Deliberative Collaborative Governance

Margaret Gollagher and Janette Hartz-Karp[1]

Introduction

Deliberative democracy, described as a way to revitalise our democratic systems of governance through public deliberation that is egalitarian, representative and influential, has attracted research and evaluation of its public deliberation processes, but little focus on its impacts on governance and institutionalised power relationships – so central to democracy. Hence, not a lot is known about if or how deliberative democracy initiatives have resulted in more democratic, collaborative forms of decision-making and leadership. In other fields, there are mounting examples of innovations in collaborative governance throughout the world, however disappointingly, there has been little systematic documentation and analysis of either the extent to which these collaborative governance initiatives were deliberative, or the precursors, enablers and success factors of collaborative governance, and where it occurs, its institutionalisation. To understand how we might effectively replicate these ventures, we need to know more about the conditions that let to their emergence, what led some to be more effective than others, and what led some to become embedded as the usual way of doing governance. For the theory and practice of deliberative democracy, this understanding is or should be pivotal.

The intent of the following paper is to contribute to the development of more systematic documentation and analysis of deliberative, collaborative governance throughout the globe. It endeavours to select case studies of decision-making processes from around the world that incorporate the coherent voice of public deliberations into policies and decisions, integrating everyday citizens as 'co-producers' of future plans and actions. It examines innovations where collaborative decision-making processes are being used to embed more democratic, participatory spaces. The study also briefly considers actual or possible changes to governance that have or could result, and factors that might support success. Using this as a starter document, the next step is to explore the experiences and insights of practitioners and decision-makers who are pioneering deliberative collaborative governance (DCG) in the contemporary context. The aim is to elicit more detail about the governance mechanisms of the examples outlined here, to document additional examples, and to analyse the results in order to inform deliberative democracy theory and practice.

Collaborative governance in the literature covers a broad and mostly ill-defined array of initiatives. Although this is briefly outlined, the focus of this paper is on *deliberative* collaborative governance. This is a hazardous endeavour since it is often unclear from the descriptions provided whether cited examples of collaborative governance are in fact deliberative. It is quite likely that after further information and analysis, some of the examples given may no longer fit under our deliberative

umbrella. Our aim has been to include examples that explicitly or at least appear to incorporate deliberation as an integral part of collaborative governance.

Methodology

The first step in this research has been to carry out a desktop review of academic research and case studies of governance processes from around the world where decision-making has been shared between a variety of parties, including some or all parties, such as governments, stakeholders, NGOs, businesses, activists, academics and communities. This has included some initiatives designed and facilitated by deliberative democracy/public participation practitioners and researchers. Similarities and differences in approaches were noted, as well as innovations in the way people have managed and engage in collaborative governance.

The next phase will be to disseminate this paper to deliberative democracy, dialogue and deliberation and community engagement networks. Our aim is for interested practitioners, public officials, academics, industry and community members involved in deliberative, collaborative governance to contribute their information and insights to this work. We are currently examining some innovative ways to interactively collect and analyse this information through crowd sourcing.

The proposed outcomes of this work are to develop a more comprehensive data base and analysis of deliberative collaborative governance throughout the world, including a typology of how these initiatives could be classified/grouped; publish and hopefully inspire others to publish research in this area; and for this endeavour to potentially transform into a vehicle for ongoing communication about this field of work by those involved throughout the globe.

The theory and practice of 'collaborative governance'

Researchers have recognised an increasing trend in the use of 'collaborative governance' around the world (e.g. Ansell and Gash, 2007; Emerson et al., 2011; Boulding and Wampler, 2010). Complex policy issues, such as health, environmental issues, and land use and transport planning, require integration across a wide variety of disciplines and government responsibilities. For example, public health outcomes are determined by a combination of impacts including health promotion, disease prevention, and safety over the short and long term. They therefore require wise, interdependent action across government agencies, and/or between people from business and civil society (Fierlbeck, 2010, 2). One way this is attempted is through collaborative governance. While it is not the only way, nor always the best way for people to work together (O'Flynn and Wanna, 2008), it can be used to consider and address issues that cannot be fully addressed by individual government departments or sections of the community.

'Collaborative governance' is interpreted and practiced in a variety of ways (for example see Ansell and Gash, 2007; Donahue and Zeckhauser, 2011; O'Flynn and Wanna, 2008; Emerson et al., 2011; Rasche, 2010; Sirianni 2009; Innes and Booher, 2004; Gunningham, 2009; Bicking and Wimmer, 2011; Lee, 2011; Bryson, Crosby, and Stone, 2006; Page, 2010; Ralston, 2008; Ashford and Rest, 1999; Boulding and Wampler, 2010; Kemmis and McKinney, 2011). The diversity of interpretations exists

partly because theory is evolving as the practice of collaborative governance evolves, and partly because of the variety of political and social contexts involved. On the one hand, the malleability of the definition of collaborative governance can be seen as positive in that it allows legitimate and sensible interpretation of the concept to suit the context in which it is being used. On the other hand, however, it also comes with the risk of being loosely applied to modes of working together that may be more 'cooperative', 'coordinated' or even 'coercive' than 'collaborative' (O'Flynn and Wanna, 2008, 184), and which may not be deliberative. Emerson et al. (2009) warn that despite the increasingly common use of the term 'collaborative governance' in public administration literature, its definition remains 'amorphous and its use inconsistent' (2011, 1).

With this warning in mind, processes identified in academic literature as 'collaborative governance' range from those undertaken between governments or government agencies, or those instigated by government and involving external stakeholders and citizens, to those that arise independently of government.

Ansell and Gash (2007, 544) define collaborative governance as an

> "… arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets'.

Stakeholders that may be involved in such deliberative collaborative governance processes include governments, non-government organisations, businesses, industry bodies, civil society, and labour organisations (Ansell and Gash, 2007).

A similar interpretation of collaborative governance, though not specifically deliberative, is:

> "… policy or the processes and structures of public policy decision making and management that engage people constructively across the boundaries of public agencies, levels of government, and/or the public, private and civic spheres in order to carry out a public purpose that could not otherwise be accomplished". (Emerson et al., 2011, 2).

This can include program-based intergovernmental cooperation to place-based regional collaboration with non-governmental stakeholders to public-private partnerships (Emerson et al., 2011, 1)[2].

In addition, collaborations are identified in the literature that are organised by non-government stakeholders without government endorsement or support, that seem to have achieved what formal government processes could not (see Kemmis and McKinney, 2011). Such collaborations may arise in order to circumvent the need for government regulation. For example, command and control regulation of environmental management can be inflexible and ineffective in comparison to some collaborative governance approaches between relevant non-government stakeholders (see Gunningham, 2009). Stakeholders may undertake collaborative governance processes of their own volition to make up for dysfunctional formal government processes (Innes and Booher, 2003), particularly where participants face a "mutually unsatisfactory status quo" (Hendriks et al., 2007, 377).

---

[2] In some cases, collaboration is attempted *between* government bodies rather than between government bodies and community representatives, and this has also been defined as collaborative governance. For instance, in Canada a form of 'collaborative federalism' began to emerge in the mid-1990s in an attempt to deal with the multiple factors that impact on public health but which lie across different areas of government responsibility (Fierlbeck, 2010, 5).

Deliberation

According to the literature, deliberation should play an important role in collaborative governance[3]. We contend that deliberation, the careful consideration of values, viewpoints and options in pursuit of a coherent public voice, is an *essential* element of effective collaborative governance. Page (2010, 249), although narrowing the focus to stakeholders rather than those broadly representative of the population, reflects this noting that for "stakeholders to govern collaboratively, they must articulate their views on key issues, consider one another's views, and formulate a joint approach to the issues".

As John Gastil explains: "When people deliberate, they carefully examine a problem and arrive at a well-reasoned solution after a period of inclusive, respectful consideration of diverse points of view" (2008, 8). He adds that to deliberate, participants must first have access to information that helps them understand the issues being considered. They will then "identify and prioritize the key values" that are relevant, move on to identify solutions, and finally evaluate each solution according to the knowledge and values gained in the early stages of the deliberative process (Gastil, 2008, 9). Eliciting diverse views, representative of the broader population is important, for example by eliciting participants through random sampling. The quality of deliberation is important, with each person having an equal opportunity to learn and express views, while taking on the *responsibility* to respect others, listening carefully and trying to understand their perspective (Gastil, 2008, 9). The aim is for participants to have a positive, active experience that deepens their understanding of other perspectives, rather than maintaining a position defensively, as a lobbyist might do. Deliberation usually requires participants to commit a significant amount of their own time to be involved.

The elements of deliberative democracy outlined above, which can be summarised as representativeness/inclusion, deliberativeness and influence (Carson and Hartz-Karp 2005), form the criteria for deliberative collaborative governance as we define it. These are the characteristics we sought in the examples from throughout the globe explored in this paper. We did not focus on the micro level elements of an effective deliberative process as this is well covered in readily available literature (see for example, the NCDD and Involve websites – http://ncdd.org/; and www.involve.org.uk/).

Although collaborative governance covers top down (instigated by government, involving community), bottom up (instigated by community, involving government) and unhitched forms of governance, this paper focus primarily on forms of collaborative governance in which governments share decision making and policy development with the broader public. In particular we examine collaborative governance that:
- is deliberative;
- has participation that is demographically representative of the relevant population;

---

[3] However, some see a distinction in the *deliberative* aspects of collaborative governance, and the *practice* of deliberative democracy, contending that while collaborative governance and deliberative democracy are related they are not the same thing in practice, or at least have not been historically (see for example, Kemmis and McKinney, 2011).

- displays a clear intent to share decision making with non-government actors including ordinary citizens not generally deemed to be 'stakeholders';
- has a transparent and influential link between deliberation and policy development;
- is embedded as an ongoing process rather than an isolated event.

While this is the framework of the following paper, it is likely to evolve with suggestions from collaborators during the next phase of our work. Our intention is to use a crowd sourcing approach to link collaborative researchers and practitioners in a deliberative space to develop it further.

It should be noted that we also briefly describe several unhitched, non-government collaborative decision-making initiatives as in our view, they may provide important lessons about innovations in collaborative governance that can be used in the co-development of public policy.

A proposed typology of collaborative governance

Given the disparate array of initiatives in the literature called 'collaborative governance', one way of analysing them more systematically is to consider what role or function they appeared to be playing. From a synthesis of collaborative governance examples in the literature (only sometimes identified as *deliberative*) they appeared to have at least one of the following functions:

1. Legitimising and better informing existing government decision making, by linking collaborative processes formally to conventional governance processes:
    a. through an institutionalised process; or
    b. at the discretion of people in power in government hierarchies.
2. Challenging and/or gradually transforming existing government power structures:
    a. intentionally, through formal processes, including changes to legislation, policy and standard practice in government agencies, where decision making power is at least partially redistributed; and
    b. informally through increased learning, understanding, and tacit knowledge about the role of deliberative collaboration throughout government agencies and the networks they are connected to. This could be achieved intentionally or unintentionally.
3. Usurping, or acting outside of, conventional government processes, through:
    a. informal, but often well-organised processes driven from the grassroots, usually by stakeholders rather than a random sample of lay-citizens, that achieve outcomes irrespective of government. They may produce outcomes or models of collaboration that governments subsequently learn from or adopt, and that could be evaluated deliberatively by a random sample of citizens to provide the basis of broader policy;
    b. formal processes involving non-government stakeholders, for example industry bodies who adopt a formalised approach to self-regulation.

In addition, some collaborative governance initiatives explicitly involve collaborative *action* as well, in an iterative process (see for example Kemmis and McKinney, 2011; and Portsmouth Listens, 2003).

A fuller description of each of these suggested categories follows in the next section. These functional categories are often not entirely distinct or unrelated. Sometimes one form of collaborative governance may precede another, or they may overlap or operate concurrently. For example, successful grassroots collaborations that are initiated and run by non-government stakeholders can subsequently influence government decision making, be linked to government processes, and/or used as a model by government in other collaborations. Collaborative governance may also be implemented to legitimise and better inform existing governance systems in the short term, with the longer term aim of enabling participants to learn from the experience and be inclined to support more fundamental transformation of government decision making processes in future.

1. *Informing and legitimizing government decision making*

Collaborative governance is often initiated by government as one way of improving conventional governance processes and giving them greater legitimacy. This has occurred in numerous ways across the globe, particularly in western countries (e.g. see Gastil and Levine, 2005) but also in China (Lieb and He 2006). Some case studies exemplifying this focus are outlined in the Table 1 Typology of Collaborative Governance Case Studies. Typical of these endeavours were initiatives in Western Australia, where the Minister who initiated these public deliberations, publicly announced that her reason was to better inform the government so wiser decisions could be made that were more acceptable to the people. A demographically representative "mini-public" involving random sampling was invited to deliberate about a particular issue, producing outcomes, often statistically validated, that were then adopted by the government as legitimately representing the considered views of the population (Hartz-Karp, 2007).

In examples such as this, DCG is intended to augment and supplement conventional forms of governance, rather than to replace or structurally transform them (Rasche, 2010; Zadek 2008). It has been attempted by local, state or national governments and government agencies. However, there are comparatively few examples of international collaborative governance (one notable example being *World Wide Views on Global Warming* (WWViews), detailed later in this paper). Global deliberations are obviously more challenging in terms of collaborative governance given the paucity of international government bodies with the authority to make legally binding decisions.

The Western Australian deliberative democracy initiatives undertaken by the Planning and Infrastructure portfolio under Minister Alannah MacTiernan, are further examined here to understand the dynamics of government undertaking collaborative governance. Over a four year period, 2001-2005, deliberative democracy initiatives (designed and facilitated by one of the authors, Janette Hartz-Karp) encompassed two of the above functions: (1) legitimising and better informing existing government decision making, by linking collaborative processes formally to conventional governance processes; and (2) challenging and/or gradually transforming existing government power structures. While decision making power officially remained with the State Government, in a number of instances where the issue fell entirely within the jurisdiction of the Minister's portfolio, she undertook to abide by the decisions of citizen deliberators, *effectively* handing the power of collaborative governance to the community (category 2) rather than simply using the outcomes to feed into and better inform government decision making. In other cases where broader government approval was required,

including national approval, the Minister undertook to take the decisions to the relevant government body for their consideration (category 1). All deliberative processes undertaken were prefaced by a commitment from the Minister to a transparent level of influence. In addition, since other Members of Parliament and the relevant government agency senior executives and other staff involved were expected to take support roles in the public deliberations, it could be argued that via experiential learning, they also provided the groundwork for potential changes in power relations.

Varying the level of collaborative governance according to the issue and context may be an obvious way forward when influence is at the discretion of the decision-maker. The following deliberative initiatives outline how this played out.

- When two adjoining suburbs 'warred' about the location of a freeway exit, prior to the deliberation, the Minister told the Citizens' Jury members from each suburb that she would pilot their recommendation if there was consensus and as long as it wouldn't cost a maximum of $100,000 more than was already budgeted for this issue. This occurred and the Citizens' Jury results were implemented.
- Similarly, in a State-wide issue of the freight network, the recommendations of a consensus forum that met several times over a year, were all implemented with the help of an implementation team of deliberation participants representing the key interests involved.
- Some time after, during a comprehensive planning process to develop a new plan for Perth and Peel (the capital city and vast surrounding metropolis), the Minister committed to participants of 'Dialogue with the City' (the 21st Century Town Meeting/Dialogue with 1,100 participants, that was the pivot point of the process) that she wanted 100 of those participating to continue working together in small teams to develop the outcomes of the 'Dialogue' into a Community Plan which she would take to Cabinet. This occurred and Cabinet accepted the Community Plan, which then became the regulatory framework for all planning in the moteropolis. (Hartz-Karp, 2005).
- In a later instance, a deliberative poll/survey result in a coastal town became the basis for government policy on building heights in coastal town/node developments.
- However, at another citizens' jury, when the town was split over an issue, the Minister told the deliberators that she would seriously consider their results and state why or why not she would implement their recommendations, but at the end of the day, the decision was hers. Even in this instance, however, she did agree to implement their recommendation, even though it was against the existing planning policy, stating that she understood their reasons and hence would create an exception.

Although there was a varied level of influence in each of these deliberations, the thread holding them together as instances of collaborative governance was the stated intent to share power to certain degrees and the transparency of process that enabled participants to see their influence.

To give further insight into the workings of government, one further example of collaborative governance in Western Australia is briefly discussed, this time at a local government level, the third tier of governance in Australia. In this instance, starting with the end in mind, deliberative collaborative governance, a variety of methods have been employed to find potential ways to embed it, so it is not so dependent on the good will of particular government officials. This project, 'Geraldton 2029 and Beyond' Project, involves a 452 km^2 city region, 4-5 hours drive north of Perth. The project

aims to provide comprehensive opportunities for ordinary citizens and stakeholders to deliberate collaboratively to influence decisions in the region. Commencing in 2010, the City has invited community members to participate in a number of deliberative processes to imagine the future they want for the Greater Geraldton region and to actively participate in achieving it. This has resulted in far reaching plans for the whole City region to become carbon neutral using alternative energy; and have incorporated a redesign of the City and surrounds to enhance sustainable living, protecting the environment, particularly the beaches, rivers and ranges, while rejuvenating the City and suburbs. To further develop collaborative governance, an Alliance Governance Group of community, industry and government members oversees the deliberations, prioritises proposals from the deliberative initiatives, and recommends further action to the elected Council. Joint community, government action teams are carrying out prioritised proposals developed by the community. These include planting 1 million trees in the next few years, becoming the bicycle capital of the west, and initiatives to empower local youth and the Indigenous population. To make the decision-making path through Council more accountable and hopefully easier, elected Council members will now lead project teams and steward their recommendations through the political process. During 2012, the first stage of participatory budgeting will commence with the long term infrastructure budget.

However, there are significant hindrances to shared decision-making in local government, particularly in the regions. Local government legislation does not leave room for shared decision-making. Local Council Mayors do not have the powers of State Government Ministers to make planning decisions and enact them. Moreover, in the regions, many major planning decisions are not made locally, but in the capital city. This has meant the recent focus is now on involving the city decision-makers in the regional collaborative governance process - not an easy task. However, the challenges of achieving a whole-of-government approach are common to many collaborative governance initiatives. Without the relevant local, state and national governments and their agencies participating with the same intent and capacity, many of the issues that really matter cannot be addressed. Hence, collaborative governance is often reduced to narrow and local horizons.

One other example of deliberative collaborative governance achieving category 1 (informing and legitimising government decision-making) outlined here is the involvement of 'Portsmouth Listens' in the review of the Portsmouth's Master Plan. It exemplifies the often integrated nature of these functional categories, in this instance, a grass roots initiative paving the way for government led collaborative governance. Portsmouth Listens developed from a grassroots initiative that began outside government as an initiative between citizens, volunteers and the City Parents concerned about bullying and violence at local schools, using dialogue with children in study circles to consider ways to deal these issues. This process was successful enough to encourage government and other stakeholders to use it in a Master Plan review process. The group running the process became known as 'Portsmouth Listens' (Sustainable Portsmouth, 2009). The input and priorities derived from the participatory 'Portsmouth Listens' process is used by the Planning Board to 'help develop' the review of its Master Plan that occurs once every decade (Portsmouth Listens, 2003a). Like the grassroots initiative, Portsmouth Listens involves the use of deliberative 'study circles' in 25 areas. Each circle can have between 8-15 people, who, together with a facilitator come together for two hours a week over four weeks to consider what is important to them in the planning of their area.

The Portsmouth Listens Master Plan study circles involved three phases over two years involving over 400 citizens. The Master Plan adopted the Vision Statement developed by the study circles. A second round focused on specific areas like transportation, open space and sustainability, the character of downtown, or building community. In this round residents planned out the vision that was the consensus of Phase One, and worked together through dot voting to set priorities. A third phase gave specifics about implementation. The resulting master plan was largely driven by the vision and energy of the citizen dialogue, and has provided a roadmap for much of Portsmouth's policy and infrastructure initiatives since 2004 (Sustainable Portsmouth, 2009).

Like the prior examples of the functional category 1 approach, Portsmouth Listens has the added dimension of supporting not only more informed decision making but collaborative *action* as well:

Portsmouth Listens has encouraged all Study Circle participants to recognize it should be about what everyone can do. That is, in addition to what the City can do, we must also be prepared to act and contribute through public-private partnerships, non-profit and volunteer institutions, businesses, and, most importantly, as individual citizens. It is all about, "How Can We Make Portsmouth the Best Place to Live and Work for Everyone?" (Portsmouth Listens, 2003b).

2. *Challenging or transforming existing government decision making or regulatory power*

While collaborative governance may be implemented to augment rather than completely replace existing governance systems, it can be transformative if it involves some degree of devolution or sharing of power that governments allow (Lee, 2011). Although these processes have at least some degree of autonomy, they exist because governments voluntarily relinquish their usual degree and mode of control over the decision-making processes concerned (for example see Maley, 2010). Collaborative governance of this type can involve different roles or aims for government in decision making processes, rather than simply better informed and legitimised business-as-usual. For example, governments may invite citizens to collaborate deliberatively to develop a well-informed proposal to be taken to referendum (e.g. see Table 1: Citizens Assembly in British Columbia). New governance structures can arise that incorporate collaborative governance, informally and/or formally. Some are institutionalised.

However, even where governments step back from full participation in a collaborative process, or permit new modes of decision making, they often retain a key enabling role by instigating the collaborative governance process and taking responsibility for organisation and facilitation (Lee, 2011). There is evidence that in some instances it is useful for government to undertake a different role rather than assuming the same type and level of power as all others in a collaborative group. The state can retreat from its regulatory role but take up a more active role in coordinating private institutions, actors and resources to achieve the goals of the collaboration. This can lead to a reduced reliance on regulatory approaches that may be less adaptive than active collaborations. In addition, collaboration can provide advantages such as improved understanding between participants and improved trust of government. This has been noted in collaborations for environmental management in Australia for example (Gunningham, 2009).

The Health Care Policy-making Council in São Paulo has been in place for over 20 years. This is supported by a mandate to develop Municipal Health Councils to deliberate and work with municipal governments. Accordingly, the Municipal Health Council in São Paulo was created to 'evaluate new health policies and to set health care priorities' (Ralston, 2008, 623). The Council consists of citizens, health professionals, government agencies and health service providers/producers (Ralston, 2008). It is a 'policy*making* endeavour wherein representatives of the major stakeholders, including the public, participate as coequal partners' (Ralston, 2008, 623).

In both British Columbia in 2005/6 and later Ontario, Canada in 2006/7, a significant exercise in devolving decision-making power to the people was undertaken involving Citizen's Assemblies. In the Ontario initiative, over an eight month process of deliberation, 103 citizens assessed Ontario's electoral system in order to recommend whether the province should retain its current system or adopt a new one. Participants first engaged in a process of learning about electoral reform through processes such as talking to people, chairing 41 public meetings, and reading through 1,000 written public submissions. A deliberative Citizen's Assembly was then held over six weekends. This process was followed in 2007 by a referendum to decide whether to adopt the Assembly's recommendation, in which the proposal was rejected by 63% of voters. (The result of the referendum in British Columbia was much closer, only very narrowly defeated in the first referendum, though more clearly in a second.)

One of the criticisms of this process was that despite the rigour of the Citizen's Assemblies, engagement with the broader community was insufficient to enable adequate understanding of the Assemblies conclusions, let alone the governance processes involved. It is often argued that this was the key reason for the proposals being defeated in the referendum. To address these criticisms of the British Columbia referendum, the Ontario Government did develop amendments to legislation to ensure that a program of public education was undertaken in preparation for the referendum of October, 2007 under the *Electoral System Referendum Act, 2007*'. However critics maintain that this was inadequate, and hence reduced the likelihood that the proposal would be supported by the broader community (Ontario Citizen's Assembly Secretariat, 2007).

A more recent initiative, The Citizens Initiative Review (CIR) was developed by Ned Crosby and Pat Benn, from the Jefferson Center. A Citizens Jury process, involving a panel of 24 randomly selected, demographically representative voters, deliberated on a ballot measure over a week. The participants heard from campaigners, learned about the issues and evaluated the pros and cons of proposed policies (Gastil and Knobloch, 2010). Their findings were sent to all registered voters in Oregon to help inform their decisions in the elections and referenda that followed. The CIR has now been institutionalised – it was enabled by House Bill 2895, with the stated intention of better informing public discussion of state policy by allowing a non-partisan citizens panel to evaluate it and report to the electorate. An independent review found the process supported high quality deliberation, and helped members of the public who read the subsequent report to better understand the issues. In fact they became less inclined to support the proposals being voted on. However, most citizens did not hear about the CIR process, and did not read the Voters' Pamphlet that explained its findings (Gastil and Knobloch, 2010, 1).

Participatory budgeting (PB) is a well-known example of transformation in government decision making processes because it allocates final decision making power to citizens, albeit typically in relation to a limited proportion of an overall budget. Some versions of PB represent a more radical challenge to conventional governance systems than others. Participatory budgeting was first used in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in 1989, where it was and continues to be undertaken voluntarily by municipalities, and involves citizens in a year-long process of budgeting for funds to be spent on public works such as schools (Boulding and Wampler, 2010, 126). PB spread to other municipalities in Brazil and is now often institutionalised, including in Recife, recognized internationally for winning the 2011 Rheinhard Mohn prize for 'vitalizing democracy' (see Best et al., 2011). PB has also been attempted in other countries, such as in Çanakkale, Turkey and Buk-gu in Korea (OECD, 2009). There are now hundreds of examples across Canada, USA, Latin America, Europe and Asia (see Table 1), and PB initiatives are currently being developed in Australia. The following examples give a potted overview of some of their achievements and challenges.

In Brazil, participatory budgeting was introduced by municipal governments with the explicit intention increasing governmental transparency and social justice by encouraging active citizen participation in civic life, and re-directing resources to low income neighbourhoods. (This intent is not necessarily mirrored in western countries where PB initiatives have often been criticized for engaging primarily with the middle classes). There are over 170 active PB programs in Brazil. They have enabled authority to be delegated to Brazilian mayors who now have the autonomy to start new programs with little interference from municipal legislative chambers. A new constitution provides incentives to municipalities to support participatory policies (Avritzer, 2006; Boulding and Wampler, 2010). However, in Porte Alegre, as in other municipalities, it is important to remember that it 'was not completely autonomous; its success depended on sympathetic state officials who had an affinity with progressive interests' (Maley, 2010, 113).

Avritzer argues that Porto Alegre's PB is strongly deliberative by virtue of three new types of institutions, all involving deliberation – 'regional and thematic assemblies, the Participatory Budgeting Council (COP) and deliberation on the constitution for participatory budgeting by the participants themselves' (Avritzer, 2006, 627). A variety of types of deliberation occur in the Participatory Budgeting Council (COP), including 'among community members over their varied priorities, and between them and the municipal administration on the final format of the budget' (Avritzer, 2006, 628). The COP also deliberates on an ongoing basis about the rules of deliberation themselves (Avritzer, 2006, 628). Furthermore high levels of participation (1-1.5% of the population participated in 2006) have been achieved - these have risen with time after a slow start in the first year (Avritzer, 2006, 629, 630).

However, there have been problems in terms of participation. While participation rates are high generally, levels of participation in PB across Brazil are affected by 'previous traditions of association and the perceived effectiveness of the process' (Avritzer, 2006, 630). For example, when there was doubt that the workers party would be re-elected, and that any incoming government would continue to support PB, participation rates fell until confidence that PB would continue was restored. In terms of representativeness, in the assemblies and COP for example, issues of inequality have been noted. While the groups of people who deliberate in PB assemblies are representative of the income

distribution of the broader community, research in 2006 showed that fewer people at the lower end of wage earnings actually spoke at assemblies. In addition, slightly more women (51%) than men attended the assemblies (Avritzer, 2006, 627). In COPs 'the income and education levels for the members…do not resemble the average income and education levels of the population' (Avritzer, 2010, 631).

Boulding and Wampler (2010) examined participatory budgeting in Brazil to see whether it has resulted in improved well-being for low-income citizens, an outcome that the World Bank expects to arise from such processes, since its own research revealed that 'participatory budgeting is positively and strongly associated with improvements in poverty rates and the percentage of houses with access to indoor plumbing and piped water' (World Bank Report, 2008, pp. 86–92, cited in Boulding and Wampler, 2010, 127). After analysing data from 220 Brazilian cities, Boulding and Wampler (2010) noted a significant increase in spending on health and education in municipalities that have participatory budgeting, possibly because a very high proportion of citizens who participate have low incomes and low levels of education. In Porto Alegre, participatory budgeting has successfully led to a redistribution of resources away from middle-class areas to low income, densely populated areas (Boulding and Wampler, 2010, 127; Avritzer, 2010).

However Boulding and Wampler found that 'even in communities where the participatory budgeting is successful in terms of improving access of low-income individuals, the availability of resources is a serious constraint to improving well-being' (2010, 126), although they acknowledge that improvements in health and well-bring may not be discernable in the short term. Nonetheless, this suggests that collaborative governance strategies cannot compensate entirely for inadequacies elsewhere in government – they must be linked to and supported by other well-functioning and well-resourced government systems. Boulding and Wampler emphasize:

> We are not arguing that participatory practices have failed. Quite to the contrary, as we are drawing attention to the potential overselling of direct citizen engagement in policymaking because heightened expectations can produce a political backlash given the incremental nature of change (2010, 126).

They also point out that their research shows that the 'direct inclusion of citizens into participatory processes produced comparable results to a top-down model of decision-making. Citizens' choices and participation in public decision-making are just as good as the elite-oriented decision-making processes' while bringing additional benefits such as empowerment and improved accountability (Boulding and Wampler, 2010, 133).

In Brazil, researchers have noted that PB has had a 'democratizing effect' on the culture. In fact, Avritzer argues that the way 'access is negotiated among social actors and politicians' is the *most* significant change, outranking even the redistribution of public funds (2006, 633).

Participatory budgeting has been used in Buk-gu, South Korea, since 2003 with such good results that it has inspired 40 other municipalities to follow. It is not used at the national level. In Buk-gu, up to 100 citizens belong to the Participatory Budgeting Council (PBC), which has primary responsibility for

decision-making. There are also broader engagement processes to complement the work of the PBC (OECD, 2009).

However, despite this success there is evidence to suggest that many other public participation initiatives in Korea are intended to 'legitimate many government policies that have already been established rather than to make people's participation easier in the policy-making or implementation process (OECD, 2009, 268). Professor Lim from the People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy argues: 'Although some institutional changes have been introduced, it can definitely be said that the prerequisites for both participation and transparency are still far too complicated and strict. It is also true that people's participation has tended to end up more as a formality than a reality' (OECD, 2009, 269).

Many have since attempted to replicate the successes of participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre. In 2010 there were, for example, 200 PB experiments in 20 different European nations (Maley, 2010, 115). In the UK, the Department from Communities and Local Government (CLG) released a draft strategy for participatory budgeting in 2008 (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2008), and many districts are undertaking PB. More than 150 communities in the UK had implemented PB by 2007. The CLG interpretation of participatory budgeting is that it -

> engages people in taking decisions on the spending priorities for a defined public budget in their local area. This means engaging residents and community groups to discuss spending priorities, make spending proposals, and vote on them, as well giving local people a role in the scrutiny and monitoring of the process (CLG, 2008).

This definition leaves decision making in the hands of conventional government processes – communities ostensibly do not have a great deal of autonomy in decision making. However, in practice, in case studies of PB such as the Salford Participatory Budgeting Event (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2008), it is observed that decision making power was *effectively* handed to the community, because the relevant government decision maker adhered entirely the community's recommendations.

In the UK, the PB Unit argues that PB:

- engages more people and different people;
- leads to better targeted and cost-effective services, closing the gap between socioeconomic groups;
- has significant social cohesion benefits;
- provides local ownership of projects, budgets, and decisions.

In addition it has the potential to:
- lead to more mature debate about priorities, by deepening the relationship and understanding between elected members, officers and residents;
- gain community support for politically difficult decisions, such as raising taxes when necessary;
- develop budget literacy amongst community members;

- achieve greater transparency in relation to public finances (see www.participatorybudgeting.org.uk; Avritzer, 2006).

In the previous case studies outlined in this section, it is interesting to note the political context in which collaborative governance arose, and the extent to which this enabled the development of innovations in collaborative governance. It is noted that little in the way of 'sociological analyses of the strategic and political settings of dialogue and deliberation processes' of collaborative governance has been undertaken (Lee, 2011, p.2). This is a significant gap since collaborative governance initiatives are implemented in a variety of political situations around the world, including under socialist governments or countries emerging from authoritarian rule. In the case of South Korea for instance, fundamental political change – i.e. moving from an authoritarian regime to a democracy - provided an opportunity to incorporate elements of strong democracy, at a time when the community expected and wanted a radical transformation of governance (Kim, 2010). In Brazil, dramatic political transformation also preceded participatory budgeting. The end of authoritarianism and the election of the workers party saw the rise of civic associations that were able to support PB and brought a new Constitution in which the role of participation was stipulated. For instance, according to the new constitution, participation of civic associations was required in the processes of developing policy for the city, health and social security (Avritzer, 2006, 623).

After a detailed analysis of Porto Alegre's socio-political history to determine how this influenced the development and longevity of participatory budgeting, Avritzer argued that the unique, combined effects of the Workers' Party, the new constitution, civic associations and local administration was crucial in supporting the development and implementation of PB in Porto Alegre (2006, 626). For instance, Avritzer came to the conclusion that 'the presence of civic associations is linked to the deliberative and distributive results of participatory budgeting and that these conditions may not be present in other participatory budgeting experiences' (2006, 623). This implies that local socio-political and historical circumstances may be so critical to the success of PB, that it cannot simply be copied from one jurisdiction for use in another without potentially significant changes to reflect the context.

This could explain why, in contrast to the above examples, PB in western countries such as Canada and those in Europe where there is an established 'system of parliamentary representation and the historical persistence of deeply entrenched institutional, political and economic barriers…the radicalization of the few PB experiments that have been launched by activists and community groups' has been inhibited (Maley, 2010, 108). For instance, Maley argues that in Canada:

> one less radical variant, Alternative Budgets (ABs), has become the default left critique of the deficit in 'fiscal democracy' in Canada…Canadian PBs and ABs are weak reflections of the radical imagination…PBs are still exercises in ephemeral, or fugitive democracy that are not yet autonomous from the neoliberal state. This is not inherent in the idea of PBs, but is the result of institutional/political and historical barriers which, in Canadian neoliberalism, continue to block their potential radicalization/proliferation (2010, 107).

However, this critique is not reflected in all instances of collaborative governance in countries with conventional institutional structures. Earlier in the paper, the deeply embedded collaborative processes in Hampton, Virginia, was outlined. The remarkable successes of this long term approach

emerged from a difficult political and economic situation. In the 1980s the Hampton community struggled with 'high taxes, low revenues, low home values, property crimes, high unemployment and drug use among youth' with little prospect of improvement (Schor, 2011, 5). This litany of challenges prompted the local government to be comparatively daring in its trials of collaborative governance. Over the past 20 years Hampton Virginia has now embedded deliberative collaborative governance in areas such as education, policing, youth issues, budgeting, parks and recreation, and planning, and has recently incorporated participatory budgeting. The city has shaped its institutions to have the capacity to undertake the collaborations thought necessary to pull the city out of the dire circumstances it faced in the 80s. Through these efforts, Hampton has managed to embed deliberative collaborative governance as part of business as usual, with corresponding, long term improvements in social capital. Collaboration also extends to the implementation of policies and plans (Schor 2011).

South Korea provides a particularly interesting case study in collaborative governance, since it became democratised in 1987, and has had only democratic governments since then. Decision makers have had the opportunity to build new governance systems from the ground up, deliberately distancing themselves from the centralised processes of previous authoritarian regimes. Kim argues that participation has therefore 'assumed added significance in democratized South Korea, primarily because of the exceptionally poor status of citizen participation under the earlier authoritarian regimes' (2010, 166) and that 'when the democratic transition occurred in 1987, South Koreans naturally equated "democracy" with "participation" ' (2010, 167). Each government in South Korea has displayed (varying degrees of) commitment to collaborative governance, defined as a 'governing arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage public programs or assets' (Ansell and Gash, 2007, 144). Kim notes that from 2003-2008 'the Roh Moo Hyun government officially named itself a "participatory government" (*chamyeo jeongbu*) and introduced numerous collaborative institutions and participatory measures' (Kim 2010, 166).

Another revealing case study is that of deliberative polling undertaken in China, not noted for its support of democracy, far less strong democracy. As Fishkin et al. note ' China…poses a distinctly different political and policy context' (2010, 436) to most other countries around the world that have attempted collaborative governance. At a national level, laws were passed that required public consultation prior to decisions about punishments and the price of public goods. Nonetheless, public hearings and 'consultation meetings' have held increasingly regularly. However there were issues of lack of representativeness, insufficient time for deliberation, and unclear procedures, and concern that the dialogues could be manipulated, or that officials could selectively encourage participants in order to obtain a particular outcome. In order to overcome these issues, deliberative polling was attempted in a few instances. In the Zeguo Township in Wenling City, over 1000 *kentan* or 'sincere heart-to-heart discussions' were held between 1996 and 1000 at village level. Other organisations, including business, also held them. It was in Wenling City that the first deliberative poll was held, and it was intended to democratise local policy making. Participants were charged with the task of prioritising a number of infrastructure projects. Town officials undertook to fund the projects that rated highest in the deliberative poll (Fishkin et al., 2010, 436/437).

Fishkin et al. contend that the deliberative poll was of high quality, according to the following criteria:

- the representativeness of the sample:
- the occurrence and magnitude of net policy attitude change;
- the extent to which the policy attitude changes appear to rest on normatively desirable processes of deliberation;
- the extent to which the post-deliberation attitudes or pre-to-post-deliberation attitude changes influence public policy (2011, 437).

These researchers also note that 'Ironically, some of the legacies of authoritarian rule made it easier to satisfy some of these criteria. The expectation of participation for public purposes made it easier to recruit the sample, and the authority of local party officials made it easy for them to deliver on a promise to implement the results' (2010, 446). They note that at this stage it is difficult to predict whether exercises such as deliberative polling will gradually lead China to stronger democracy, or whether they will in fact entrench existing institutional structures (2010, 447).

3. Collaborative governance beyond or without government

Forms of collaborative governance have been identified in non-government contexts as well, often in response to a lack of appropriate government policy, rather than in an attempt to develop government policy (see Chester and Moomaw, 2008). There are a number of contexts in which it could be applied, such as in areas where government has failed or is perceived to have failed to deal with a policy issue to the satisfaction of a community; in Indigenous communities that continue to practice governance as they have for many generations independently of the state; or in areas where state-supported governance is limited or non-existent, such as in unplanned communities with informal economies on the fringes of major cities around the world. It may have a role in the governance of international issues, due to the paucity of global institutions of government with real power enshrined in law. In this context, governance can be defined as 'some notion of order, or a set of explicit or implicit normative prescriptions or rules about the way things ought to be. It is defined as the management of the course of events in a social system, and is about how people exercise power to achieve the ends they desire' (Kimani, 2010, 31).

Environmental issues in particular, which often transcend national boundaries and where command and control approaches have not been sufficiently effective, have been approached through diverse forms of collaboration, or cooperation, between state and non-state actors 'to fill the policy and implementation vacuum both between and within various international environmental regimes' (Chester and Moomaw, 2008, 190). For example, a variety of actors come together to frame the governance of corporate social and environmental responsibility, in part due to a need to address the "omnipresent governance gaps" faced by corporations operating in a global economy (Rasche, 2010, 502). Multinational corporations may source elements of their supply chain from countries that do not have effective national regulation of environmental or social production standards, and where there are ethical and practical issues associated with real or perceived corporate influence on local governments. A relatively small but growing proportion of businesses and industry bodies is therefore attempting to undertake collaborative governance in an attempt to overcome lack of regulation and

achieve corporate responsibility goals (Rasche, 2010, 502). There is little evidence in the literature about the degree to which these industry processes are deliberative, or involve citizens appropriately, however they could conceivably be designed to be deliberative, or to link with deliberative participatory processes in some way.

It is clear that the current lack of effective global governance structures creates significant barriers to effective collaborative international governance, as evidenced by the difficult process of international negotiations about climate change policy and action at the regular Conferences of the Parties (COP) (see Dryzek, 2011). Reidy and Herriman note that 'the outcome of COP-15 fuelled existing debates about the ability of current systems of international governance to satisfactorily respond to global challenges like climate change' (2011, 2). They observe that:

> Among the participants were 120 Heads of State empowered to act on behalf of their citizens, supported by delegations of Ministers and bureaucrats…COP-15 brought together the highest concentration of robust decision-making power the world had seen…Yet this unprecedented gathering of global decision-makers was unable to deliver an effective global response to climate change. The Copenhagen Accord that emerged from COP-15 was not legally binding and was not formally adopted under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2011, 1).

Innovative approaches to collaborative governance are therefore needed to tackle complex international issues such as climate change. A number of normative global governance systems have been proposed in response to this and other dilemmas of international governance. These include authoritarian approaches, market based approaches, inviting a smaller number of nation states participating in negotiations in the hope that this will make them more manageable, or an increased democratisation of global governance, including through deliberative democracy (Riedy and Herriman, 2011, 2).

There are some notable attempts at deliberation at a global scale for issues such as climate change. In 2009, the Danish Board of Technology held *World Wide Views on Global Warming* (WWViews), a deliberative event held on a single day, involving citizens in 38 countries. Researchers concluded that the deliberations did yield informed, well-considered views, but they had very little observable impact on climate policy, particularly on the outcomes of COP 15, at which they were aimed (Rask et al., 2011; Riedy and Herriman, 2011). Furthermore, Riedy and Herriman argued that 'the quality of deliberation was compromised by attempts at standardisation that seem misguided in light of cultural and political differences between the participating countries' (2011, 25). They also suggested that rather than dealing with mini publics from nations as WWViews did, another way of convening 'mini-public' could be to 'involve participants from across the globe in a single process, where the views of the rich can be challenged by those of the poor and the full global implications of decisions become clear' (2011, 26). The way mini publics are conceptualised has important implications for DCG.

At a smaller scale, cases have been identified in which collaborative governance to be driven completely from the grassroots, independently of government influence. These often arise as "place-based collaborations" although the relationship between the focus on a relatively small geographical place and the emergence and form of collaborative governance has not yet been fully evaluated. They

can be undertaken in an *informal* way if community members and stakeholders take the initiative and decide to collaborate to solve problems. In this context, 'informal' means organised outside the conventional channels of government, although they may be very organised and thorough.   For example in the US, the Toiyabe Wetlands and Watershed Management Team was created and populated by farmers and environmentalists who had been invited by a farmer to visit his ranch to look at and discuss the way he managed it. The farmer was looking for an effective way of dealing with an insoluble policy issue of private and publicly owned land that had been a source of dispute for some time. The group ran trials to evaluate the use of livestock on the land, and realised that there was a way of managing the land that would satisfy both farmers and environmentalists. The group succeeded in resolving conflict over management issues where government had failed, and established an informal governance network that resulted in the implementation of improved management techniques across the area. This collaborative group was therefore 'literally "grassroots" and "organic" in its origins' (Kemmis and McKinney, 2011, 2). Kemmis and McKinney referred to this form of grassroots-driven collaboration to address environmental issues as an "ecology of democracy" and argue that it represents an 'important but still-emerging form of democracy' (Kemmis and McKinney, 2011, 2). This case study also illustrates that collaborative governance can be more than more than government inspired/co-created decision making. It can be an iterative process involving both action learning and policy development.

Similarly, the Beaverhead-Deerlodge Partnership evolved from the grassroots. It was formed by conservationists and loggers who had been unable to find common ground previously, but were driven to act by their concern about a new plan for Montana's Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest. Working collaboratively to undertake action research and develop policy, they -

> found common ground when some of the conservationists acknowledged that logging itself wasn't necessarily bad for wildlife and water quality, if done in the right way and at the right scale. They began exploring ways of fitting fish and wildlife restoration into a sustainable timber-harvesting program. The timber interests, meanwhile, were willing to acknowledge that substantial portions of the forest should not be logged but would better be protected as wilderness. Eventually the partnership's laborious collaborative efforts were incorporated into legislation introduced by Senator Jon Tester, which is pending in the U.S. Congress (Kemmis and McKinney, 2011, 2).

 'Portsmouth Listens', described earlier in this paper, was a grass roots initiative that had a similarly organic process of development. It also led to a formalised process of collaborative governance and collaborative action involving government, community and the Local Chamber of Commerce (Sustainable Portsmouth, 2009).

This type of informal collaborative governance may be important, however it is difficult to ascertain how often it occurs, or how deliberative and effective it can be, since there may not be official records, or evaluation by external parties. Further research is required to explore the role of informal collaborative governance, and how it may connect or inform official governance processes, and to what extent it may be a source of innovation in terms of collaborative governance processes. It will also be interesting to see what effect the availability of digital means of technology will have in terms of supporting grassroots collaborative governance. Analysts have already noted the unprecedented

erosion of state sovereignty brought about by forces such as technology-enabled connections between global citizens (e.g. Chester and Moomaw, 2008).

An associated difficulty is evaluating the quality of deliberation in these grassroots collaborations. Kemmis and McKinney note that they have a strong and necessary element of deliberation, but draw a distinction between collaborative governance and deliberative democracy. They argue that the grassroots collaborations they have studied typically involve *stakeholders* who are passionate about a local issue, whereas deliberative democracy tends to require engagement of a representative group of *ordinary citizens* (2011, 8, 9). Kemmis and McKinney also suggest that grass roots collaborations seem to be more focused on 'solving immediate, concrete problems' in contrast to deliberative democracy, which they contend has focused to date on 'more abstract, less action-oriented discussion of issues', although they acknowledge that it has been used more recently for practical problem solving as well (2011, 9). Furthermore, they argue that the engagement of stakeholders in grass roots collaborative processes has enabled them 'to engage more effectively with the representative system than most deliberative processes have managed to do' (2011, 9), noting the difficulty deliberative democracy practitioners face in getting elected officials and government decision-makers on board.

Others have considered the relative merits of stakeholder (partisan) and lay-citizen (non-partisan) participants in deliberative practice. Hendriks et al., for example, argue that:

> The two types offer deliberative governance something different. Non-partisan forums such as citizens' juries or consensus conferences rate favourably in deliberative capacity, but can fall short when it comes to external legitimacy and policy impact. Contrary to expectations, partisan forums can also encounter substantial legitimation and impact problems (2007, 362).

These authors note the tension between the likelihood that partisans will not readily give up their committed positions in the interests of deliberation, and the fact that since legitimacy in deliberative democracy 'exists to the extent that those subject to a collective decision have the right, opportunity and capacity to contribute', partisans are central to deliberative democracy (Hendriks et al., 2007, 362). Recognising this, some collaborative governance initiatives have attempted to involve both partisans and non-partisans in their deliberations, in order to have a better chance achieve the aims of deliberation, legitimation and influence. For example, many of the deliberative processes instigated by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure in Western Australia (described earlier) had elements of both partisan and non-partisan deliberation (Carson and Hartz-Karp, 2005).

Institutionalising collaborative governance

Despite the need to address complex issues through formal channels in integrated ways, collaborative governance is rarely institutionalised or legislated for in government processes. It is frequently undertaken on a discretionary basis. However, many see increased institutionalisation of collaborative governance as essential to ensure that collaborative governance is as effective as it can be. Carolyn Lukensmeyer, the President and Founder of AmericaSpeaks, argues that

> The way the public's business is done needs to become more inclusive and participatory as standard practice, especially at the national level. Only by institutionalising these

practices will we rebuild trust in our governing institutions and transform what it means to be a democracy (2009, 231).

Similarly, in our view, what we have termed deliberative collaborative governance should be institutionalised. Just as strong democracy is best understood as an embedded aspect of community life as opposed to a series of voting events, DCG practices such as participatory budgeting, should be embedded in an ongoing basis as a normal part of the structure of governance. There are cases where deliberative collaborative governance processes have been institutionalised with positive outcomes, such as participatory budgeting in Brazil, the Citizens Initiative Review in Oregon and the Health Care Policy-making Council in São Paulo (See Table 1 for more information).

However institutionalisation may not be possible in all cases, or at least it may be very difficult to achieve. As mentioned, the lack of international institutions of governance with influence supported by legislation makes institutionalisation of DCG extremely challenging at the global scale, as evidenced by the difficult process of international negotiations about climate change policy and action at the regular Conferences of the Parties (COP). Furthermore, Chester and Moomaw argue that 'state sovereignty no longer constitutes the only pillar supporting "international world order"… (which) holds particular relevance in regard to how we respond to the expanding number of global environmental threats' (2008, 192).

At the other end of the scale, Kemmis and McKinney (2011, 12) put forward sound arguments against constraining grassroots place-based 'collaborative democracy' through institutionalisation. They suggest that institutionalisation might put its 'organic' nature - the source of its strength and innovation - at risk:

> To the extent that collaboration is a form of democracy that has emerged in response to a relatively dysfunctional decision-making framework, we should not be too eager to confine its creative energy within the bounds of that very framework. Rather, we should pay attention to the ways in which this emergent phenomenon is manifesting its life-giving adaptiveness. By studying, documenting, and nurturing that adaptive capacity, we may discover some of the most exciting work yet to be done in both democratic theory and practice (2011, 12).

They further argue that it may be unhelpful to extrapolate too broadly from the outcomes of localised collaborations when formulating state or national policy, because of the variety of settings policy at that level must apply to. They therefore suggest that processes of deliberative democracy, involving a representative cross section of the broader community, could be used to consider the outcomes of relevant collaborations and come up with high level policy.

Table 1: Typology of Collaborative Governance: Case Studies

Project Type	Project title and location	Year/s	Project aim	Decision making	Process	Institutionalising the process	Participants	Evaluation of process and implementation
1. Informing and legitimizing government decision making	*Geraldton 2029* Geraldton (Australia)	2010 ongoing	To provide comprehensive opportunities for ordinary citizens and stakeholders to deliberate collaboratively to influence planning decisions in the region	Normal government processes apply. Decision making powers remain with the City of Greater Geraldton, and relevant State and Federal government departments. In those areas that are under Council jurisdiction, decision-making power is taken very seriously.	***Deliberative.*** The project will run over 3 years, and includes processes such as 21st Century Dialogues, Civic Evolution (online collaborative development of initiatives) and world cafés run by citizen 'champions'. The entire project is overseen by an Alliance Governance Group consisting of government, industry and community members.	***Not yet institutionalised*** Implemented at the discretion of the local government, with additional support from a 3 year Australian Research Council grant.	Depending on the process: Randomly selected demographically representative community members; volunteers.	Evaluation takes place for each major participatory event (participant feedback surveys). Long term evaluation of planning outcomes will be needed. Other process evaluations such as Outcome Mapping may be used.
	Dialogue with the City, Perth, Australia	2003	To plan to make Perth the world's most liveable city by 2030, looking at sustainability issues such as urban sprawl.	Decision making power retained by relevant local, State and Federal governments and agencies	***Deliberative.*** The process included surveying the community to identify key issues; interactive website; a deliberative forum with 1,100 participants to determine the common direction; and then continuing the deliberation over the next eight months with over one hundred of the participants from community, industry and government, to create the community planning strategy.	***Not institutionalised*** Instigated at the discretion of the Minister. Resulted in the planning document 'Network City: A Community Planning Strategy for Perth and Peel'.	Randomly selected, demographically representative citizens, as well as industry and government representatives.	Participant feedback surveys. Planning outcomes over the long term will require ongoing evaluation.
	Citizens' Initiative Review (CIR) Oregon (US)	2010 - current	To "listen to campaigners, learn the issues, and separate fact from fiction	The information is used by voters at general elections, referenda, etc.	***Deliberative.*** A panel of voters deliberates on a ballot measure over a week. Their findings are sent to all registered voters in Oregon.	***Supported by legislation***	A panel of 24 randomly selected, demographically representative	Trial in 2010 was evaluated by academics, funded by the National

								voters	Science Foundation
	Yorkshire (UK)	Ongoing	Allocating "community chest" of funding for local initiatives in parish councils	Only the parish councils or parish clerks can legally make decisions. They are informed by votes at public decision making event.. However, in *effect*, the parish clerks abide by the decisions of the community.	***Possibly deliberative, or some deliberative elements***. After an initial meeting to raise awareness, community members/groups submit proposals in their own time that the task group evaluates. Proposals are then voted for at a public decision making event.	***Not institutionalised.*** Initiated voluntarily by parish councils in each instance. Overseen by task group of parish council and community members.	Parish council and community members – (not necessarily representative)	Parish Council evaluates the CG process and the implementation of projects
	Salford Participatory Budgeting Event, (UK)	2007-ongoing	To involve the community in proposing and prioritising projects for highway improvements.	Elected council members were legally responsible for making the decision. However in *effect*, they abided by the community's decision, thereby challenging normal governance processes.	***Possibly deliberative, or some deliberative elements***. Project proposals were obtained from the Community Action Plan and from residents and costed before the event. At the event participants looked at each of the schemes. A technical officer answered questions. Residents scored each scheme and the top 10 schemes went through to a second round of scoring. £100,000 allocated in the first year, £200,000 in the second.	***Not institutionalised.*** Initiated by the Claremont and Weaste Community Committee, one of 8 community committees in Salford.	50 local community members (not necessarily representative)	Residents evaluated the process via online voting.
2.Challenging or transforming existing government decision making or regulatory power	Participatory Budgeting Porto Alegre (Brazil)	1989 - current	To allocate spending on new urban infrastructure projects , e.g. health care clinics and schools	Citizens make the final decision.	***Deliberative.*** Citizens negotiate with each other and with government in a year-long process.	***Institutionalised*** A new constitution provides incentives to municipalities to support participatory policies. Brazilian mayors have the autonomy to start new programs with little interference	Citizens, representing all socio-economic groups.	The process is self-regulated with the rules being defined and modified by participants and therefore varies between municipalities.

					from municipal legislative chambers.		
Participatory Budgeting Buk-gu (Korea)	2003 - current	To allocate district funding for a small proportion of the total budget (>6%)	Mayor finalises the budget proposal through a District-Citizen Joint Conference, for approval by the District Council.	*Possibly deliberative.* Citizens invited to participate in open forum, public hearings or by sending ideas via mail or the internet. Online portal to submit ideas created. Overseen by Participatory Budgeting Council and 8 thematic sub-committees.	***Supported by a local regulation institutionalising PB***.	Citizens	Participatory Budgeting Council oversees implementation of proposals
New York (US)	Oct 2011 - ongoing	To allocate US$1 million funding to improve infrastructure in NYCs districts (total of US$6 million)	Residents decide by voting on which of the final proposals to implement.	*Deliberative.* 2 sets of neighbourhood assemblies and meetings at senior centres, PTAs, and with young people. Delegates are selected at assemblies to go into issues in more depth and report back. Innovations include using open source mapping software and videos for citizens to submit ideas. Overseen by a steering committee.	***Not yet institutionalised.*** Instigated by New York City Council members	Residents of NYC's districts	Community members evaluate the process and oversee implementation of projects.
Participatory Budgeting Recife, Brazil	2001 (this iteration of PB)	To oversee public works procurement processes and monitor progress; includes decision-making through to implementation	The executive branch (e.g. president, governor and mayor) present the budget for legislative approval but can develop it as they choose.	*Deliberative* Involves citizen-based community committees directly on a weekly basis. Public works contractors are required to hire local community members. Open access thematic forums discuss the implications of municipal social investments and use of Federal and State level project funds. The budget is not determined in advance, unlike elsewhere.	***Institutionalised***	Citizens including children in over 200 municipal schools Nearly 20% of the adult population was involved in some way in the 2009 budget process \	Annual reviews are undertaken to improve the process.
Health Care Policy-making Council São Paulo	>20 years	To 'evaluate new health policies and to set health care priorities'		*Deliberative.*	Supported by a ***mandate*** to develop deliberative Municipal Health Councils to work with municipal governments	Citizens, health professionals, government agencies and health service providers/producers	
Citizen's Assembly on Electoral Reform Ontario	2006/7	To assess Ontario's electoral system and	Referendum to decide whether to adopt the Assembly's	*Deliberative.* Participants engaged in an 8 month process of learning about electoral reform through talking to people, reading public submissions and chairing public	***Not institutionalised,*** although it was Initiated by the	103 randomly selected citizens, selected by Chief Election Officer	

(Canada)			recommend whether the province should retain its current system or adopt a new one.	recommendation in 2007. Proposal rejected by 63% of voters.	hearings. A deliberative Citizen's Assembly was then held over six weekends.	Premier and an amendment to the *Election Act*2 was passed to authorize the selection of representative bodies of electors to consider specified matters relating to democratic renewal. The Assembly was supported by a secretariat.	according to criteria outlined in the amendment to the *Election Act. I*	
3.Collaborative governance without or beyond government	Toiyabe Wetlands and Watershed Management Team	1980s	To find an effective way of dealing with conflict over the management of private and publicly owned land, that government had been unable to resolve.	Participants agreed on a form of land management they could all live with. Government was not involved.	***Possibly deliberative (not fully evaluated)*** Place-base collaboration, instigated by a farmer who invited stakeholders such as farmers and environmentalists to visit his ranch to look at and discuss the way it could be managed. The group ran trials to evaluate the use of livestock on the land, and realised that there was a way of managing the land that would satisfy both farmers and environmentalists.	***Not institutionalised –*** instigated and run by grassroots community and other stakeholders.	Local community members and stakeholders with an interest in the issue.	Not evaluated, other than in academic research.
	Beaverhead-Deerlodge Partnership	2006 - onwards	To develop an forest management plan that would be more appropriate than the one proposed by the US Forest Service.	Participants agreed on a management plan that was eventually incorporated into legislation (pending in US Congress).	***Possibly deliberative (not fully evaluated).*** Place-based collaboration, instigated by 'citizen leaders' from lumber mills and local environmental groups. They worked together informally to develop a management plan that all parties could live with.	***Not institutionalised –*** instigated and run by grassroots community and other stakeholders	Local community members and stakeholders with an interest in the issue.	Not evaluated, other than in academic research.
	World Wide Views on Global Warming	2009	To deliberate about the core issues at stake in the	(See www.wwviews.org. for details of the outcomes)	***Deliberative.*** The citizens received balanced information about climate change, and deliberated with each other for a full day on September 26,	***Not institutionalised.*** Organised by the Danish Board of	4,000 citizens in 38 countries.	Feedback from participants; limited effect on decisions in

			December 2009 UN negotiations on climate change and to provide recommendat-ions		2009.		Technology.		relation to climate change.

Table 1: Case Studies in Collaborative Governance (Adapted from Bedsted and Klüver, 2009; OECD, 2009; Kemmis and McKinney, 2011; Best et al., 2011. <mark>Etc***</mark>)

25

Conclusion

The typology of collaborative governance proposed in this paper presents one way of gaining a birds eye view of collaborative governance, i.e. framing the potential functions as an initiative which (1) legitimises and better informs existing government decision making by linking collaborative processes formally to conventional government processes; (2) challenges and/or gradually transforms existing government power structures; and (3) usurps, or acts outside of, conventional government processes. As previously noted, these categories need not be either mutually exclusive, nor understood as steps in a sequential process of evolution from less to more sophisticated forms of DCG.

Our particular focus is on *deliberative* collaborative governance involving shared, discursive decision-making and policy development between governments, citizens and stakeholders. To align with the principles of deliberative democracy, DCG should be characterised by a clear intent on the part of governments to share problem solving and decision making with ordinary citizens, demonstrating a transparent and influential link between deliberation and policy development or decision-making. More specifically, participation should be demographically representative, maximising cognitive diversity; deliberative, maximising opportunities to share reasons, explore options and arrive at a coherent voice in an egalitarian manner; as well as influential, impacting on policy development and decision-making. Preferably, these participatory initiatives should be embedded as ongoing processes rather than one-off events.

From the case studies examined, there are a number of factors that help determine the form, quality and impact of DCG initiatives. For instance:

- The locus of decision making power can influence the category of CG that can be undertaken – e.g. if a government agent instigating a collaborative governance initiative does not have final decision making power, DCG is likely to be confined to a limited version of category 1 in that decision making power will not be devolved, it will just be better informed.
- The socio-political context in which CG develops and is implemented is significant -
    - in several case studies, more radical category 2 forms of DCG emerged in a period of major political transformation, such as in South Korea and Brazil;
    - DCG models cannot necessarily be easily transplanted from one place to another;
    - DCG may enhance or challenge existing government institutions (e.g. in China).
- Grassroots initiatives developed outside of government can be particularly innovative – and can inform or be joined with government processes.
- Collaborative governance can involve collaborative action as well as decision making, in an iterative process.
- Collaborative governance initiatives that are successful in themselves may be hampered by deficiencies such as lack of resourcing elsewhere in government.
- Public perceptions of government commitment to DCG influence the degree of participation; institutionalisation of DCG can help to overcome this.

This article aims to start a more broad yet focussed conversation around deliberative collaborative governance. Out next task if to facilitate an online deliberative crowd sourcing initiative, in which practitioners and decision-makers who are pioneering deliberative collaborative governance can

comment on the usefulness of the typology and modify it accordingly, amend the examples, give greater detail to the governance mechanisms, document additional examples, and help to analyse the results in order to inform deliberative democracy and collaborative governance theory and practice.

References

Ansell, C. and Gash, A. 2007. 'Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice.' In *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory.* Vol. 18, pp. 543-571.

Ashford, N. and Rest, K. 1999. 'Executive Summary', in *Public Participation in Contaminated Communities.* Available online: URL: http://web.mit.edu/ctpid/www/tl/PPCCexsum.pdf (Accessed 12 October 2011).

Avritzer, L. 2006.'New Public Spheres in Brazil: Local Democracy and Deliberative Politics.' In *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research.* Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 623-637.

Bedsted, B. and Klüver, L. (eds) 2009. *World Wide Views on Climate Warming: From the World's Citizens to the Climate Policy Makers. Policy Report.* Danish Board of Technology.

Best, N., Brabender, S., Koop, A., Spink, P. and Teixeira, M. 2011. *Recife, Brazil: Participatory Budgeting Case Study.* Online. Available: URL: http://www.vitalizing-democracy.org/site/downloads/1324_303_Case_Study_Recife.pdf (Accessed 12 March 2012).

Bicking, M. and Wimmer, M. 2011. 'Future Internet for Collaborative Governance: Closing Gaps in ICT for Governance and Policy Modelling.' In *Proceedings of the 2011 International Conference on Networking, Sensing and Control Delft, the Netherlands*, 11-13 April 2011.

Boulding, C and Wampler, B. 2010. 'Voice, Votes, and Resources: Evaluating the Effect of Participatory Democracy on Well-being.' In *World Development*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp125-135.

Bryson, J., Crosby, B. and Stone, M. 2006. 'The Design and Implementation of Cross-Sector Collaborations: Propositions from the Literature.' In *Public Administration Review.* Vol. 66, pp. 44-55.

Carson, L. and Hartz-Karp, J. 2005. 'Adapting and Combining Deliberative Designs', in J. Gastil and P. Levine (Eds), *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century*. Jossey Bass, San Francisco, pp. 120–38.

Chester, C. and Moomaw, W. 2008. 'A Taxonomy of Collaborative Governance: a Guide to Understanding the Diversity of International and Domestic Conservation Accords.' In *Environmental Agreements*. Vol. 8, pp. 187-206.

Department for Communities and Local Government. 2008. *Participatory Budgeting: A Draft National Strategy.* Communities and Local Government Publications, London.

Donahue, J. and Zeckhauser, R. 2011. *Private Roles for Public Goals.* Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Dryzek, J. 2011. *Foundations and Frontiers of Deliberative Governance*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T. and Balogh, S. 2011. 'An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance'. In *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory Advance Access.* Published May 2, 2011.

Fierlbeck, K. 2010. 'Public Health and Collaborative Governance.' In *Canadian Public Administration.* Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 1-19.

Fishkin, J., Baogang, H., Luskin, R. and Siu, A. 2011. 'Deliberative Democracy in an Unlikely Place: Deliberative Polling in China.' In *B.J.Pol.S.*Vol. 40, 435-448.

Hendriks, C., Dryzek, J. and Hunold, C. 2007. 'Turning up the Heat: Partisanship in Deliberative Innovation.' In *Political Studies*, Vol. 55, pp. 362-383.

Gastil, J. and Knobloch, K. 2010. *Evaluation Report to the Oregon State Legislature on the 2010 Oregon Citizen's Initiative Review.*Department of Communication, University of Washington.

Gastil, J. and Levine, P. (Eds). 2005. *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century*. Jossey Bass, San Francisco.

Gastil, J. 2008. *Political Communication and Deliberation.* Sage Publications, Los Angeles.

Gunningham, N. 2009. 'The New Collaborative Environmental Governance: The Localization of Regulation.' In *Journal of Law and Society*. Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 145-66.

Hartz-Karp, J. 2005. *A Case Study in Deliberative Democracy: Dialogue with the City.* Online. Available: URL: http://www.21stcenturydialogue.com/resources/Dialogue%20with%20the%20City%20Case%20Study%20published.pdf (Accessed 3 November 2011).

Hartz-Karp, J. (2007). 'Understanding Deliberativeness, Bridging Theory with Practice', *International Journal of Public Participation*, 1(2): 2–23, http://www.iap2.org/ijp2 (Accessed 9 February 2008).

Innes, J. and Booher, D. (2003) 'Collaborative Policymaking: Governance through Dialogue', in M. Hajer and H. Wagenaar (Eds), *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 33–59.

Innes, J and Booher, D. 2004. 'Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century.' In *Planning Theory & Practice* Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 419-436.

Kemmis, D. and McKinney, M. 2011. 'Collaboration as an Emerging form of Democracy.' In *National Civic Review,* Vol. 100, No.2, pp. 2–12.

Kim, Sunhyuk. 2010. 'Collaborative Governance in South Korea: Citizen Participation in Policy Making and Welfare Service Provision.' In *Asian Perspective.* Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 165-190.

Kimani, N. 2010. 'A Collaborative Approach to Environmental Governance in East Africa.' In *Journal of Environmental Law.* Vol 22, No. 1, pp. 27-57.

Lee, C. 2011. 'Five Assumptions Academics Make About Public Deliberation, And Why They Deserve Rethinking.' In *Journal of Public Deliberation*. Vol.7, No. 1. Online. Available URL: http://services.bepress.com/jpd/vol7/iss1/art7 (Accessed 12 January 2012).

Leib, E and He, B. 2006. (Eds), *The Search for Deliberative Democracy in China*, New York: Palgrave.

Lukensmeyer, C. 2009. 'Learning from the Past, Committing to the Future: A Practitioner's View of Our Democracy'. In *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 70, pp.S273-S283.

Maley, T. 2010. 'Alternative Budgeting and the Radical Imagination: In Europe but not in Canada?'. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action*, Vol. 4, No.2, pp. 107-140.

National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (NCDD).2010. *Resource Guide on Public Engagement.* Online: Available URL: http://www.ncdd.org/files/NCDD2010_Resource_Guide.pdf (Accessed 12,3,2012)

National Consumer Council and Involve. (2008). '*Deliberative Public Engagement: 9 principles*', UK.

OECD. 2009. *Focus on Citizens: Public Engagement for Better Policy and Services.* OECD Studies on Public Engagement, OECD Publications.

O'Flynn, J. and Wanna, J. (Eds). 2008. *Collaborative Governance: A New Era of Public Policy in Australia?'* Australian National University E Press. Online. Available URL: http://epress.anu.edu.au/collab_gov_citation.html (Accessed 30 January 2012).

Ontario Citizen's Assembly Secretariat. 2007. *Democracy at work: The Ontario Citizen's Assembly on Electoral Reform: a Record of Ontario's first Citizens' Assembly Process.* Online. Available URL: http://www.citizensassembly.gov.on.ca/assets/Democracy%20at%20Work%20-%20The%20Ontario%20Citizens'%20Assembly%20on%20Electoral%20Reform.pdf (Accessed 13 December 2011).

Page, S. 2010. 'Integrative Leadership for Collaborative Governance: Civic Engagement in Seattle.' In *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 21, pp. 246-263.

Portsmouth Listens. 2003a. *Portsmouth Listens: Process & People.* Online. Available URL: www.**portsmouthlistens**.org/**people**.htm (Accessed 10 March 2012).

Portsmouth Listens. 2003b. *Portsmouth Listens: Planning for Portsmouth's Future.* Online. Available URL: http://www.portsmouthlistens.org/4_3info.htm (Accessed 10 March 2012).

Ralston, S. 2008. Intelligently designing deliberative health care forums: Dewey's metaphysics, Cognitive Science and a Brazilian Example. (Dupont Summit 2008). *The Review of Policy Research,* 25**,** 619.

Rasche, A. 2010. 'Collaborative Governance 2.0.' In *Corporate Governance.* Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 500-511.

Rask, M., Worthington, R. and Lammi, R. (2011). *Citizen Participation in Global Environmental Governance.* Earthscan, London and New York.

Reidy, C. and Herriman, J. 2011. 'Deliberative Mini-publics and the Global Deliberative System: Insights from an Evaluation of World Wide Views on Global Warming in Australia.' In *PORTAL Journal of Multidisciplinary International Studies,* Vol. 8, No.3, pp. 1-29.

Schor, D. 2011. Hampton USA: Deliberative Governance. Case Study (Draft). Online. Available URL: http://www.vitalizing-democracy.org/site/downloads/94_265_Case_Study_Hampton.pdf (Accessed 10 March 2012).

Sirianni, C. 2009. *Investing in Democracy: Engaging Citizens in Collaborative Governance.* Brookings Institution Press, Washington.

Sustainable Portsmouth. 2009. *"Portsmouth Listens" History.* Online. Available URL: http://sustainableportsmouth.org/about/portsmouth-listens-history (Accessed 10 March 2012).

Wanna, J. 2008. 'Collaborative Government: Meanings, Dimensions, Drivers and Outcomes.' In *Collaborative Governance: A New Era of Public Policy in Australia?'* Australian National University E Press, pp. 3-12. Online. Available URL: http://epress.anu.edu.au/collab_gov_citation.html (Accessed 30 January 2012).

Zadek, S. 2008. 'Global Collaborative Governance: There is no Alternative.' In *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 374-388.