



## Recommendation 21:



Using 'Policy Making 2.0' to meet the public sector need 'Civil servants as a community of change'

### Actual solutions and services:

There are already a number of platform supporting policy making 2.0 activities platforms running, both governmental ones as well as from private organisations. However, the popularity of these e-participation platforms varies from country to country: Citizen Space; Futurium; Puzzled by Policy; SOLVIT; OurSpace; Agora Voting; kosovakosovo.com (Serbia, Kosovo); OpenKratio; Policy Compass; Sirvo A Mi Pais; FUPOL applications; Better Reykjavik; Gothenburg, Online forum; The Malmö Initiative.

Existing initiatives that support policy making 2.0 already are:

- European Citizens' Initiative (ECI)
- Online EU Public Consultations
- Petitions to the European Parliament

SWOT Analysis	
<b>Strengths</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enabling all stakeholders to participate in the decision/policy making process.</li> <li>• Citizen engagement and democratic participation.</li> <li>• Enabling citizens to offer a set of unique skills and competencies (as provided by participating citizens) that government cannot acquire or can do so at high cost.</li> <li>• Enabling governments to acquire feedback on planned or implemented policies.</li> <li>• Enabling the civil society to act a watchdog for government.</li> </ul>	<b>Weaknesses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in legislation needed.</li> <li>• High cost of implementation.</li> <li>• Not guaranteed participation of stakeholders involved.</li> <li>• Existence of bias – results and outputs may represent just a sample of the society.</li> </ul>
<b>Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More participative policy formulation.</li> <li>• Higher alignment between societal needs and policies implemented.</li> <li>• Enablement of learning processes.</li> <li>• Non-discriminatory participation in policy making</li> <li>• Transparency support</li> </ul>	<b>Threats</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neglecting citizen's opinions</li> <li>• Manipulation of user groups and/or specific resolution by organised communities</li> <li>• One-Off approaches, not sustained</li> <li>• No clear Policy Making 2.0 strategy</li> <li>• High costs in data/information curation</li> </ul>

## **Civil servants as a community of change:**

*It is widely recognized that people, not organisations, drive innovation. This is even more true in the realm of public sector. Thus, it is necessary that the responsibility and the will to drive changes percolates down the hierarchy and become a responsibility at all levels: from top-level management to midlevel managers and front line staff. They must increase their ability to drive change by collaborating more and differently with each other and with end-users such as citizens, businesses and the third sector. Public sector innovation activities must become more embedded structurally, more strategic and more systematic. Sub needs include the need for a flexible public sector and the reflection that authorities need to be more open-minded. To further illustrate through the informants' voices: "Need of an organizational structure that is flexible and adaptable" and "The collaboration between different municipalities is still difficult".*

## **Policy Making 2.0:**

*Policy Making 2.0 refers to the adoption of a Web 2.0 approach to the policy cycle composed of four main steps: agenda setting, policy design, policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation. More specifically, the adoption of a more open, bidirectional and discursive approach by government agencies offers interesting opportunities for: i) increasing citizens' participation and engagement, by providing to more groups a voice in discussions of policy development and implementation; ii) promoting transparency and accountability, and reducing corruption; iii) public services co-production, by enabling government agencies and the public to develop and design jointly government services; and iv) exploiting public knowledge and talent in order to develop innovative solutions to the increasingly serious and complex societal.\**

\*Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Grimes, J. M. (2012). Promoting transparency and accountability through ICTs, social media, and collaborative e-government. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 6(1), 78–91.

Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Hansen, D. (2012). The impact of policies on government social media usage: Issues, challenges and recommendations. *Government Information Quarterly*, 29, 30–40.

Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., Munson, S., & Glaisyer, T. (2010). Engaging the public in open government: The policy and government application of social media technology for government transparency. *IEEE Computer*, 43(11), 53–59.

Tapscott, D., Williams, A.D., & Herman, D. (2008). *Government 2.0: Transforming government and governance for the twenty-first century*. : nGenera Corporation.