creators (i.e. service users).While several co-creation (digital) tools can be identified on the "market", none of the free of charge tools offers as much digital support to co-creation process as Co-Renew.	The General user journey template (GUJT) is filled in with data gathered at a workshop with service users and civil servants. It captures potential steps and touch points service users face during service delivery. The application automatically creates a survey and sends it to service users. Service users indicate their individual path, by identifying steps, touchpoints, level of satisfaction, problems faced and suggestions for improvement of the service. Given the survey responses, the application generates an interactive report presenting several information.	1) To include feedback of a large amount of service users into the co-creation process; 2) The User Journey Map captures detailed user experiences going beyond traditional citizen satisfaction surveys; 3) The interactive and dynamic report provides solid bases for informed decisions during the preparation of the plan and service renewal.	Co-Renew is an additional co-creation channel. In this way, digitally less qualified service users will not be excluded from co-creation initiatives. The Co-Renew includes of service users but it also encourages to use other existing co-creation technics/methods to include additional relevant perspectives depending on their specific case.	1) Willingness and engagement within public administration organisations to implement co-creation (i.e. to use the tool). 2) Co-Renew should be used by the owner of the public service to be renewed. A public servant who is an expert in this field (and has a clear understanding of the process behind the service). 3) Suitable time for the whole process supported by Co-Renew.

Co-Master Tool (SI5)

Brief Description

Tool supporting the assessment of the quality of a co-creation process in order to identify room for improvements of future co-creation initiatives. The Co-Master allows public organizations to gain an overall impression of the success of specific co-creation processes, and to identify aspects that can be improved in future. The attributes of the Co-Master tool (i.e. the survey questions) were extracted from the Wp4 reports and from the in-depth content analysis of 109 WoS papers.

Related Bibliographical References

Link to the tool: https://www.cogov-toolkit.eu/co-master/presentation

Jukić, T. et al. (2022) Web-based Toolkit. COGOV Deliverable 7.3. http://cogov.eu/publications/deliverables/d7-3/

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice to work)
Lack of methodologies and tools supporting the assessment of the quality of co-creation processes.	The assessment survey, based on which the Co-Master tool helps users to assess the quality of the co-creation process and identify its main weaknesses. The assessment result also offers tips for improvements of future co-creation initiatives	Public organisations are able to assess their co-creation initiatives (i.e. processes of co-creation) and thus get information on how to improve future co-creation initiatives		The Co-Master tool should be used by a public servant who coordinated the co-creation process to be assessed. While answering the questions, they can consult with other participants of the process (recommended).

Brest's participatory budgeting (FR1)

Brief Description
The practice is about season 2 of the participatory budgeting process in Brest, which represents € 500,000 available, i.e., 3% of the investment budget of the city.

Related Bibliographical References
Soldo, E. et al. (2020). Brest Participatory Budgeting. In B. Regal and E. Ferlie (eds) Patterns of strategic renewals. COGOV Deliverable 2.3, 182- 204.
Le Corre M. (2019). Rapport d'évaluation du Budget Participatif Edition 1 2018. Brest Métropole et Ville – Rapport.
Bézard, A. (2018). BUDGETS PARTICIPATIFS: La nouvelle promesse démocratique ? Publication from Fondation Jean Jaurés

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice to work)
Problem: attaining the Implementation of a participatory budgeting. 1) Encouraging innovative practices for citizen consultation and the development of new financial tools; 2) Facilitating the emergence of projects of general interest; 3) Mobilising residents (empowerment effect).	1) Communication: developing a new "format" for citizen participation thanks the direct link between citizen and local government; 2) Mobilising stakeholders, through the promotion of an ongoing resident participation in a wider inclusion of stakeholders; 3) Institutional venues for mobilising stakeholders, at two levels (intraorganizational and extra-organisational): strong inclusion needed, budget from both city and metropolis competences, two governance bodies (monitoring committee and the technical one), evaluation approach step by step.	1) Revealing citizens' preferences for local investment in co-creation of public value; 2) Attaining renewed citizen participation by a "bottom-up" operation and, a pedagogical form for consultation; 3) Contrasting citizens disaffection for the civil service; 4) Improving communication and transparency to strengthen legitimacy and confidence in the local government; 5) Developing joined up government and providing an additional budget.	Counter-productive effects which can weaken the process. E.g. some respondents talk about citizens "intrusion" and some managers don't know how far their role goes (ethics concern). Specifically, to the way this practice was designed: 1) A lack of representativeness and gender balance in the CCQ, mostly composed males; 2) A need for better comm; 3) Need for a robust digital platform to be completed by face-to-face contacts; 4) A need to manage overload of staff.	1) Adequate pre-existing organisational design enabling integration: Brest City and the metropolis of Brest share the same organization chart (high integration of skills and high articulation of levels of competence); 2) A rather good financial situation with a low level of debt for both; 3) A real culture of participation (seven neighbourhood consultative councils, consultation mechanism, an organizational culture of experimentation at work within an experimentation department; 4) Commitment by senior decision-makers towards fostering an evaluation culture: 5) Pre-existing inter- and intra-organisational coordination.

Co-Construction of a Territorial Cultural Strategy (FR2)

Brief Description

The practice is about two levels at which co-construction of territorial cultural projects can be strategically managed. 1) First level is based on territorial governance arrangements (D 5.3, SP3, pp. 17-23) based on strategic prioritisation and varied degree of stakeholder participation; 2) Second level is focused on leadership and the development of a leadership model of co-construction (Soldo et al., 2021 SP4, pp. 24-27). The overall focus is on the three stages of the policy cycle: co-design, co-production, and co-evaluation.

Related Bibliographical References

Soldo, E. et al. (2021). A model for co-construction of a territorial cultural strategy. COGOV Deliverable 5.3.

Arezki, D. (2019). La mobilisation collective des ressources humaines : un levier de pérennisation organisationnelle. Une approche contingente dans quatre organisations festivalières, Thèse de doctorat en Sciences de Gestion. Aix Marseille Université.

Soldo, E. (2018). Vers une théorisation de l'attractivité territoriale durable. De l'ancrage démocratique des projets culturels de territoire à l'attractivité territoriale durable. Habilitation à diriger des recherches. Aix Marseille Université.

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice)
Problem: How to implement the cultural strategy of a recent public organization: AMP Metropolis? Functions: by facilitating the participation of various stakeholders in a territorial strategic process; and by promoting a leadership model of co-construction	1) Setting up mobilising structures in order to enable stakeholders' participation; 2) Developing the ideational bases for co-construction at the individual, organisational, inter-organisational level, by developing spaces, practices, and tools; 3) Conceptualisation and categorization of leadership practises (transformational, shared and/or humanistic ones)	1) Improving participative approaches for a territorial cultural strategy; 2) Providing an operational portfolio through three levels and three strategic ingredients - each of them positioned on continuums: spaces (physical to virtual), practices (informal to formal), tools (intangible to tangible). Example: spaces as mega events or digital platforms; 3) Encouraging animation of co-constructed projects: Implementation of a plural leadership exercised and shared by various stakeholders; 4) Developing a toolbox for public territorial agencies and actors involved in co-constructed projects (creation of OTACC Chair)	1) Strong dependency on current events acting as catalyst, like the COVID crisis; 2) Risk of enhanced political antagonism	Strong context dependent (contingency approach) 1) CCI actors currently mobilize participative and co-creation approach; 2) Co-constructed projects driven by various stakeholders, included citizens; They used to work together: A opportunity for the AMP Metropolis; 3) Mix of strategic logics: top-down & bottom-up facilitate territorial dynamics

Cultural policy solutions (FR3)

Related Bibliographical References
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). [Report on case studies of Public Administrations as arenas for coproduction and co-creation](#). COGOV Deliverable 4.1
Torfing, J. et al. (2022). [Archive of Practices](#). COGOV Deliverable 4.2

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice to work)
The city councilors and directors of cultural facilities in the cultural development project took up a defensive posture in the co-creation workshops and, more generally, there was confusion amongst the participants about their roles	Use of personas with different socioeconomic and cultural participation profiles provide a boundary object for the participants to jointly focus upon when interacting (thus downplaying their different individual roles and interests). Externalization draws the attention away from the individual participants and let them focus on a common problem and challenge and that makes it easier to interact	Moderate positive impact on stimulating co-creation of cultural policy solutions as the actors gradually loosen up and participate in the discussions and end up finding solutions to lack of cultural participation.	No side-effects observed	The solution presuppose knowledge of persona method and capacity to use it properly based on research and story telling

Practices extrapolated: summative and concluding considerations

The COGOV Practices Sourcebook provides practitioners as well as academics doing extrapolation-based research in public management with a repertoire of practices analysed in such way to be usable for replication – appropriately adapted – in the different circumstances in which public services are being co-created and delivered.

This repertoire of practices may be used for the improvement of public services, the strategic renewal of public organisations, and the development of forms of co-creation across Europe and beyond.

Communication

The tables with practices and related links (plus an excerpt of the present methodological notes) are available online on the COGOV webpage here: http://cogov.eu/practice-sourcebook/ .

References [on extrapolation methodology - for the detailed references for each practice see the table]

Ferlie, E and E. Ongaro (2015, 2nd edition 2022) Strategic Management in Public Services Organisations: Concepts, Schools and Contemporary Issues, London and New York: Routledge, chapter 9 of 2nd edition in particular.

Ongaro, Edoardo (2020) 'Forms of Knowledge for the Practice of Public Administration', pp. 273-291 in Geert Bouckaert and Werner Jann (eds.) European Perspectives for Public Administration: The Way Forward. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press – available open access at: www.lup.be/EPPA