ISBN 978-92-64-04886-7 Focus on Citizens Public Engagement for Better Policy and Services © OECD 2009

## PART III Chapter 35

# Democratic Innovations: Open Space Event

by

Edward Andersson, Head of Practice, Involve, United Kingdom

Around 20 people from 13 countries met as part of the "Open Space" event held on the afternoon of Friday 27 June 2008, following the official closure of the OECD/Slovenian Government International workshop on "Building Citizen Centred Policies and Services." This event was endorsed by (but was not officially part of) the preceding workshop.

What follows is a personal perspective, as I cannot hope to capture the details of all the rich discussions that we generated in a short period of time. Several reports have already been uploaded to the website of the event <a href="https://www.webjam.com/oecd\_openspace">www.webjam.com/oecd\_openspace</a> and I hope that others will follow and that the conversations started in Ljubljana will continue online.

## Why hold an Open Space event?

The two reasons for holding the event were to expose the participants to a different – and more participative – way of working, as well as giving participants the chance to develop ideas they had as a result of the international workshop. An online forum was set up in advance of the day to identify key areas for discussion.

The stated purpose of the "open space" event was to: "provide a space for open and equal discussion between conference attendees and members of the Slovenian civil society organisations, allowing participants to take forward actions they have identified previously, develop partnerships of interest, and build ownership of conference outcomes."

The event was a partnership between Umanotera – The Slovenian Foundation for Sustainable Development and Involve – a not for profit foundation based in the United Kingdom. Umanotera's role was to co-ordinate with the Slovenian Ministry of Public Administration, identify Slovene participants for the event and run a meeting of Slovene participants in advance to present the OECD report, co-ordinate Slovenian input and motivate participants. Involve set up the online space where participants could log their ideas for sessions to run. We also facilitated the workshop on the day and wrote this brief report of the event.

## **Highlights**

A wide range of interesting topics were proposed by the participants. In the end the following sessions were held:

- Exploring Instruments for Community Empowerment.
- E-Democracy Lessons from Slovenia and elsewhere.
- How to improve citizens' awareness of the implementation status of the Millennium Development Goals.
- Building Global Coalitions of NGOs for the 2009 Copenhagen Summit on Climate Change.
- Creating a Global Democracy Index.

### Box 35.1. About "Open Space"

"Open Space" Technology is a participative meeting approach, developed in the 1980s by Harrison Owen. A feature that distinguishes Open Space from many other methods is the amount of responsibility and power over the agenda given to the participants.

An open space event has a central theme or question, but no fixed agenda (in this case the theme was the same as the workshop, namely "Building citizen-centred policies and services"). The participants set the agenda based on their areas of interest and self-organise in breakout groups, reporting back at the end of the event.

Open space has four fundamental principles:

- "Whoever comes are the right people."
- "Whenever it starts is the right time."
- "When it's over, it's over."
- "Whatever happens is the only thing that could happen."

There is also one "law":

The "law of two feet". (If participants find themselves in a situation where they are not learning or contributing, they have a responsibility to go to another session, or take a break for personal reflection.)

These principles help create an environment where participants feel empowered to take joint responsibility for the successful conduct of the meeting. Open Space has successfully been used by hundreds of organisations across the globe, in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors.

For more information about Open Space, please see:

www.peopleandparticipation.net/display/Methods/Open+Space.

The discussions covered a broad range of topics. Groups ranged in size from two people to seven but in all cases participants appeared to have had very useful conversations. Indeed in some cases the smaller groups were most effective, as people with high levels of specialist knowledge could work together at the same level.

Some of the innovative ideas discussed on the day included "Dating for democracy" – the idea to draw on the successful principles of dating sites when designing online engagement, and the idea of involving citizens in monitoring implementation of targets – such as the Millennium Development Goals – by measuring how many years countries are lagging behind the UN targets.

Participants found the chance to share practical experiences across national contexts very useful; for example, the ways in which different countries are dealing with political apathy, public distrust and the digital divide when engaging online.

Other benefits were new contacts. Many participants mentioned that they would stay in touch after the event and develop joint projects together. It was also a good opportunity for local civil society organisations from Slovenia to interact with colleagues from other countries and from international organisations.

It was a privilege to be able to facilitate the session and I would like to thank all of those who took part in the Open Space Event and helped make it a success. I hope the event has contributed to building successful international partnerships for democratic innovation.

## For more information please see:

www.webjam.com/oecd\_openspace www.involve.org.uk www.umanotera.org

## Table of Contents

| Acknowledgements  |  |     |  |
|-------------------|--|-----|--|
| Executive Summary |  |     |  |
|                   | Part I   |     |  |
| Focus or          | Citizens: Public Engagement for Better Policy and Services |     |  |
|                   |  |     |  |
| -                 | 7 Invest in Open and Inclusive Policy Making?              |     |  |
|                   | n Policy Making: Work in Progress                          |     |  |
| =                 | usive Policy Making: The Next Step                         |     |  |
| -                 | uation Improves Performance                                | 57  |  |
| =                 | eraging New Technologies and the Participative Web.        | 65  |  |
| Chapter 6. Prin   | ciples to Support Practice                                 | 77  |  |
|                   | Part II  |     |  |
|                   | Case Studies in Citizen Engagement                         |     |  |
| Introduction      |  | 83  |  |
| introduction      |  | 63  |  |
| Regional and Url  | ban Development  | 89  |  |
| Chapter 7.        | <b>Building Future Scenarios for Regional Development</b>  |     |  |
|                   | in Northeast England, United Kingdom                       | 91  |  |
| Chapter 8.        | Public Engagement to Achieve Self-Sufficiency              |     |  |
|                   | in New Brunswick, Canada                                   | 97  |  |
| Chapter 9.        | Public Involvement in Urban Renewal in Trondheim, Norway   | 105 |  |
| Chapter 10.       | Improving Quality of Life in Distressed Urban Areas        |     |  |
|                   | in Bremen, Germany   | 111 |  |
| Chapter 11.       | Building on a Participatory Community Summit               |     |  |
|                   | in Port Phillip, Australia                                 | 119 |  |
| Local Participato | ry Budgeting   | 127 |  |
| Chapter 12.       | Participatory Budgeting in Çanakkale, Turkey               | 129 |  |
| -                 | Participatory Budgeting in Buk-gu, Korea                   |     |  |
| National Level Po | articipatory Programmes                                    | 143 |  |
|                   | The Citizen Participation Policy Programme, Finland        |     |  |
| =                 | The Environment Roundtable, France                         |     |  |
| =                 | The Forest Dialogue, Austria                               |     |  |
| -                 | Standardised Surveys on Voter Behaviour, Switzerland       |     |  |

| <b>Building Capaci</b> | ty and Tools for Engagement  | 167  |
|------------------------|--|------|
| Chapter 18.            | The Online Participation Project, New Zealand                      | 169  |
| -                      | Developing Professional Standards for Citizen Engagement,          |      |
| -                      | The Netherlands  | 177  |
| Chapter 20.            | <b>Building Government's Capacity to Engage Citizens,</b>          |      |
|                        | United Kingdom   | 185  |
|                        |  |      |
|                        | Part III   |      |
| Prac                   | ctitioners' Perspectives: Why Now, How and What Next?              |      |
| Introduction           |  | 195  |
| Why Now? The           | Case for Citizen Engagement  | 197  |
| -                      | Why Should Governments Engage Citizens in Service Delivery         |      |
| Grapter 21.            | and Policy Making?   | 199  |
| Chapter 22.            | Public Engagement Is a Must in a Multi-Stakeholder World           |      |
| =                      | Calling All Politicians: Take Your Citizens Seriously,             |      |
| •                      | or Be Marginalised   | 213  |
| Chapter 24.            | And the Winner Is Trust and Credibility                            |      |
| How? Engaging          | the Public Effectively   | 225  |
|                        | Participate, but Do so Pragmatically                               |      |
| =                      | The Next Challenge for Citizen Engagement: Institutionalisation    |      |
| -                      | Internal Communication: The Problem and the Solution               |      |
| -                      | Leveraging Technology to Engage Young People                       |      |
| -                      | The Privacy Implications of Public Engagement                      |      |
| Grapter 23.            | The Fivacy implications of Fubic Engagement                        | 213  |
| Where? How Co          | ntext Shapes Practice  | 249  |
| Chapter 30.            | Social Partnership in Ireland: A Problem-Solving Process           | 251  |
| Chapter 31.            | The Right to Know in Mexico: The Challenge of Dissemination        | 257  |
| Chapter 32.            | Participation at the Municipal Level in Italy: The Case of Bologna | 261  |
| Chapter 33.            | People's Participation in Korea: Formality or Reality?             | 267  |
| Which? Exchan          | ging Experience and Perspectives                                   | 271  |
|                        | Building Citizen-Centred Policies and Services: A Global           | _, _ |
| Chapter 34.            | Snapshot   | 272  |
| Chanter 35             | Democratic Innovations: Open Space Event                           |      |
| -                      | Are You Listening? Youth Voices in Public Policy                   |      |
| Chapter 50.            | Are rou insterning. Total voices in rubile roney                   | 203  |
| What Next? Sho         | aping the Future Today   | 293  |
| Chapter 37.            | The Future of Open and Inclusive Policy Making                     | 295  |
| Chapter 38.            | Globalised Democracy   | 299  |
| Annex A. I.eois        | slation and Policy Measures for Open Government                    | 303  |
| _                      | sight Institutions for Open Government                             |      |
|                        | o  |      |

| Ann    | ex C          | C. Members of the OECD Steering Group on Open and Inclusive Policy Making (2007-2008)   | 315 |
|--------|---------------|---|-----|
| Ann    | ex I          | D. Civil Society Respondents to the 2007 OECD "Questionnaire for Civil Society Organisations on Open and Inclusive Policy Making" | 317 |
| Ann    | 02 F          | E. Glossary   |     |
| 211111 | CA L          | Globbury  | 320 |
| Box    | es            |   |     |
| C      | ).1.          | Guiding Principles for open and inclusive policy making   | 17  |
| 1      | l.1.          | Building citizen centred policies and services  | 26  |
|        |               | Australia: Citizen summits help shape long-term strategy  | 29  |
| 2      | 2.1.          | Civil society organisations: Evaluation of progress in open   |     |
|        |               | and inclusive policy making   |     |
|        |               | Civil society organisations: Views on principles  |     |
|        |               | The Netherlands: Code of conduct for professional consultation  |     |
|        |               | Czech Republic: Setting new standards for public consultation   | 36  |
| 2      | 2.5.          | Finland: Building the capacity and culture for public participation   |     |
|        |               | among civil servants  |     |
|        |               | Austria: Building capacity for public participation   |     |
|        |               | European Commission: Putting principles into practice   | 39  |
| 2      | 2.8.          | European Commission: Accountability and participation   |     |
| _      |               | in supranational decision-making  |     |
|        |               | Relevant OECD principles  |     |
|        |               | Constitutional provisions for openness  |     |
|        |               | Italy: Tuscany region guarantees rights to participation  |     |
|        |               | UK: Developing engagement profiles  |     |
|        |               | The Netherlands: Piecing together the profiles of non-participants  |     |
|        |               | Austria: "Children to the Centre"   | 48  |
| 3      | 5.4.          | Austria: Developing a social integration strategy through an inclusive participation process                                      | 52  |
| 9      | ) E           | European Commission: Fostering eInclusion.  |     |
|        |               | France: The high school participatory budget of the Poitou-Charentes region   |     |
|        |               | UK: The Innovation Fund   |     |
|        |               | Austria: Evaluation helps government identify people's expectations   | J-  |
| 7      | г. т.         | and needs   | 60  |
| 4      | 12            | Canada: Building on multiple sources of evaluation.   |     |
|        |               | Ministerial meeting charts the course towards an open and inclusive   | 02  |
| _      | ,. <u>.</u> . | Internet economy  | 67  |
| 5      | 5.2.          | UK: Leveraging the web for a "national conversation"  |     |
|        |               | France: Engaging users in designing online services   |     |
|        |               | US: Intellipedia and Diplopedia   |     |
|        |               | OECD: Designing and launching Wikigender  |     |
|        |               | Portugal: Using a social network site to engage with citizens abroad  |     |
|        |               | New Zealand: The ParticipatioNZ Wiki  |     |
|        |               | UK: FixMyStreet.com   |     |
|        |               | Guiding principles for open and inclusive policy making   |     |
|        |               | Vision statement  | 125 |

| 18.1.         | Why use a wiki?   | 171 |
|---------------|---|-----|
| 18.2.         | Wikis in government: Potential risks and mitigations                          | 171 |
| 35.1.         | About "Open Space"  | 283 |
|               |   |     |
| <b>Tables</b> |   |     |
| 2.1.          | Actions taken to apply principles in practice: some examples                  |     |
|               | from OECD countries   | 38  |
| 4.1.          | Advantages and disadvantages of internal, independent                         |     |
|               | and participatory evaluation  | 61  |
| II.1.         | Overview of main characteristics of the country case studies                  |     |
| 7.1.          | SHiNE: Key characteristics  | 93  |
|               | The Self-Sufficiency Agenda: Key characteristics                              |     |
|               | Trondheim urban renewal project: Key characteristics                          |     |
|               | WiN and Soziale Stadt projects in Tenever: Key characteristics                |     |
|               | Port Phillip Community Summit: Key characteristics                            |     |
|               | Guiding principles for the Port Philip Community Plan Steering Committee      |     |
|               | "I Know My Budget" campaign: Key characteristics                              |     |
| 13.1.         | Participatory Budgeting (PB): Key characteristics                             | 137 |
| 14.1.         | Citizen Participation Policy Programme: Key characteristics                   | 148 |
|               | The Environment Roundtable: Key characteristics                               |     |
|               | Austrian Forest Dialogue: Key characteristics                                 |     |
|               | Vox surveys: Key characteristics  |     |
|               | The Online Participation Project: Key characteristics                         |     |
|               | Mapping four dimensions of the impact of citizen engagement                   |     |
| 19.2.         | Developing standards for citizen engagement: Key characteristics              | 182 |
| 20.1.         | Building capacity for engagement: Key characteristics                         | 187 |
|               |   |     |
| Figures       | 3   |     |
| 1.1.          | Policy performance and democratic performance                                 | 22  |
|               | What are OECD countries' goals with respect to government?                    |     |
|               | What are OECD countries' goals with respect to citizens?                      | 28  |
|               | Principles for which greatest progress has been achieved                      |     |
|               | Principles which are the most difficult to meet                               | 35  |
|               | Resources devoted to promoting open and inclusive policy making               | 37  |
|               | Main targets of support for open and inclusive policy making                  | 41  |
|               | Identifying the costs for government  | 42  |
|               | Identifying the risks for government  | 43  |
|               | What barriers are people facing?  | 49  |
|               | Why don't people participate?   | 49  |
|               | Measures to lower barriers for government information                         | 51  |
|               | Measures to lower barriers for consultation and participation                 | 51  |
|               | Measures to increase uptake of government information                         | 52  |
|               | Measures to increase the appeal of consultation and participation initiatives | 53  |
|               | What proportion of open and inclusive policy making initiatives               |     |
|               | are evaluated?  | 58  |

| 4.2.  | Countries have different reasons for evaluating open                      |     |  |
|-------|---|-----|--|
|       | and inclusive policy making   | 59  |  |
| 4.3.  | Countries evaluate a range of factors in open and inclusive policy making | 60  |  |
| 4.4.  | Self-evaluation is the norm   | 62  |  |
| 5.1.  | OECD governments use ICT to inform more than to engage people             | 70  |  |
| 5.2.  | OECD governments are exploring new online options to inform               |     |  |
|       | and engage citizens   | 71  |  |
| 5.3.  | Shifting paradigms: from Participation 1.0 to Participation 2.0           | 73  |  |
| 12.1. | Mapping participation in Canakkale city management                        | 130 |  |



#### From:

## **Focus on Citizens**

Public Engagement for Better Policy and Services

## Access the complete publication at:

https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264048874-en

## Please cite this chapter as:

Andersson, Edward (2009), "Democratic Innovations: Open Space Event", in OECD, *Focus on Citizens: Public Engagement for Better Policy and Services*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264048874-38-en

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgment of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to rights@oecd.org. Requests for permission to photocopy portions of this material for public or commercial use shall be addressed directly to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) at info@copyright.com or the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC) at contact@cfcopies.com.

