ETORKIZUNA
ERAIKIZ
think tank

NEW POLITICAL CULTURE

REPORT OF THE 21st MEETING

2022/09/14

Contents

SPACE FOR DELIBERATION ON THE NEW POLITICAL CULTURE

14 September 2022, 3 pm – 7 pm

1. Programme

Theme	Person responsible
Introduction and presentation of the session	Eider Mendoza. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
Presentation by Quim Brugué and dynamics of work on the strategic questions of the group	Quim Brugué. **Autonomous University of Barcelona**
Evaluations and end of session	Eider Mendoza. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**

2. Group members

In attendance:

1. Eider Mendoza. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
2. Xabier Barandiaran. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
3. Ander Arzelus. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
4. Sebastián Zurutuza. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
5. Ion Muñoa. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
6. Itziar Eizagirre. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
7. Olatz Errazkin. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
8. Julen Cocho. **Provincial Government of Gipuzkoa**
9. Naiara Goia. **Aranzazu Laboratory of Social Innovation**
10. Mikel Irizar. **Badalab**
11. Fernando Tapia. **University of the Basque Country**
12. Andoni Eizagirre. **Mondragon University**
13. Asier Lakidain. **Sinnergiak**
14. Gorka Espiau. **Agirre Lehendakaria Center**
15. Miren Larrea. **Orkestra - Basque Institute of Competitiveness**

16. Ainhoa Arrona. **Orkestra - Basque Institute of Competitiveness**
17. Eva Sánchez. **Orkestra - Basque Institute of Competitiveness**
18. Mikel Gaztañaga. **Orkestra - Basque Institute of Competitiveness**

3. Introduction and presentation of the session

The Deputy for Governance took the floor. *'Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you very much for attending this session of the Think Tank on the new political culture. Today's session will differ from our usual ones, because we have a special guest with us, Quim Brugué. We are very excited about today's session. There has been great expectation about it. We have been working for a long time in the field of collaborative governance and new political culture and we have many issues to resolve. Several questions have been raised about the distribution of power, legitimacy and collaborative governance that we wish to work on. We have been discussing questions such as "How much power needs to be distributed?"; "Does power sharing affect our legitimacy?" and other similar questions. For this session we prepared a series of questions to work on with Quim Brugué, who is a leading expert in the field. The session will focus on these questions and queries. However, before starting the session, I would like each participant to introduce him or herself. We know Quim. He is a professor of political science and administration in the Department of Political Science and Public Law at the Autonomous University of Barcelona and a recognised expert on issues such as collaborative governance, public management and citizen participation. I like the intro he wrote on Twitter. With your permission, Quim, I am going read it: "Partner, Parent and Teacher". I love that description. That is the end of my introduction to the session, so now I'd like to ask you all to introduce yourselves. Then we will start with the workshop. Thank you very much.'*

4. Presentation by Quim Brugué and working dynamics on the group's strategic questions

All the participants briefly introduced themselves. Quim Brugué took the floor. *'Good afternoon. Thank you very much for the invitation. I'll be honest, I was really excited about attending this session. It is a challenge for me to be here today. Not only because of the expectations. You've raised some difficult questions for me to answer. If it were a course, it would be easier. A workshop is always more difficult, but I think it will be more productive. Otherwise I would just be setting out some repetitive issues. I have stuck to*

the questions you asked me. I think it's best if we approach it as a conversation, as a working dialogue. You have done some preliminary work that will facilitate this dialogue and help to generate lessons. The starting point for this session is not what I have to teach, but your questions and concerns. It's an unusual type of approach. So, I hold out no guarantees of success. However, I think it will be worth it. I think we should be shifting from courses to workshops. I think today's session could be very interesting.

'Today's session will follow the five questions you posed. But before I start with the questions, I want to give a brief introduction. If at any time you want to contribute something, feel free to jump in. The presentation will focus on the big question mark hanging over power. Power and authority both generate aversion in our society. It is difficult to talk about these topics these days. The subject of power brings people out in a rash. So, I think it's very important that you have explicitly included them in the debate. Politics is the exercise of power. That needs to be qualified, of course: there are limits, conditions, authority, etc. But, at the end of the day, it is the exercise of power. In political science we teach what power is. We should start from the premise that it is impossible to govern without power. The real question is the way in which that power is exercised.

'And so, I want to start with the question you raised: "Under what conditions can power be shared without losing legitimacy?" That is a key question. One thing I think it is important to remember is that public institutions not only have the legitimacy *to make decisions; they also have the* duty *to make them — the painful duty to make decisions, I would say. Why? Because of the current context. Making decisions in the current context is far from simple, let alone rewarding. I think the contextual factor is very important. We live in societies of enormous complexities, great diversities, antagonisms and conflicts. Governments have to address complex problems involving lots of different antagonisms, where conflict is generated. In short, we live in complex societies. In that regard, making decisions is not at all rewarding. Moreover, as I said a moment ago, the legitimacy of decision making is called into doubt. Nonetheless, those decisions have to be made.*

'To balance what I'm saying, I also have to say that these days you can't make decisions alone, precisely because of that same context of complexity. A few decades ago, governments made decisions on their own. The context of the time made that type of governance easier. Moreover, they were legitimised by having won a democratic election. They had electoral legitimacy and that was enough. Governments were backed by strong technocratic structures. The administration possessed a set of knowledge and techniques. That was sufficient to govern and solve problems. If there was a problem, an expert was called in. That person issued a technical-administrative verdict, which those in government evaluated and then synthesised into a policy. In that regard, governments were sustained by the legitimacy they derived from the electoral process and by technocratically valid knowledge. Now, however, that is unfeasible.

'During my presentation I will try to illustrate these ideas with real, practical examples. For example, the issue of prisons. The text I sent you discusses both the issue of prisons and the issue of river basins. Where should we build prisons? Traditionally, the answer to that question was based on expert opinions. We would have technical experts in the field and ask them for the most optimal answer. Those experts would submit their reports

to the politicians and the corresponding decisions would be taken. These politicians would be legitimised to make these decisions because they had been voted in at the ballot box. But would that form of governance be considered valid today? These days, as well as the two elements I have just mentioned (democratic legitimacy and expert knowledge), the government would have to listen to the citizenry, have a dialogue with stakeholders, promote participatory processes, etc.

' In Catalonia, the issue of prisons was totally deadlocked. For 15 years, we were incapable of making any progress on the issue. During that time, the population had grown by 1.5 million and the penal code had been tightened. Spain has one of the largest prison populations in Europe. Moreover, prisoners serve longer prison sentences than in other countries in the region. There were problems of overcrowding in Catalan prisons. That meant there was a problem with the prisoners. More prisons were needed. The Catalan government had been in charge of the prison system since the 1980s. The Catalan population was concerned about the issue of prisoners. That was before the financial crisis, so there was money available to build new prisons. To sum up: more prisons needed to be built because there was an objective demand; the population supported the building of new prisons; the government had the necessary powers and there was money to build them. And yet, for 15 years nothing was done. The process was completely paralysed. If the government decided to build a prison on a site, it immediately generated a lot of resistance.

'The politicians didn't understand what was going on. They didn't realise that in addition to the elements I've already mentioned, something else was missing. They needed to explain the project; they needed to talk to the parties involved and affected; the project had to be transparent, and so on. Often when governments have to make policies on controversial issues, such as prisons, they prefer to go about it in secrecy. They think: "We are going to run into resistance, so we're better to keep it secret. It's better if the population doesn't know about it". But, in the twenty-first century, that's not the way to govern. Today, dialogue and listening are essential. But, in the end, decisions have to be made. And that decision rests with the legitimately-elected government. In the case of the prisons, after a long process, four or five prisons were built. Without much

enthusiasm, with problems and with complaints. Nonetheless, though, they were built and a problem that had been in stalemate for 15 years was finally resolved. And these are modern prison facilities that have been improved in recent times. They have swimming pools and they are well maintained. They have been in the public eye a lot because of the issue of the Catalan political prisoners. A society is judged by the way it treats its prisoners. It's a good yardstick. However, such processes require time, effort and resources. People think that all they need are a couple of meetings. Clearly, that's not the case. For example, they spent €5 million on the prison process. That's a lot of money. But, they made progress on a very complex historical problem. It was worth it.

'In these cases, it is critically important to set the boundaries before the process begins. You need mechanisms to regulate the debate. In the case of the prisons, there can be no debate on whether the prisons are going to be built or not. They are going to be built, like it or not. In addition, the government, based on its ideological principles, accepts that the purpose of prisons is rehabilitation and not punishment. In the United States, the purpose of a prison is to punish the offender. So they have prisons on remote islands like Alcatraz, or in the Florida swamps. From that perspective, the Catalan prisons can't be out in the middle of nowhere. They have to be close to urban centres in order to promote rehabilitation. Moreover, the prisoners have to be close to their families; the necessary logistics can't be obstructed, and so on. What I mean is that before this issue is brought up for discussion, the government has to determine what is and is not going to be discussed. In politics, that is legitimate.

'If collaborative governance is the solution, then what is the problem? Because we have to be clear that collaborative governance is not the goal, but the answer to a problem. So what's the problem? The problem is the failure of public policies. It is the inability to build prisons, the inability to reduce inequality, to end school segregation, the difficulty in tackling climate change, etc. The problems that have to be addressed by public policy are poverty, climate change, education, segregation, inequalities, and so on. And faced with these problems, politics feels overwhelmed. The public tell us we are incompetent, that we can't solve the problems. I think we are powerless, we are overwhelmed by these problems and by the complexity. In that regard, collaborative governance is a way of

governing with problems that overwhelm us. One thing is sure and that is that we can't govern alone. The key idea is this: we can't do it on our own, we need to collaborate. The Department of Education, on its own, is incapable of solving a problem like school segregation. The Department of Environment, on its own, is incapable of solving climate change. And so, something we had incorporated to a large extent in the twentieth century, political-technical collaboration as a solution to political problems, blows up in our faces. We realise that we are powerless to solve the problems and challenges of our era. What used to work in the twentieth century is no longer operative.

'You approached me with different forms of collaborative governance. And you illustrated it with the metaphor of the pies. The pies illustrate different forms of collaborative governance. In some cases, the ultimate decision always rests with the government. In other cases, the decision rests with the territorial stakeholders. And in another, governance is built among all stakeholders. I think it's a very good metaphor. However, I believe there is only one model of collaborative governance. In my opinion, the decision should always rest with the government. As we have seen in the case of the prisons or in the case of the river basins. That does not mean that there is no need to consider the way in which decisions are made. It is necessary to renew the forms of decision making. But the decisions must be made by the legitimately-elected government. The root of the term "governance" is "government". I'm a bit of a radical on this issue. Collaborative governance doesn't mean that you stop governing; it means governing in a different way. I am very clear on this. However, the characteristics of collaborative governance differ substantially from those of traditional governance. What are the main features of the collaborative governance model? How do they differ from traditional governance? Traditional forms of governance are characterised by two things, one structural and the other dynamic. Traditional government is a pyramid. There is a hierarchy that has to be complied with. Collaborative governance, on the other hand, is organised as a network. It is a form of ecosystem, a living system.

'I'm going to give you an example to help you understand this better. I don't know if you guys here talk about or have worked with 360º Education. In Catalonia, at least, there has been a very important debate on this issue. There is a problem with education in

Catalonia: school segregation, school failure, inequality, etc. After a series of studies, people realised that segregation and inequality were due not only to the school itself, but also to all the extracurricular activities that children did: English classes, sports, music, travel, museum visits, etc. Children with limited resources could not avail of these extracurricular activities. On the other hand, 12–14 year olds with more resources took part in a total of 6,000 hours extracurricular activities. They realised that there is currently more school segregation outside *the school than in it. In that regard, the policies were aimed at levelling out this inequality. But how can you make a more egalitarian policy? The answer was the 360º Education programme. As well as the schools themselves, this policy incorporated private academies, music academies, leisure activities, museums, etc. And that means networking, working much more collaboratively.*

'As for the dynamic component, traditional governance works through procedures and protocols. What are the procedures? Basically, when there is a problem, someone finds the solution, systematises it and then people follow the defined guidelines. And administrative staff repeat the task over and over again. The procedure is to management what the assembly line is to industry (Fordist-era industry, I mean). An expert in the field says that something has to be done in one particular way. And the worker complies with the order and that's it. The worker is not expected to be intelligent or creative. They simply have to obey orders and follow procedures. That's the way you make a good car. And it's the same in the administration. In contrast, collaborative governance means that you have to discover, discuss, debate, think and be creative. You have to find the solution through dialogue. It's not about having an engineer or an expert tell you what to do. It is a construction based on dialogue. Continuing with the example of education, working collaboratively involves discussing the problem of school segregation with teachers, families, private academies, social agents, children, etc.

'Moving from traditional governance to collaborative governance can be very uncomfortable. When all you have to do is follow the procedures, everything is very convenient. It's safe. You know what needs to be done. But, if you're in a network, you don't know who is in charge, and you have to find the solution together; it all becomes more complicated. Round here, I'm sure you're all very familiar with Daniel Innerarity. He says: "you have to start from 'I don't know'. You have to say: 'I don't know what needs to be done to tackle climate change'". Of course it is uncomfortable, because it means accepting the uncertainty of not knowing. But that is where you have to start from. However, you have to strike a balance between comfort and discomfort. A politician can't say he knows nothing. Decisions have to be made, and to do that you have to know certain things. However, you have to accept that many things are not known, and it is necessary to collaborate with others to try to solve problems. That is why I say we have to strike a balance between providing answers and working on insecurity. I prefer to talk about hybrid models rather than pure models.'

DFG7 took the floor. *'I found the presentation very interesting. The government has to listen to the agents from the territory and talk to the different sectors, but the final decisions have to be made by the government. We need collaboration, dialogue and listening, but there is also a need for ruling elites. A highly-skilled government. Mariana Mazzucato talks about Politics with a capital P. The state needs to be strengthened. But, it is true that government alone cannot address the great challenges of our time. They cannot be tackled. For collaboration, you need criteria, efficiency and the right measures. But collaboration is very important and the decision must rest with the government. I found this talk very interesting. Thank you very much.'*

The Head of Strategy and Research took the floor. *'I have to go shortly, so I'm going to take this chance to say my piece. I'm going to be provocative. I want to provoke discussion. I have a substantially different view about whether the government should be the sole decision-maker. I agree that there is a need to open spaces for dialogue, collaboration and debate. However, I am not convinced that the government is the only party that can make the decision, in other words, that the decision should be made exclusively by the government. It is true that the government has to establish guarantees and conditions. However, in certain conditions, I believe it is possible to share that decision-making capacity. I believe that the public space is not synonymous with government. Civil society and organised society also exist together in the public space. In that regard, there is an interaction between public institutions and other stakeholders in the public space. And, in this interaction, spaces of shared sovereignty can emerge where power is shared when it comes to making decisions. Policies can be co-created in these spaces. In some cases, I believe it is feasible for institutions to cede some of their power and share sovereignty. We need to bear in mind that one of the problems we are currently identifying is that of political disaffection. Indeed, collaborative governance is also a response to this situation. The link between citizens and politics is very weak. In that regard, collaborative governance seeks to empower society.*

'At the same time, in the Basque Country we have a political tradition that differs from the tradition that has been inherited from the French Revolution. Sovereignty here has not been articulated in a Jacobin fashion. There have been collective, public spaces that

did not come from the state. There has been a form of sovereignty that is more diffused in the territory — in other words, sovereignty that is not concentrated solely in the structures of the government and state. That is a crucial issue in the Basque Country. It is a topic that generates a lot of debate. But it's a position that allows us to have a conversation.'

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'I understand what you mean. It is a different vision. However, I think we need to be careful about words like co-creation. I am worried about the proliferation of these types of terms. In the end we don't know what we're talking about. My hypothesis is that deliberation and co-creation are not the same thing. From my point of view, deliberation is geared towards formulating public policies. In contrast, co-creation is geared towards public actions. Let me give you an example. Barcelona City Council has a climate policy. You're probably familiar with the urban islands policy. The idea was to ban car traffic from certain areas of the city. It is a policy that has sparked a lot of concern and a lot of antagonism. If there was a popular vote on the issue, it almost certainly would not pass. As you know, there's a lot of pressure from car drivers. The mayor's office, against the will of many citizens, has placed a series of restrictions on car traffic. In this context, the city council has opened a series of spaces for co-creation. There are spaces for social innovation, in which a series of groups discuss specific contributions to solving climate change. Or to give you another example, hospitals have co-created solutions such as a mobile app; if you have a family member in hospital, it lets you know how they're getting on: whether they are in surgery, whether they're out of surgery, in post-op, what condition they are in, etc. It is a way of getting information about the person in hospital. This was a co-created solution, which even had a technological component. In co-creation spaces, you need a set of knowledge and techniques. You create a solution or a tool. That's why I think it is different to a space for deliberation. It's not about constructing a public policy. Nonetheless, to me they appear complementary.*

'A politician has a commitment to ensure that in a deliberative space, debate, listening and participation will be encouraged. And that those in charge will listen and participate in the deliberative space. In other words, the policy-maker has to hear about poverty, climate change, the prison issue, the economy, etc. It is an exercise in transparency in

which the decision-maker listens to and debates with other territorial stakeholders. Nonetheless, the decision lies with the ruler, the person who is endowed with the authority, legitimacy and responsibility to make that decision. In contrast, in co-creation spaces, citizens and technicians co-create solutions of a more technical nature, such as the app for hospitals. And in addition, they tend to be more experimental in nature. In the deliberative spaces, technicians have a more passive role. In that regard, I think we need to draw a distinction between the two spaces.'

DFG7 took the floor. *'I agree. What I was saying was along the same lines. The politician has to listen before implementing a policy. However, the ruler has the legitimacy to make the decision. Technicians usually say what is feasible, what is possible. They generally set the limit of the real situation. And then, the decision is made by the politician.'*

ECO7 took the floor. *'In my opinion, territorial actors can play a role in formulating public policies. There are issues that lie outside the scope of politicians. In my opinion, it makes sense to talk about different types of collaborative governance. The model that has been mentioned is not the only one. I am referring to the model that argues that collaborative governance consists of a deliberation between politicians and territorial stakeholders, but in which the politician always has the decision-making capacity. I think that is one model, but there are others. Territorial actors, together with politicians, can co-construct a policy in a collaborative exercise.'*

DFG6 took the floor. *'I think that the fact that a politician doesn't know about one thing or another should not be a reason for delegating responsibility. The responsibility lies with the politician. At the same time, I believe that there are issues, such as fiscal policy, that are difficult to co-create. However, I do think it makes sense to co-create innovative solutions to combat tax fraud. There are many possibilities for co-creation in the future. I believe there are many different ideas that should be open to deliberation and co-creation. Nonetheless, there should be limits, frameworks and lines that set the limits to what should be discussed. Like with the issue of the prisons. The decision is made that we are going to build several prisons. That is not in dispute. What is open to discussion is where to put them, what particular features they should have, etc. However, there are*

others, such as tax policy, which should not be open to co-creation. There are government issues that should not be shared. Above all, because of the issue of responsibility. In other words, if the policy later turns out to be flawed, the responsibility will be mine. You can't dodge that responsibility. I think that's important. Also, imagine if I had to co-create a fiscal policy with employers, unions, etc. Each of them would try to get the most for themselves out of it. I will listen to everyone, but ultimately it will be me that makes the decision. And the responsibility will be mine.'

ECO13 took the floor. *'There's something I would like to add. Earlier, when the example of 360º Education was mentioned, it was said that the ultimate decision rested with the government. However, the government was not the only decision-maker. It is true that the government took those decisions. But there were other stakeholders such as private academies, music academies and museums that also made decisions. In other words, stakeholders from the ecosystem also made their own decisions. In that regard, in order for all the decisions to be aligned there has to be a deliberation and there has to be dialogue. I think it's important to take that into consideration.'*

ECO6 took the floor. *'I'd like to make a few comments. In my opinion deliberation does not only mean that the decision always has to be made by the government. It is possible to have shared solutions. I believe there is no contradiction in this. And responsibility, just like decision-making capacity, is also shared.*

DFG6 took the floor. *'In my opinion, it varies a lot depending on the field. Education is not the same as taxation. However, I think it's always necessary to set out the game rules, the limits of what is to be discussed and what is to be decided upon. Otherwise, it can lead to a lot of frustration. And ultimately, you end up losing legitimacy.'*

ECO3 took the floor. *'Power sharing doesn't mean sharing all power. Power sharing needs requirements. We've said that legitimacy derives from democratic elections. But, in my opinion, that it is not the only space where legitimacy resides. There are other spaces. There is organised society, for example. And I always find it funny when people say that the state is above all else. We know that these days, states are controlled by the markets, and not the other way around. We saw this in the case of the Covid-19 vaccines. Who sets the price of the vaccines? Was it a decision taken by the states? In other words, there are other actors that have a decisive influence on governments. And the power being wielded by the markets is not shared. Moreover, here in the Basque Country, there has always a society that is organised for action. And there is a degree of power there that cannot be ignored. We have heard it said that collaborative governance is better than other forms of governance because it is made necessary by today's problems. In that regard, I believe that shared sovereignty and power sharing make sense. Sharing power between the government, organised society and the citizenry.'*

DFG3 took the floor. *'We should also talk about shared strategies. It is not just a question of sharing a space in which to deliberate. It also involves building shared strategies between the government and territorial stakeholders. They are aligned with the stakeholders. However, the actions are shared between the government and the stakeholders. For example, in our case, there are the reference centres. In the area of new mobility, we have tried to come up with a shared strategy with territorial stakeholders. Etorkizuna Eraikiz felt that the best way of responding to the crisis in liberal democracy was through a re-legitimisation of public policies. Shared agendas fulfil this function. Collaborative governance meets two objectives. One is to work with complex problems. In other words, the problems that politicians have to face are complex. On the other hand, though, governments have to respond to the context of public disengagement from politics. Collaborative governance has to respond to those two challenges. Collaboration and shared agendas restore a certain proximity between citizens and public institutions. Public policies need to be more responsive to problems and they need to gain legitimacy. Thank you very much.'*

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'I think it's important to talk about the issues that are being raised. You just mentioned the crisis in democracy. There is a lot of talk about the crisis in democracy. It has also been mentioned that collaborative governance is a response to the crisis in democracy and the crisis of legitimacy that public institutions are suffering. The debate on the democratic model is an old one. Who makes the decisions in a democracy? Who has the power in a democracy? Who has the final say? How do you govern in a democracy? Historically there have been two types of democracy: representative democracy and direct democracy. They are two different models. One form of democracy has been identified with voting and the other with debate and participation. At the same time, within representative democracy there are also two movements: liberal democracy and deliberative democracy. Liberal democracy is based on the idea that people, as selfish beings, seek their own advantage. They don't want to deal with other people unless it is in their own interest. In this case, the task of democracy is to evaluate the multiple individual preferences and to accept the majority option. In this form of democracy, individuals do not meet with each other and they do not engage in dialogue on issues that affect the community. In this perspective, society is seen as a*

zoo where the different animals would kill each other if there were no fences between them. In contrast, deliberative democracy is based on the idea that we are not wild animals. In other words, as citizens we are able to coexist in a space with other people who do not think the same as us. It is assumed that citizens should debate, talk, discuss and deliberate on issues that affect them as citizens. There will often be disagreements —conflict even— but that does not prevent us from continuing to live in the political community as citizens. Innerarity talks about living together when we are different.'

'However, it is often argued that representative democracy is not true democracy, because the citizens do not intervene directly but instead through their representatives. In this vision, true democracy is seen as being direct Athenian democracy. This form of democracy is based on the assembly and citizens' participation in it. Representative democracy, on the other hand, had its origins at the US Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia at the end of the eighteenth century. And that is the form of democracy we have known in recent centuries. Now that democracy is in crisis, there is a temptation to try to get back to the supposedly "authentic" democracy. In other words, to return to Athenian democracy. It has also been argued that digital tools can help generate virtual democratic assemblies. People assume that the intermediaries are now superfluous. For example, the Encyclopedia Britannica was an intermediary between scientific knowledge and the citizenry. However, with the advent of Wikipedia, that function has become meaningless. In this logic, representative democracy has become meaningless in the era of the Internet and digital voting. Citizens can make their own political decisions, without the intermediation of politicians. In reality, however, this issue is far from simple. Indeed, participation in these digital forums has been shown to be minimal.'

'You also commented on governance as interaction between institutions, territorial stakeholders and civil society. There is a movie by Ken Loach that I highly recommend called "I, Daniel Blake". It won the Palme d'Or at Cannes in 2016. I always recommend this film to my students. You really have to see it. I don't want to give away any spoilers, but I think if I explain the film you'll get a better picture of what I mean. Daniel Blake is a man from Newcastle in the north of England who has problems with the administration. He is an older man who is unable to work because of health problems.

He is also digitally illiterate. He is a person who has problems and he turns to the administration for solutions. And the people in the administration all treat him well — doctors, social workers, etc. They help him, they are generous with him. However, they don't solve his problems. Why? Because each separate part of the administration tries to solve the problem individually. However, the solution requires the different institutions to work in synch. And he is deadlocked in that lack of cooperation from the administrations.

'*The film clearly shows that there is a lack of dialogue between administrations. They are not cooperating with each other. It is a film that demonstrates the failure of public policies. We have to move from a sectoral perspective to one of dialogue. We have to accept that we can't do it alone. That is the essence of the issue. No matter how well you do things, you won't solve the problems. You need to relate to other points of the problem, to have a dialogue with other agents, and ultimately to cooperate. You need a comprehensive approach to the problem. However, it is very difficult for us to operate in this way. There is a lot of resistance from traditional governance. At the same time, we often argue that collaborative governance involves listening outside the institutions. But I would argue that you also have to listen* inside *the institutions. The institutions need to collaborate with the territorial stakeholders, but it is equally necessary to cooperate within the administration. That's what Daniel Blake's case is all about.*'

'Now I want to talk about a specific case I worked on. This is the case of racism in real estate in a city in Catalonia with a population of 25,000. The problem is that there were racialised people who argued that as people of colour, they weren't eligible to rent apartments. In other words, when it came to accessing rented accommodation, they were discriminated against simply because they weren't white. They were black people, North Africans, etc. This is an issue that happens in a lot of places in Catalonia. The media took up the issue. And a debate was generated in the city. How was this problem to be solved? There was an amalgam of actors involved in the problem: the people affected by the discrimination, the landlords, the city council, etc. A discussion process was launched to try to build a response. The baseline was a position of ignorance. There are no official protocols, it is difficult to prove racial discrimination, the landlords argued that they had

the right to rent the accommodation to whoever they wanted, etc. Some of the people involved in this problem met up for 4-5 hours every month. At these meetings they talked, they argued, but they also had a few beers and relaxed; they got to know each other; they forged bonds. After a year there were some intangible results: relationships of trust had been forged, people had got to know each other, empathy had been generated, etc. Has the problem been solved? Evidently not. However, a council service has been created, an awareness campaign has been generated in the city, etc. The role of the city council is crucial. There has been a process of dialogue, listening, discussions, etc. Now, however, the decision lies with the city council. Certainly, the other stakeholders —the landlords, the residents' associations, the racialised people and other groups— can all do things. But it is the city council that will create the public policies. It is the city council that has the power, the resources, the time, etc.

'I'll give you another example. On the Costa Brava, in Catalonia, there were problems of maritime congestion. It was a complex issue. There are lots of people and sectors living and operating around the sea in the Costa Brava: restaurants, fishing boats, nautical activity companies, etc. They all live off the sea and they need it. However, that very activity is destroying the sea. There is an awareness that it needs to be preserved. What do we do? It's a really complex issue. The government's approach is to bring all the stakeholders together: the different economic agents, academia, marine biologists, environmental organisations, sector representatives, etc. Evidently they weren't able to agree. Each of them had divergent perspectives, interests or views of the issue. The process was deadlocked. They weren't able to go from talk to action. Even so, they were able to make progress within their disagreement. People realised that it was necessary to move from debate to concrete actions. It was immediately accepted that government involvement was necessary. There was a lack of resources, a lack of time and, above all, a lack of money. It was estimated that €80,000 was required. The government would have to make some decisions. And those decisions would not be to the liking of all the stakeholders. However, the risk was that the process would not result in a concrete policy and that people would see the whole process as being pointless. A process where people engaged in conversations, and not in concrete actions. There is a danger of creating

frustration. In this regard, the government's decisions are fundamental. It has to make decisions. And decisions are tied to accountability.'

ECO1 took the floor. '*I think one has to accept that there are a lot of things that are not known. That is difficult. Accepting that premise has profound implications. We often accept that we don't know something, but we only do so very superficially. If you were to ask someone from government, they'd probably tell you that they don't know everything. But that doesn't translate into anything. Not knowing has much deeper implications; there's a big difference. I found what you said very interesting. For example, when you said we should identify the challenges we have a solution to. In other words, some challenges have a solution and we know what the solution is. You need to implement a working system, a series of procedures. However, there are other challenges that we don't know how to solve. I liked that distinction you drew. In addition, the number of problems we don't know how to solve is growing. For example, we know a lot about sustainable mobility, climate change and poverty. However, there are other aspects of these problems that we are not aware of. We don't know what needs to be done to solve these challenges. That means that we have to try to find new solutions, new routes. It means opening new doors.*

'We need a new way of working and tackling problems. In these cases, we have to go from the language of the prototype to the language of experimentation. We should be encouraging contradictory solutions — for example, fostering two solutions that are contradictory and testing which one works best. And we should be doing all this at the same time. We should encourage active experimentation. We need to learn how to live with contradiction, with different narratives operating at the same time. I believe Etorkizuna Eraikiz is a perfect way of going down this path. We should be promoting several deliberation groups that operate at the same time, like a fractal system. Some will work, some won't. This would generate contradictions and different narratives. But practical, problem-oriented solutions would emerge. Finally, I'd just like to add that I think the digital arena offers lots of possibilities: live participation, digital assemblies, etc. It is true that they there are advantages and disadvantages. But that doesn't mean it isn't an interesting area for experimentation. Thank you very much.'

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'The idea that it is good not to know things should not be made light of. In our organisations there are some things we know and some things we don't. People often say there are two spaces in any organisation: the space where decisions are made and the space where they are executed. I would add that there should be a third deliberative space for thinking, doubting, experimenting, innovating and debating. That third space is very important. You could call them the "I don't know" spaces. It is important for organisations to have this type of space. Nonetheless, you have to be careful not to destroy the other two spaces. Spaces for making decisions and executing them are just as important as spaces for experimentation. You shouldn't replace those two spaces with the spaces of innovation and experimentation. They are complementary. Someone also said we need political elites. I agree. But we also need bold politicians, who are willing to make the decisions and be wrong. However, there is little tolerance for mistakes. This is a very important issue, though. We need to create more of these spaces. The question is: how do we incorporate this type of space? You need to select several deliberative processes. But you have to be careful. We often focus on creating structures: discussion groups, spaces for participation, etc. However, the structures do not leave a lasting impression. The crucial issue is organisational culture. This is why you shouldn't promote experiments just for the sake of it. You have to promote good experiments, ones that leave their mark on the organisation. You have to generate experiments. In other words, a small number of well-developed experiments. I say that we have to promote artisan experiments; they should be promoted carefully and lovingly. We have lots of PowerPoint presentations that we use over and over again. Prison policy is not the same as real estate racism. Creating lots of new standardised processes doesn't work. We have to accept complexity. Once again, I would stress the importance of devoting resources, time and care to the processes. And you have to communicate the experiments. You need to work on communication. You have to plant the seeds of change in the organisation.*

'There is another issue I'd like to comment on. For a long time now, we've been talking about the citizen as a customer. I believe that is nothing short of suicide. Citizens are not customers. Citizens have rights, but they also have duties and responsibilities. They are

not customers who have rights as such. This interpretation has been a big mistake. Another issue that was raised was the whole issue of digital platforms. Certainly, this is an issue that cannot be ignored. However, digital platforms are not the solution to everything. For example, in both Barcelona and Madrid, several digital initiatives for citizen participation have been promoted. They have been a complete failure. The only people who got involved were IT staff. Participation was very low. More people tend to participate in person. The masses do not participate. People often want to get back to the assembly-type democracy of the ancient world. Yet clearly, Athenian direct democracy was very elitist. Only citizens participated. If you were a woman, a slave or an immigrant, you couldn't take part in the assembly. In other words, the majority did not participate. Digital democracy is very elitist. Only those who are already there participate. So we have to be careful not to get carried away with the idea of digital democracy. That doesn't mean that you shouldn't use digital platforms. That's not what I am saying. Indeed, in specific cases it may be of some use. We just need to be careful not to get carried away. In addition, these spaces usually end up talking about purely digital issues: free software, computer science, etc. They rarely address energy poverty, prisons, river basins, coastal problems, and so on. First you have to decide what you want to solve and then you can see whether digital tools are valid or not.

'Once again, I would stress that in processes where several agents with a stake in the problem are going to participate, it is important to set the limits to what is going to be discussed. I believe you have to place limits on public debate. Before launching the process, you have to say; "we want to talk about this, but not this and this". This is important, because otherwise it tends to generate a lot of confusion and, ultimately, a lot of frustration. In the processes I am involved in, before I start anything, I like to meet with the policy makers and ask them what they want to discuss and what is not up for debate. For example, on the prison issue, there was a possibility that the whole policy of building more prisons might be discussed. But, that was not up for discussion. What had to be discussed was where to put the prisons. In addition, the government's position was based on ideological principles that weren't up for discussion either: the aim of the penal system is rehabilitation; prisoners' families should not be punished, and so on. Or, in the case of the river basins, it was important to make clear that there was no plan to reroute

water from the Rhone. In other words, we had to work with the river basins of Catalonia. These issues were not up for discussion. The deliberation began from that starting point. In the case of property racism, there was no question of the landlords begin able to choose to exclude people. Also, we might have ended up discussing the difficulties young people face in accessing accommodation. This is an interesting and extremely relevant discussion. But, not for that occasion. So, in that regard, we had to debate about points that had been previously defined. These points should not be discussed. You have to delimit what you are going to talk about.'

'In politics you have to be brave. And that means saying no to a lot of things. And it involves defining what issues are not up for discussion. For example, the incinerator in Gipuzkoa or the prisons in Catalonia. Even if you launch a process of debate and citizen participation, you cannot discuss whether or not they are going to be built. Not everything is open for discussion. My thesis is that an overly general debate creates a lot of frustration. So, I would stress the importance of setting limits on the issues that can be discussed. It is a critical, highly relevant process. This preliminary work may mark the success or failure of the process.'

DFG7 took the floor. *'I fully agree with what has been said. On the issue of waste disposal, we went through all the phases you mentioned.'*

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'When you set limits, a lot of people react by saying that you are curtailing their freedom. But that's not the case. The government's responsibility is to solve this problem and to do so, you first need to establish a preliminary framework. In other words, you have to set limits. It's uncomfortable, it's true. But it's essential. At some point in time, the citizen-as-client notion took root. Customers never have any limits, but citizens do. It is essential to set limits. Setting limits is part of the teaching process.'*

ECO7 took the floor. *'In certain cases, it is very difficult to set limits.'*

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'In theory it's easy. But, in practice it is very difficult. In my opinion, it is very important that the rules of the game are clear from the beginning. If the process begins to develop before the rules are established, and you start setting the rules at the same time as the process is in progress, problems tend to emerge. It slows down the process. If that happens, many of the participants may think that the cards were rigged from the outset. On the other hand, if the limits are clear, each participant knows the game rules from the outset. The key to success lies in the phases before and after the process. In the preliminary phase, if the limits are not well established, the process is inevitably going to get bogged down. On the other hand, if the process has gone brilliantly, but the subsequent policy decisions have not been agreed on, it generates a lot of frustration. To take the example of the debate on the coastal environment of the Costa Brava, no matter how happy the stakeholders are with the debate on the marine economy, ecological damage and coastal restoration, if no subsequent decisions are taken, the stakeholders will be left with the impression that the process has failed. This is just as dangerous as not setting limits. We often place too much emphasis on the process, without giving importance to the pre- and post-process phases. And yet they are crucial to the success of the process.*

'I'd like to give you a concrete example to illustrate my point. I took part in an urban regeneration process. The aim of the process was to define how two points in the city were to be joined up. What was being debated was how *they were going to be joined up, not* whether *they were to be joined up. However, the process included a residents' association that was demonstrating against the connection between these two points. The city council did not ¡contemplate the no to the connection¡. But nonetheless, an association that was opposed to the project participated in the process. What happened? The residents' association convinced other stakeholders that the whole connection was a mistake. And as a result, most of the participants in the process turned against the connection. The city council, though, was determined to go ahead and went ahead with the connection. It generated a lot of frustration, and the process did a lot of harm. In that sense, if there are organisations, individuals or associations that do not accept the basic points of the process, it is better that they do not participate. If you're not in favour of the connection, you don't take part in the process. It's as simple as that. Because the city*

council is determined to go ahead with the connection and if you are getting involved with a view to blocking this decision, it's better if you stay out. If you participate and in the end you don't achieve your goal, you feel cheated, you get frustrated. We have to set boundaries. There's nothing arbitrary about this; the government is the legitimate authority. The government is there because it won an election with a manifesto. It is entitled to do what it proposed. A friend of mine used to say that it's important to approach things with an open mind, but not an empty one. Governments have a programme, and they plan to solve problems. They listen to the stakeholders, but they don't do so with an empty mind.'

ECO1 took the floor. *'You talked about processes and steps. But those steps imply that we view the process as linear. And often that is not possible. Complexity prevents us from operating in a linear fashion. Processes can be circular. In the example you gave about the residents' association that was opposed to the connection, what were their reasons? Because they must have had some reason for opposing the project. I'd like to know about that.'*

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'You're right. Some processes are circular and that makes it difficult to follow certain steps or sequences.'*

ECO1 took the floor. '*I'd like to talk about a figure that I think is interesting: the figure of the community connector. They have their own professional profile, but they are often connected to different spaces, communities and sectors. For example, the private sector, public institutions, the community, etc.*'

Quim Brugué took the floor. *' The figure of the connector is a very interesting one. It is linked to a form of leadership. We come from traditional models and traditional leadership. Individualistic profiles have been promoted, but now we need another type of profile. Now we have to do everything between all of us. People talk a lot about networks. But I always say that networks don't have a head or a heart. They lack the impulse of the heart, and they lack the orders given by the head. In that regard, we need profiles to drive, mobilise and galvanise networks. We talk about relational leadership.*

This is a form of leadership that starts from the position of "I don't know". In other words, it is not a leadership that provides you with answers. It is a leadership that expresses will, that galvanises networks, one that knows how to listen and is modest. That doesn't mean that it is weak leadership, though. Indeed, it has to be a leadership capable of uniting different determinations and setting them in motion. People often use the example of Pasqual Maragall[1]. People say he was a bad manager but a great seducer. Maragall was able to seduce many stakeholders. He had a vision for the city and he was able to convey that vision to stakeholders and citizens. He was able to seduce them with that vision. He was a visionary and a seducer. He was able to build bridges between stakeholders. However, that sort of leadership is not always available. In the literature, people often refer to three types of leadership style: autocratic, charismatic and bridge-building. These days people talk about female leadership. We need more female leadership. The macho model doesn't work any more.'

DFG6 took the floor. *'Apropos of what you are saying, at the Provincial Government we have promoted facilitative leadership. We've carried out a range of exercises to promote relational or facilitative leadership. For us, that is fundamental.'*

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'A metaphor I often use is the school run. I tend to compare my style of picking up the kids with my wife's. We have three children. And I have to say I have a lot of experience picking kids up from school. I am very professional about it. I have a very clear goal: to get the children out of there as quickly and efficiently as possible. I focus all my attention on that task. I don't let myself get distracted by anything. I go into the school, get the kids and we go home. It takes me two minutes to get them out of the school. If I worked in government, I'd get the best civil servant award every week. My approach is focused on efficiency. In contrast, my partner takes 45 minutes. She talks to one set of people, she talks to others, she knows the parents of our kids' friends, she knows the teachers. She stops to talk to everyone. And now I would ask you: if you were going to hire one of us, which one would you hire? Me or my partner? The schoolyard is like an ecosystem. I work with maximum efficiency. How do I achieve*

[1] Translator's Note: Pasqual Maragall is a former President of the Catalan Government and Mayor of Barcelona.

that? My strategy is to be very simple. I am a specialist in child extraction. I go into the school, get my children and leave. Now, if someone asks me what has been going on in the canteen lately, I have no idea. What about extracurriculars? I know nothing about anything beyond the child extraction. If I'm not available some day, it's very easy to replace me. I hire another specialist, explain to them how I do it, and they can replicate the procedure, without any problem. My wife, however, would be irreplaceable. She has a network, she has built up relationships of trust. She knows the teachers, she knows the kids' problems, she has built relationships of trust with other parents. That type of profile tends to be much more innovative. They generate collective intelligence. They are capable of mobilising the ecosystem. They are capable of generating solutions, of getting the stakeholders to reach agreements, etc. But the problem is that schools are being fenced off and parents now have to pick up their children outside the school. That's a problem, because relationships of trust are no longer generated, the network is disrupted. So we need to champion that type of space. We need that type of space for different people to enter into dialogue, to talk. To meet each other, in other words. These types of space are needed to solve complex problems.

'These spaces allow trust to be generated. In the case of property racism, the process allowed relationships of trust to be generated between different stakeholders. Has the problem been solved? No. But trust has allowed certain issues to move forward. My reticence about digital platforms is related to this. The digital space doesn't allow these types of relationship to be generated. We are complex societies with complex problems. We need to get to know each other, fraternise with each other, generate personal bonds. We need to look each other in the eye, we need to meet each other. To build a solid society, we need spaces where we can see each other, disagree, debate, talk, build trust. We have talked about the importance of social capital. This type of space is indispensable for that. One of the biggest problems in American society and democracy is that they have no space where they can meet. From that perspective, I think it is helpful to promote spaces of this kind. There is a book by Eric Klinenberg, called Palaces for the People, in which he argues that democracy is not only based on procedures and values, but also on spaces where citizens can meet, talk, argue, etc. The failure of American democracy may lie in the fact that American society has ceased to meet up. It's a very good book, I highly

recommend it. That thesis should remind us that it is impossible to build communities without some friction.'

ECO13 took the floor. *'We have used the concept of relational leadership. We took this concept from your work. And I agree that it is important to seduce. However, this concept often generates a degree of resistance or discomfort. I remember that at one point we were working with a Norwegian author and when we used this concept he asked us if it was the most suitable approach. We told him not to worry, that it wasn't a strange concept. But it is a concept that can generate discomfort. Or, depending on the space, it can sound strange. We've even discussed love here. I agree that affection, friction and seduction all play a very important role.'*

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'In the case of the prisons, that direct contact was decisive. When a person is speaks to his or her own audience, there isn't usually much empathy; everything seems very clear. Everyone agrees with the person making the argument. But, when we mix with other people who don't agree with us a priori, it is more difficult to set out our reasoning. There are more arguments, there are more views of the problem. For example, in the case of prisons, there were prison managers, but also prisoners' relatives, different groups, etc. Do you solve things? It is difficult to solve them. But you generate trust, you forge bonds and that dogmatic euphoria disappears. You generate a moral economy of disagreement. Explaining your reasons to others doesn't mean abandoning your positions. It means respecting other people's positions.'*

The Head of Strategy and Research took the floor. *'Collaborative governance is not just about efficiency. In other words, democracy is not just about getting a good service. It has to be something more. And this is related to the intangibles. A system doesn't endure just because it is efficient or fulfils its citizens' needs. It endures and thrives because citizens are engaged with the system. One of the great challenges we face is that the population has become disengaged from politics and institutions. And you can't solve that just by making policies more efficient. We need to promote different forms of relationship between the institutions and the citizens.'*

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'This form of engagement also changes the object. For example, when the city council agreed to discuss property racism, it accepted that this problem did exist.'*

The Head of Strategy and Research took the floor. *'What I am saying is that as a governor I want to give good service, but I also want to be loved. That may sound a bit strange. But I want to be loved. If people love me, a bond of trust is established. And if that trust exists, there is also more room to ask things of that community. That social cohesion allows for trust, which is bidirectional. If that trust exists, citizens develop a better understanding of politics. For example, the group that is meeting here today has been meeting for two years. In the time since we started, we have developed a high degree of trust. What is the purpose of this group? Among other things, it serves to build trusting relationships. It serves to structure the community and to advance community solutions. You activate capabilities within the community. For me, it is not enough just to provide services. There has to be something else. Collaborative governance is not just an instrumental issue. It has to be something qualitatively different. For example, I don't want to live in a community where if one day there is suddenly no rubbish collection, people start killing the politicians. I want to live in a community where if that happened, the citizens would think: "Something must have happened; it will be solved". Today's citizens act like rights-holders, without feeling any duty towards the community. They claim their rights, but they are not bound by any duty to the community that provides them with those rights and services. We live in complex societies and profound changes are needed in this relationship between citizens and the institution.'*

Quim Brugué took the floor. *'That reminds me of a metaphor. Children often don't like us because we set limits, we force them to do boring things, etc. I think that politics is similar. Politics has to get involved in a contradictory reality, full of different interests. Politics transforms reality, and in doing so, it impinges on many different interests. It generates discomfort. It is difficult for them to love you. The difference between a service and a policy is that with a service you want to be attended to, but with a policy you want them to transform the reality. In that sense, it is difficult for them to love you. Earlier, during the break, we were talking about the issue of waste disposal. Is it a good policy*

or a bad one? It has transformed the reality and that has generated a lot of controversy, discomfort and a divergence of interests. That is politics. I often say that the good politician is the one who frustrates society. They balance different interests. That is why the politician is unlikely to be someone who is loved. Politicians are in place to say no, to formulate answers to complex problems, etc. It's a difficult task. The politician has to educate the citizen about "no". It's like the metaphor of the child. You have to educate them about "no", about limits.

'There is an author, Margaret Canovan, who says that democracy has two souls, which are also contradictory. One is pragmatic and the other redemptive. Democracy means that our rubbish is collected, we are looked after when we are ill, highways are built for us, our elders are cared for, our streets are cleaned, our children are educated, etc.... and all this is done as well and as efficiently as possible. But democracy is more than just that. Otherwise, it would be too cold. It would be little more than a technical issue. If we put too much emphasis on this aspect of democracy, we end up freezing to death. And one of the problems of our democracy is that we have frozen to death. One of the threats to democracy is technocracy, i.e., government by technicians. This is a real danger that we have experienced in recent years. Democracy has to be something more. We ask for something more from democracy. That part of democracy is linked to our hearts. And here, the danger is that we may die of overheating. If we place too much emphasis on that side of democracy, we get populism. Democracy shouldn't renounce either of its souls. You have to combine the two. Sometimes it will be colder and other times it will be warmer. However, you have to be careful not to place too much emphasis on one side and neglect the other. And moreover, it is an unsolvable dilemma. It cannot be solved as such. There is an insurmountable tension there. There will always be a danger of technocratism or populism. You have to live with it. You have to strike difficult balances. Governing is an art, not a technique. It is something delicate. But we have to love democracy in all its fragility. It will always be attackable in its fragility. But, if we try to strengthen it by accentuating just one of those two souls, we will destroy it. And on that issue of on unstable balances, I will conclude my presentation. There are still a lot of points I want to talk about. So, you can invite me back again. Thank you very much.'

5. Evaluations and end of session

The Deputy for Governance took the floor. *'First of all, I would like to thank Quim Brugué for taking part in this session. It has been a great pleasure for us. It really has been a very stimulating session. We will continue to work on these issues, which are very important for us. I would also like to thank everyone who participated in this session. I'd like to remind you to fill out the evaluation forms. You know it's really helpful for us. Finally, the next session will be on 24 October. Thank you all very much. See you next time.'*

6. Appendices

a. Working Document No. 22

THINK TANK

Working Document No. 22. Process of deliberation on new political culture

DIALOGUE WITH EXPERTS AS A METHOD FOR DISTILLING THE GROUP'S THINKING ON COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE

(15 September 2022)

Introduction

Between September 2021 and May 2022, the deliberation group reflected on collaborative governance based on the practical problems arising from three projects: (a) the mapping of collaborative governance in Gipuzkoa, focusing on the activity of municipal councils and regional development agencies; (b) strengthening collaboration within the Provincial Government, focusing on collaboration between two specific departments and (c) clarifying and strengthening the role of the deliberation group in the ecosystem, experimenting on ways in which the individual and collective dimension interact.

In June 2022, the group began a more conceptual phase of reflection, with the aim of: (a) developing a conceptual framework for what had been learned from practice and (b) discussing those lessons with experts from the field of collaborative governance. At the June session, the group defined five questions it considered relevant for the development of collaborative governance in Etorkizuna Eraikiz. These were summarised in one key question (see Working Document 21). After a session with Quim Brugué on 14 September aimed at answering these questions, this working document sets out some of the input that is being consolidated in the narrative of some of the group's participants.

For a proper understanding of this document, it is important to note that the questions posed in the previous working document were a framework for reflection, but were not answered individually. Instead, throughout the dialogue between Quim Brugué and the participants in the deliberation group, two discourses took shape. On the one

hand, we have Quim Brugué's perspective on collaborative governance and on the other, a position that Xabier Barandiaran explicitly raised as being different to Quim Brugué's, which was expanded on by Xabier Barandiaran himself and by other members of the deliberation group. It is this dialogue between two different ways of viewing collaborative governance, and not each specific question, that has been taken as the thread running through the working document.

However, even if the five questions are not individually answered, the debate between the two perspectives could be said to quite clearly linked to the question that the deliberation group posed as a synthesis of all the others:

> Through elections, society gives power/responsibility to public institutions. What conditions need to be met to share this power/responsibility without losing political legitimacy?

This working document sets out the results of the reflection in two sections:

a) The first section includes two ways of interpreting collaborative governance that have emerged from the dialogue between the guest experts and some of the participants in the deliberation group.
b) A version of the forms of collaborative governance of Etorkizuna Eraikiz proposed by the deliberation group in the previous working document, modified in the light of the lessons learned from the dialogue with the experts.

Lessons learned on collaborative governance in Etorkizuna Eraikiz

The Think Tank's deliberation group's reflections on new political culture have not taken place in isolation. A seminar on the Etorkizuna Eraikiz case was held on 5 and 6 September, in which a significant number of the members of the deliberation group took part. In this space there was a relative consensus about the fact that Etorkizuna Eraikiz and its collaborative governance are being constituted in an *emerging* way, giving rise to a *hybrid* model in which various forms of collaborative governance coexist. This emergent nature is considered to be a strength.

This emerging, hybrid framework allows us to view the two perspectives on collaborative governance that were raised in the 14 September session as being distinct but complementary. Both can form part of Etorkizuna Eraikiz's hybrid model. Most of the experts invited to the seminar (especially Jacob Torfing —see session report— and Quim Brugué himself) viewed collaborative governance as a process that

takes place within the framework of representative democracy, when a government deliberates with the citizens or organisations from the territory, in order subsequently to make decisions that affect public policies. In this case it is understood that the sovereignty that brings legitimacy to the decision-making process derives from the legitimacy conferred on the government by the citizenry through the ballot box. What guarantees the democratic nature of the process is that the government maintains the final decision, ensuring that it prioritises the common good, and not the potential interests of the individuals or organisations participating in the deliberation process. Etorkizuna Eraikiz has examples of this type. One of these is the collaborative governance of the deliberation group on the Future of Welfare States, where, at the request of the participants themselves, a code of ethics has been developed for the entire think tank. The code establishes that the ultimate responsibility for the decisions made by the government rests with the government itself, even when those decisions are influenced by its deliberations with representatives of the policy ecosystem. However, the code also includes a paragraph proposed by Xabier Barandiaran, which introduces a different logic into the interpretation of collaborative governance. This paragraph suggests that as collaborative governance is extended, it may in the future lead to processes of co-responsibility. This would involve jointly-made decisions for which all participants would assume responsibility. This perspective was discussed with the international experts in the context of the Etorkizuna Eraikiz case and was also raised openly in the session with Quim Brugué. In both cases it was argued that in this form of collaborative governance the government does not make the final decision. Rather, it negotiates and agrees on decisions with the other stakeholders in the territory. The response of all the experts to this proposal was that if the government does not have the final decision, the process does not enjoy the democratic guarantee associated with representative democracy. There is no guarantee that the process fulfils the common good, so it would not be appropriate to commit public funds to the process.

The members of the deliberation group who posited this other way of looking at collaborative governance based their arguments on the existence of community logics in which another type of legitimacy is formed. In the dialogues at the think tank, Etorkizuna Eraikiz's reference centre, Badalab, was raised as a specific case based on

this kind of interpretation. In practise, there are also elements of this kind in the dynamics of the deliberation group on the future of work. The government works with other territorial stakeholders on a public agenda in which no one has the capacity to unilaterally make the final decision. In this framework, the Provincial Government still retains the final say on its political agenda and the other stakeholders retain the final decision on their own agenda. Each of these agendas, however, is only one part of the public agenda and the decision on the public agenda as a whole can only be a shared one.

We now return to the central question of the deliberation group: What conditions need to be met to share this power/responsibility without losing political legitimacy? Simplifying, the answer most frequently given by the guest experts was that it is the government's final decision that enables power/responsibility to be shared without sacrificing political legitimacy.

Through its praxis, Etorkizuna Eraikiz is problematising this answer and posing both (a) an alternative and complementary form of collaborative governance in which the government waives its right to make the final decision; and (b) a form in which the government simultaneously retains the final decision in its political agenda, but waives it in the public agenda.

Thus, the question posed by the group remains for cases in which we want to explore approaches that have been described as “more communitarian”. The cases from Etorkizuna Eraikiz cases that follow this logic could constitute empirical sources of learning in this regard.

We could sum this up by saying that the discussions with experts have allowed the group not only to learn from them but also to use them as a mirror of its own discourse, helping to clarify it. It has also been noted that the ideas put forward by the deliberation group are not exclusively theoretical, but are also based on Etorkizuna Eraikiz praxis. This allows for the possibility of proposing a new phase of learning-by-doing that could focus on cases such as Badalab and the deliberation group on the work of the future, which are closely linked to the deliberation group's activity.

Concerning the different forms of collaborative governance in Etorkizuna Eraikiz

In the light of the dialogue between Quim Brugué and some of the participants in the deliberation group, we now return to one of the contributions set out in Working

Document No. 21, with regard to the different forms of collaborative governance of Etorkizuna Eraikiz.

In this working document, three ways of viewing and practising collaborative governance were proposed, inspired by the experience at Etorkizuna Eraikiz. We return to this contribution because to a large extent it represents the lessons learned at the session on 14 September. However, some of its elements need to be qualified.

At the June session, when this typology was first presented, a certain evolutionary linearity between them was proposed. In other words, some were considered to be more advanced than others and an evolution from one to the other was proposed.

If we accept that Etorkizuna Eraikiz develops in an emergent and hybrid form, the hypothesis of linearity between these forms loses strength. It seems more logical to interpret them as different forms of collaborative governance that coexist within the same framework, giving Etorkizuna Eraikiz greater flexibility to adapt to different contexts. This idea was reinforced by Eider Mendoza during the session with Quim Brugué, when she pointed out that collaborative governance has to be adapted to each specific context and that the conditions do not exist in all cases for the government to waive its right to make the final decision.

The following is a summary of the three ways of viewing collaborative governance proposed by the group in June 2022, adapted to the learnings from the previous section.

a) Governance focused on decision-making, resources, strategy and leadership by government

This is a type of governance that is framed within the political agenda. These are deliberative processes that the government opens up to participation by other ecosystem stakeholders, but based on the government's decision-making capabilities, resources, strategy and leadership. The main role of the people invited to participate in the processes is to contribute knowledge.

Through such knowledge, participants can influence government decisions. However, the ultimate policy decision always lies with the government. Returning to the examples raised in the previous section, the deliberative group on the futures of welfare states would match this view of collaborative governance.

b) Governance centred on the decision-making capacity, resources, strategy and leadership of all stakeholders involved

This is governance that is framed within the public agenda, which is broader than the political agenda. These are processes in which all participants, including the government, contribute not only knowledge, but also decision-making capacity, resources, strategy and leadership on problems that affect everyone.

Throughout the process, the various stakeholders can influence each other's decisions. However, after joint deliberation, each stakeholder makes the decisions within its own sphere of competence.

Thus, the government continues to make decisions on its policies, just as the other stakeholders make decisions related to their sphere of action, but these decisions are aligned around a common objective. An example of this interpretation is that of the deliberation group on the future of work.

c) Governance focused on the decision-making capacity, resources, strategy and leadership of the territory (community)

This requires that the territory/community be interpreted as a collective subject that is seen as something more than the simple sum of territorial stakeholders. In this case, not only are the decisions made by each territorial stakeholder mutually influenced, but a collective decision-making space is generated, in which there are resources, strategies and leaderships that pertain to the territory or the community (and not exclusively to the government).

In this case, the government links some decisions on its political agenda to the shared public agenda, over which it does not have the final decision-making capacity.

According to most of the experts with whom we have spoken, for this it would be necessary to specify other democratic guarantee mechanisms. One example that can be used to reflect on this interpretation in practice is Badalab.