

COGOV WP 4: Experiences and Practices of Co-creation and Co-production

The role of strategic management practices for co-creating public value outcomes

Report on WP4 T4.1-T4.4 prepared by Jacob Torfing and Eva Sørensen

April 2022

1. Theoretical validation of conclusions from design experiments

The previous report on T3 also contain a theoretical validation of the lessons drawn from the positive results gained through the design experiments. The theoretical validation will be expanded in a forthcoming publication. Eva Sørensen, Jacob Torfing and Mitja Dečman are contributing a jointly written article to a special issue of *Public Policy and Administration* that will discuss the lessons drawn from the design experiments about how to spur co-creation and reflect on the use of design experiments as a method of interactive research bringing together researchers and practitioners. The article will further dig into the theoretical support for the interventions that proved successful in overcoming problems and challenges to co-creation. This article is supplemented by an article for *Cities* that is currently under review. In this article Eva Sørensen and Jacob Torfing reflect on the use of design experiments in Gentofte municipality from 2015 to 2021 and further discuss the theoretical support for the interventions in the Gentofte case where the actors aimed to turn public libraries into cultural hubs.

Theories and practical experiences are often drawn up to motivate interventions in design experiments and the results of the interventions helps to confirm, falsify or revise the understanding of what works in a particular context and situation. To illustrate, it is well-known in research that knowledge sharing between participants in co-creation is important in order to facilitate effective participation in innovation processes (Markovic and Bagherzadeh, 2018). This insight supported the intervention in the Gentofte case where it was found that knowledge discrepancies prevented the participants to participate on an equal footing in developing the libraries into cultural hubs. Visits to the six public libraries were organized and helped to level the field of knowledge between the actors, but created an unintended negative effect as the librarians were highly defensive in the meeting with the participants in the Task Committee as they gave the impression that everything that was suggested by the participants was already in place or had already been tried, thus leaving the participants disempowered by the inability to contribute anything new. So, while the theoretical insights from existing research is confirmed, the result of the intervention leads to the recommendation that knowledge sharing is not organized as presentations followed by Q&A, but perhaps as a quiz where the participants in the task committee use Menti to vote for answers before they are presented with the right answer. This technique was tried in another Task Committee with much success as it contributed to knowledge sharing in a way that empowered the participants and created an informal and funny exchange when the participants were surprised about the result.

2. Development and dissemination of context specific recommendations

The COGOV project decided to collect recommendations across all work packages and construct a Practices Sourcebook that overlapped so much with T2 in WP4 that we chose not to do a separate list of context specific recommendations based on the design experiments,

but instead spend the time and energy contributing to the said Practices Sourcebook. Here the context-specific problem is presented followed by the key mechanism producing an effect, the main positive effect achieved, the potential side effects and the contextual factors enabling the generation of a positive effect.

The contribution from WP2 to the Practices Sourcebook is show in table 1.

Table 1: WP4 contribution to Practices Sourcebook

Problem addressed / Function Performed	Brief Description and <u>link</u> (Report and pages where practice described)	Key Mechanism(s) producing the effect	Main (positive) effect(s) expected of the practice	Side effects?	Key Context Factors (enabling the practice to work)	Practice Detected on the field or co-created? [D / Co-C]
COVID-19 lockdown halted face-to-face interaction in co-creation project at heritage site	The co-creation project created outdoor excavation test pits in peoples back gardens that prompted discussions over the fence (p. 11)	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 prizes	No side effects observed	Good connections to local citizens helped recruit participants in new type of activity	Practice was detected in the field [D]
A co-created playground at the heritage site was subject to anti-social behavior and vandalism that had the potential to attract negative media attention and undermined the idea that the neighborhood deserved good public facilities	The response involved a meeting with the park ranger, the local high school, citizens, the local councillors 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 (p. 11)	The standard inclination to call the police and press charges was defeated in favour of a constructive management of the conflict	Positive impact on the overall goals as the threat to the co-creation process ended up extending and strengthening it and today 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 a common ownership to and pride in the local community enabled local actors to take a constructive stance reaffirming community values	Practice was detected in the field [D]
The lack of open-access data regarding past projects prevents local actors from getting a comprehensive picture of what has been done so far under the Rijeka Local Partnership Program (RPLP)	The RPLP program has created a data repository, which is a part of the City of Rijeka e-Services portal. It has also built a GIS database that publish data on a web map (p. 12)	Transparency ensured through digital solutions enable local actors to see where past projects were conducted and where there was a need for new projects	Positive impact on the democratic legitimacy of future co-creation since the availability of project descriptions combined with GIS data tends to assure a more fair spatial distribution of the local projects funded by the City of Rijeka	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	Practice was co-created [Co-C]

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	Two active citizens with previous experience from RPLP projects will be added to the selection committee starting with the year 2022 (p. 12)	The addition of citizens representatives enhances input legitimacy and the fact that they were active and experienced enhances output legitimacy	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, but it is important that the citizen representatives enjoy popular support and a fairly appointed/ elected	The solution was predicated on the willingness of established organizations to share power with active citizens	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
The RPLP program lacked a formal evaluation procedure that assesses and compares the success and sustainability of the local projects	A broad range of participants were involved in developing, testing and refining a new framework for project evaluation in several stages (p. 12)	Collaboration with a broad range of actors both stimulated needs-based innovation and built ownership over the solutions	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	Local organizational capacities were needed to drive the collaborative innovation process	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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 (p. 12)	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	Positive impact on the participants' motivation to try something new and pursue innovation	No side effects observed	No particular conditions for the solution	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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	There was created a new type of open meetings with no fixed agenda, a more withdrawn facilitation and plenty of room for brainstorming and discussion (p. 12)	Open meetings helps to prevent oversteering and frees up time for free, open and unhurried discussions that stimulate innovation	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	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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	Letting the libraries tell about the libraries and letting the citizens ask questions would create a massive knowledge transfer	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	Negative side-effect as the librarians turned quite defensive and gave the impression that everything had or would	The solutions required extra meetings and local resources for planning of the site visits	Practice was co-created [Co-C]

	there was time of Q&A (p. 13)			be tried, thus reducing the space for innovation		
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 (p. 13)	The cure of talk-centrism is to act and show that co-created action is possible and has real effects	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	Negative side-effect as 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	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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 (p. 13)	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 side effects observed	The solution merely required facilitation of deliberation	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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 (p. 13)	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 decisionmaking	The solution merely required facilitation of deliberation	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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 (p. 13)	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	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
There was a general and discouraging feeling that	Decided to hold board meetings focusing on practical	Forcing the board to discuss concrete actions would help to	Limited positive impact on the innovation ambition of the participants:	Negative side-effect occurred because	The solution merely required facilitation of deliberation	Practice was co-created [Co-C]

meetings were all talk and little action.	implementation and the planning of concrete activities and next steps (p. 13)	demonstrate the value added of policy co-creation	their mutual relations and aspirations were strengthened	action decisions were postponed		
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 (p. 13)	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	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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 (p. 13)	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	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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	Practice was co-created [Co-C]
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	In order 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 FareShare	Blended finance combining contributions from manifold public 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	Practice was detected in the field [D]
Relying on external public financing meant that food packages could only be given to	The project decided to enhance the reliance on volunteers and donations and	Scaling down public funding and enhancing private funding can free co-creation projects	Positive impact on the fulfillment of physical needs of local families and the kids participating in the holiday camp due to	No side-effects observed	A local tradition for charity contributions is an important condition for this solution	Practice was detected in the field [D]

<p>certain families and not to all families in need</p>	<p>only employ one seasonable employee in order to gain financial independence</p>	<p>from constraining rules and strings attached to public money</p>	<p>enhanced self-management and self-financing</p>			
<p>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</p>	<p>Gaining financial independence through voluntarism and donations meant that collaboration with the external, national-level actor was no longer needed</p>	<p>Collaboration between local partners who know each other well and is on an equal footing will generate trust</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No side-effects observed</p>	<p>A local tradition for charity contributions is an important condition for this solution</p>	<p>Practice was detected in the field [D]</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>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)</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>No side-effects observed</p>	<p>The solution presuppose knowledge of persona method and capacity to use it properly based on research and story telling</p>	<p>Practice was co-created [Co-C]</p>

3. Creation of learning game in both an online and board game version

In order to disseminate insights generated in WP4 T1-T3 as well as in the rest of the COGOV project, we have created a learning game called the COGOV GAME. Gamification of research results and practical insights is on the rise and part of a new learning game trend. We play games from we are children and all the way through our upbringing and even in adult life. The use of all sorts of games is increasing, especially amongst young adults. Games used for learning purposes are often referred to as serious games as they tend to teach the participants a particular repertoire of actions. Serious learning games are an effective way of communication research results and transforming them into new actions. People often learn more and better from an active mind-body experience than from a passive reading of a text (book, article, report or brochure) or a passive viewing of a slides show or animated movie. The use of games creates an exciting, funny and playful situations where people are performing new actions and learning from the feedback. By placing the players in a fictional space in which they have to overcome obstacles and act in new ways, they gain confidence in their own ability to do new things. This empowerment effect helps people to try to act differently in real life situations. New research confirms the positive impact of the use of learning games in teaching of practitioners (Vlachopoulos and Makri, 2017).

The target group for the development of the new COGOV games was local public managers and employees in charge of orchestrating co-creation processes. The purpose of the game was to communicate learnings from the COGOV to practitioners, but we soon discovered that the insights from the COGOV project had to be supplemented by more general insights from the past decade of co-creation studies in order to develop a comprehensive learning game covering all the different phases and aspects of local co-creation processes.

The participants in WP4 began the development of the new learning game with a series of online meetings in 2000 where we discussed ideas for fictional cases and the kind of insights from different WPs that should be flagged in the game. It was also discussed whether to go through with the original plan of developing both a board game and an online game. Experiences with previous games such as the Danish games COCREATOR and POLICVYMAKER spoke against the online version since the pedagogical effect of playing the game in a group sitting around a table and playing a board game is huge and much bigger than the effect of sitting at home playing an online version. The board game becomes a boundary object that different actors focus upon and learn from playing. However, the disadvantage of the board game is the complicated distribution through the mail and package delivery service that acts as a barrier to its diffusion and usage. An innovative solution to this dilemma was found since we decided to make a board game that could be distributed online through the downloading of a print file that people can take to their local print facility to print out all the material to be used when playing the game (except for the box that contains the game). The print-and-play version of the COGOV game can be downloaded freely from the GOGO website. This solution ensures that the game can be played in all corners of Europe and indeed the entire

world with maximum pedagogical effect, but no transportation problems and no costs (except for the printing).

Alongside the initial discussions of the storyline for the game, a suitable design company had to be found and a contract had to be signed. The Danish lead of WP4 contact several private companies and chose the one with the most experience with games in this areas and a competitive price. Hans Peter Hartsteen from the game company participated in several brainstorming meetings with the partners participating in WP 4 and had several bilateral meetings with the Danish lead of WP4. Close collaboration between researchers and game developers is essential for developing an insightful and exciting game that is worth playing. Researchers sometimes attempt to develop a learning game on their own and the result is often a game with many insights but a lousy game dynamic. Conversely, serious game developers sometimes try to develop game all by themselves with the result that the game dynamic is great, but the learning content is poor. In the development of the COGOV GAME, we worked together to design the storyline and the game dynamics. The researchers then wrote all the text into templates provided by the game developers and the prototype was then changes several times through joint evaluations and further as a result of more than 10 test games with different groups of players from different countries.

The COGOV GAME is meant to be played by a group of 2-6 people. The group play together against the game, thus allowing joint reflection and learning. The groups is first presented with a fictional situation. Lanice Municipality somewhere in Europe is experiencing an increasing frequency of torrential rain that causes the river to overflow, thus generating massive flooding problems that call for the co-creation of innovative climate adaptation solutions. At the same time, the central government requests that all municipalities develop local climate action plans for climate change mitigation. The Municipality of Lanice decides that the flooding problem should be solved as a part of a local climate action plan and establishes a new Climate Task Force that brings together a diversity of public and private actors who will work together to co-create a set of solutions that will eventually be discussed and endorse by the City Council. The City Council selects a group of public managers to lead the Climate Task Force. The players playing COGOV GAME is that group of public managers responsible for orchestrating the co-creation process.

The drama in the game is that the public leaders of the Climate Task Force AKA the group playing the game encounters a series of problems that are formulated as dilemmas. There are two dilemmas in each of the five phases: convening, facilitation, innovation, implementation and evaluation phases. When facing a dilemma the players have to choose between three solutions. To select a solution they must pay with resources that they get from the fictional participants of the Climate Task Force that they have selected at the beginning of the game. When they have selected and paid for a solution, they turn the game card to discover the impact of the chosen solution. The impact is described in words and translating into points achieved on four different success parameters:

1. **Innovative solutions:** The novelty of the co-created ideas and practices. Innovation is important because today's problems cannot be solved by yesterday's solutions.

2. **Joint ownership:** Support for the innovative solutions from key stakeholders and the general public. Joint ownership is important because it reduced implementation resistance.
3. **Sustainable Outcomes:** The solutions effectively solve the problem at hand. In the final instance co-creation is about making a difference by having a real impact on the world.
4. **Trust and network:** Improved relations between the involved actors. Trust-building and the formation of well-functioning networks pave the way for future collaboration.

The players win the game if their choices lead to a high and balanced score on the four parameters that is higher than the excellence level marked on the board. The players do well if they get points higher than the critical scope level. Playing the game again will yield new learnings and offer a chance to perform better and win the game with a high score.

At the final COGOV conference in Utrecht—28th and 29th of April 2022—an almost complete version of the COGOV GAME was tested by +30 researchers and practitioners. The test took place at the morning of the 29th of April and lasted around 2 hours.

Facilitated by a researcher from the Danish lead of WP4, a small group of four participants played the game online and reflected on the findings with the facilitator. Given the limitations of the online setting, the online test was remarkably successful in visualizing the considerable benefits and also some of the limits of learning through board games, such as identifying with the case focusing on issues pertaining to sustainability and climate change. The online players were highly satisfied with the game and congratulated COGOV for this achievement

The participants present at the conference played in small groups sitting together in a large conference room. After a brief 10-minutes introduction laying out the idea and structure of the game and instructions to note any problem encountered when playing the game, the players began playing the game. A researcher from the Danish team observed the game playing and noted how the different steps in the game functioned in practice.

At the end of the on-line and physical game testing sessions, we collected comments and recommendations and we conducted a brief oral evaluation. The game was a huge success and many participants wanted to know more about how to acquire the physical game and gain access to the online version. Following the comments and observations, we made a few corrections to the game in early May 2022 before we produced the final version that were then sent to all partners in the form of four physical board games and a link to where the print file can be downloaded. The link is: <https://participation.dk/>

The COGOV GAME can be used in many different ways. As a part of blended teaching at universities or in master programs, in connection with a public presentation about leading and managing co-creation or as a tool for self-learning by a group of employees in a public agency.

A major strength of the COGOV game is that it is self-facilitated. The players open the game box, set up the game as indicated on the enclosed drawing, pick up the game cards and start to play. There is no need for introduction or facilitation. The players must not spend time learning the rules or reading a manual. The COGOV GAME can be played right away. It is easy to play and the rules are few and explained along the way when they are necessary.

Each of the GOGOV partners will use the games they have received in the coming years and slowly expand knowledge of the game. The partners in WP4 will advertise the game via LinkedIn and Twitter to ensure that people know about the game and start using it.

4. Developing national and European beacons for inspiration and knowledge diffusion

When planning the design experiments in WP4, we were looking for spectacular cases that had accomplished something extraordinary that could serve as potentially inspire others to advance their capacity and efforts to co-create solutions to complex and turbulent societal problems.

Although all the cases selected for the design experiments had something special and noteworthy to offer in that respect, COGOV identified three cases as beacons of best practices partly because that they had something significant to contribute within their particular context, but also because they came from different corners of Europe and produced similar findings to some of the other cases. The three selected beacon cases were the Local Partnership Program from Rijeka in Croatia, the Hidden Hillfort Heritage project from Cardiff in Wales and the Task Committees from Gentofte in Denmark.

The initial idea was to organize on site seminars with participants from other national and European municipalities, but when we started planning the beacon events in November 2021 the COVID-19 pandemic spoke against this format. We feared that we would eventually create super-spreading events. The alternative solution was to showcase the three beacon cases at the final COGOV conference held in Utrecht on April 28th and 29th, 2022. Representatives from the three cases took part in the workshop well-visited workshop. The representatives from Cardiff and Gentofte participated on-line while five people from the Rijeka case participated in person in the workshop.

The workshop was facilitated by Jacob Torfing from the Danish team leading WP4, who started out by explaining the what, why and how of co-creation and then introduced the rationale for conducting interactive research on co-creational leadership based in design experiments to the +20 on-site and online participants, and then moved on to interviewing the representatives from

the three beacon cases. The interviews focused on two of the most remarkable design interventions in each of the three cases.

First interview was with Josipa Cvelic from the City Government of Rijeka. The design experiment carried out in relation to the Local Partnership Program from Rijeka in Croatia had identified two problems: 1) The exclusion of citizen voices in the selection committee that consisted of organized stakeholders and media people; 2) The lack of formal procedures for evaluating the projects co-created by different actors and financed by the municipality. The first problem was solved by recruiting two ordinary citizens to the selection committee and the result was an enhance legitimacy of the selection committee's work. The second problems was solved by inviting citizens and relevant stakeholders to develop and test a framework for evaluation of local urban development project at different stages. This intervention was a huge success as it not only produced a new framework for project evaluation with a joint ownership that secured its usage, but also sparked a lot of additional collaborations and new ideas to projects involving public actors and citizens. In the wake of the intervention, the involved actors agreed that involving citizens in evaluating city development projects should be mainstreamed. Moreover, it was decided to involve university students in conducting evaluations since that would serve a valuable learning purpose and provide resources for evaluation.

The second interview was with Eva Elliott from Cardiff who was involved in the Hidden Hilfort heritage project that was a collaboration between a local NGO, community historians at Cardiff Business School and people from a deprived community with a long tradition for participation in co-creating public value. The researchers in GOGOV and the project participants decided to make two design interesting interventions. First, since COVID19 made it impossible to carry out the joint activities of the partners in the heritage project, an alternative solution was designed. Hence, 36 families were invited to make test pit excavations in their back garden in search for objects that said something interesting about the neighborhood. The participants were to film the work at their test pits. The films were shown all over the neighborhood and triggered much debate in the community about all the heritage related things people cherished and how to protect them. Second, in response to some incidents of vandalism against a playground that was created by the project, the researchers and project leaders decided to mobilize the local community and police to put pressure on those responsible and win their support for the heritage project. This turned out to be an effective strategy. The interventions highlighted that much can be achieved through local co-creation but also that strategic efforts by the local government to support such initiatives is extremely valuable.

The third interview was with Dorte McEwen who is a leading public manager in the city of Gentofte and responsible for a network of the municipal facilitators of co-creating policy-making committees consisting of local citizens and politicians that are known as Task Committees. Since 2015, the City Council in Gentofte has developed most of its new policies is Task Committees consisting of five elected politicians and ten citizens, and to improve the functioning of the Task

Committees, researchers from Roskilde University and the municipality decided to make a number of interventions in a new Task Committee aiming to transform the local public libraries into cultural hubs. The first design intervention aimed to overcome a certain present bias among some committee members who worried that efforts to innovate the libraries would come at the expense of all the things they liked about the existing libraries. Hence, addressing this concern by letting all the Task Committee members list what they wanted to keep and what they wanted to add helped reassuring the participants that there was no zero-sum game between the old and the new library functions. This recognition greatly improved the appetite for innovation through co-creation. The second design intervention addressed the tendency toward oversteering in the Task Committee. The highly skilled and knowledgeable facilitator often ended up talking too much and the formal agenda for each meeting was so packed with presentations that there was hardly any time for open and free deliberation through which new and innovative ideas could emerge. In response, the researchers and Task Committee chairs decided to add a meeting with no agenda where the participants could debate whatever came to their mind. The meeting was a great success, and the municipality has decided to include such meetings in future Task Committees to stimulate brainstorming of new and innovative ideas.

Following the three interviews with people from the three beacon cases, came an interview with Professor Jean Hartley from the Business School at the Open University in London who commented on what she had heard from the three cases and had read in the case reports. She found that it was highly valuable studies with a strong potential for adding the comparative analyses of the dynamics in co-created governance processes. She also liked the design experiment approach and asked for further elaboration of the format of such experiments and how it differed from or overlapped with action research. She was also interested in hearing more about the role of leadership in co-creation processes. Is it possible to differentiate between different kinds of leadership and what are the roles of politicians and civic leaders? Also what is the role of joint sense-making and appeal to emotions etc.? She was also wondering how goals travel and are transformed in co-creation processes, and how design experiments can help to encourage people to participate and empower different types of actors to contribute to the collaborative process. She was also wondering if public value is sometimes destroyed through co-creation. She stressed that she saw a clear connection between co-creation and innovation that was brought out in the design experiments.

The workshop concluded with an open plenary discussion amongst all participants. A practitioner from Croatia noted that it was a limitation that they had not involved politicians in the project and found that the technical staff in the municipality was reluctant to collaborate with lay actors. A researcher who is not part of COGOV stressed that it is important not to treat politicians as one group as they differ in a number of respects. Also we should not forget to analyze the role of ideology that drives some politicians and makes it hard for them to co-create. Another public administrator from Croatia pointed out that city governments are rigid organizations, i.e. that the city is a big system with clearly demarcated silos. That makes co-creation difficult. Moreover, she

pointed out that citizens are often negative towards public employees and visa-versa, which makes co-creation difficult. Moreover, many citizens do not want to participate. The situation is that public actors and citizens do not know how to get together. She stated: “We want the same but we do not know how to make the conversation. I need tools to work together. She found that design experiments were a valuable means to search for ways to begin to work together. Another Croatian public administrator added: “We need to educate the employees to co-create with citizens”.

All in all, the workshop help to bring out key learnings from the design experiment and discuss their potential usage in other localities.

References

Markovic, S., & Bagherzadeh, M. (2018). How does breadth of external stakeholder co-creation influence innovation performance? Analyzing the mediating roles of knowledge sharing and product innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, 173-186.

Vlachopoulos, D., & Makri, A. (2017). The effect of games and simulations on higher education: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1), 1-33.