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Consolidation of objectives in Spatial Planning around the notion of sustainability:

- Deliver **sustainable and fair futures**
- Increase **public goods**
- Redistribute **gains**
- Increase **life chances and prosperity**
We have some directions

(Spatial) Justice+ (Social, Economic and Environmental) Sustainability + (Intervention/Design of) Governance
‘Enhanced’ Sustainability

“For sustainability to occur, it must occur simultaneously in each of its three dimensions” (economic, social and environmental)

Larsen, 2012
“The main goal is to create conditions for the full realization of human potentials, through healthy, sustainable and fair environments.”

Human Rights Education Associates

“Sustainable development” http://www.hrea.org/
In order to achieve those objectives, planners and designers are inserted in and must understand complex systems of governance.
Our hypothesis
Our hypothesis

Understanding and designing governance helps enhance social sustainability because it might warrant ‘procedural justice’ (Fainstein).
Understanding and designing governance helps enhance social sustainability because it might warranty ‘procedural justice’ (Fainstein).

Ultimately, it may also deliver better results in terms of adequacy of solutions, acceptance and implementation of plans.
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X

Descriptive** dimension

* relating to an ideal standard or model. ** also may be understood as ‘how it happens in practice’
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The great sectors of society (civil society, public sector and private sector) ought to be in positive tension, where they simultaneously apply and receive pressure from other sectors. In doing so, they keep each other in check and avoid overrunning each other. The problem with this model is that not everyone has an equal voice or power to express his or her views.
Agents form networks of coalitions between sectors and within sectors towards objectives.
Agents form networks of coalitions between sectors and within sectors towards objectives.
Agents form networks of coalitions between sectors and within sectors towards objectives.

Spatial Planners and designers are inserted in networks (and bureaucracies).
Governance refers to the emergence of a ‘policy making style’ dominated by cooperation among government levels and between public and non public actors and the civil society.

Papadopoulos, 2007
Changes in governing (& planning)

Emergence of a particular style of governing where there must be sustained co-ordination and coherence among a wide variety of actors with different purposes and objectives from all sectors of society.

Papadopoulos, 2007
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State (the rule of law)
The rule of law

The rule of law provides the framework for the Public sector, the Private sector and the Civil society to exist in certain forms and in certain relationships with each other.
What's governance again?
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Values and norms (informal institutions)
Common values and norms
(informal institutions)
Common values and norms (informal institutions)

Explains behaviours like patronage, nepotism, corruption, ingrained practices and traditions as well as how networks are formed.
Multilevel governance

‘Involves a large number of decision-making arenas, differentiated along both functional and territorial lines and interlinked in a non-hierarchical way’

Eberlein and Kerwer, 2004
Networked governance

Policy making and implementation is ‘shared’ by politicians, technocrats, experts, dedicated agencies, authorities, semi private and private companies, the public, NGOs, etc which constitute NETWORKS of policy and decision making across levels, territories, mandates, etc.
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Multilevel Governance

Ward (elects the members of the Court of Commons)
Multilevel Governance

1. Ward (elects the members of the Court of commons)
2. City of London Corporation (borough)
3. Greater London Authority
4. English regions
5. England
6. United Kingdom
7. European Union
Networked decision-making

City of London Corporation

Primary decision making

- Court of aldermen
- Lord Mayor + 2 Sheriffs

Elected by livery men (108 livery companies)

Elected councilors by residents, landowners, land leasers (25 wards with different number of elected councilors)

121 committees in 2012

72 outside bodies
Networked Governance

Great London Plan

Greater London Authority
- Mayor of London
- London Assembly (25)

Primary decision making
- Court of aldermen
- Lord Mayor
- 2 Sheriffs
- 121 committees in 2012

72 outside bodies

Elected by residents of London
Elected by 14 constituencies + 11 from a party list
Elected in 25 wards by residents and landowners

History, tradition, uses and customs

Standing orders

UK local authority legislation

UK Parliament

House of Lords
- (powers are limited)
- Lords Temporal (Appointed)
- Lords Spiritual (Appointed)

House of Commons
- MPs (Elected)

Queen (advised by Prime Minister)

European Union

Directives and conventions that have subsequently been enacted into UK legislation and influenced the development of the thinking behind the Government’s policies, like the Groundwater Directive and the Environmental Impact Assessment Directive, for example.

These include global treaties, such as Kyoto and strategies for dealing with the influences and effects of climate change and for integrating sustainable development into the EU’s environmental policies as a result of major conferences, including the World Summit on Sustainable Development.

International protocols
Urbanisation in the Randstad, 1950

Urbanisation in the Randstad, 2010
Multilevel governance in emerging city-regions.

Urbanisation in the Randstad, 1950

Urbanisation in the Randstad, 2010
Multilevel governance in emerging city-regions
Policy formulation and implementation

Networks involving:

- public actors (politicians and administrators) in different decision levels
- technocrats
- economic agents
- interest representatives (civil + corporate)
- other stakeholders
- experts (e.g. planners)
New forms of steering complex governance networks

Deliberation
Bargaining
Compromise-seeking
Instead of... blueprints
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Why network governance?

1. decisions with strong output legitimacy
2. the content is more appropriate
3. better accepted by target groups
4. technically more adequate and politically more realistic decisions
Designing governance will make your plan and design better.
But what are the challenges of governance for the quality of our democracies?
Now we will explore challenges presented by governance in detail.
Main issues
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Main issues

1. Hollowing out of the State
2. Accountability deficiency
3. Representation and visibility
4. Decoupling of the realm of politics
Hollowing out of the State

The networked nature of governance structures have been triggered by ideologies that endorse the minimal state
But we think that...

they are ultimately the result of the increasing complexity of our societies and of their embeddedness in complex spatial settings
Accountability is at the core of discussions on networked governance.
Accountability
Accountability refers to the attribution of responsibility and mandate, and the possibility of check by other parties involved.
Accountability refers to the attribution of responsibility and mandate, and the possibility of check by other parties involved.

In network governance, it is difficult to attribute responsibility and mandates and ultimately difficult to hold anyone accountable (the problem of many hands)
Accountability

For agents to be held accountable, they must be identifiable as accountability holders and they must belong to arenas where there is a possibility of sanction.
For elected officers, we might think that elections are the ultimate test of accountability: the hanging sanction is the non-reelection.
But...

In networked governance structures, the role of elected officials is often not central in the decision making process.
Moreover...

we shouldn’t narrow the issue of accountability to that of democratic control

Grant & Keohane, 2004
Other forms of (necessary) accountability in policy making and implementation

Fiscal

Legal

Administrative
Weak visibility

Decisional procedures in policy networks are often informal and opaque (as this facilitates the achievement of compromise)
Politics of problems
X
politics of opinion
Politics of problems
X
politics of opinion

Politics of problems (problem solving politics) oriented towards a backstage network of knowledge and decision-making
Politics of problems (problem solving politics) oriented towards a backstage network of knowledge and decision-making

Politics of opinion is the traditional politics in the media, party struggles and ideological assertions
Citizens as accountability holdees
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Citizens should be the ultimate holdees of democratic accountability...
Citizens as accountability holdees

Citizens should be the ultimate holdees of democratic accountability...

...but in reality the public is not the only judge of governmental performance and in many instances citizens can not sanction agents that are responsibly for policies that affect them directly (e.g. IMF, European Union, etc.)
Transparency

Transparency induces the accountability holders to provide justifications for their actions, but there are no guarantees that accountability holdees can apply sanctions.

Publicity is a necessary condition for democracy but not a sufficient one.
Multilevel aspects make competencies fuzzy

Complex structures cutting across decision levels (e.g. federal states, emerging city-regions, but also the EU, IMF, World Bank, etc)

Entails cooperative intergovernmental relations, but the formal division of competencies is often fuzzy (e.g. EU)
Diluted responsibility

Networks dilute responsibility among a large number of actors (the problem of many hands)
Policy networks must be (re)coupled to public representative bodies that are able to regulate service provision or policy implementation and which provide the tools for identifying accountability holders and also tools for sanctioning them.

Policy networks must be re-coupled with the public arena.
It is not that simple!
Composition of policy networks

Policy networks are largely composed of bureaucrats, policy experts and interest representatives, who are often only indirectly accountable to citizens and sometimes only accountable to their peers (other experts).
Peer accountability

In governance networks, public accountability is often replaced by peer accountability. Durable cooperative interactions between actors are expected to generate self-limitation, empathy and mutual trust, but also mutual black mailing and excessive reliance on reputation and trust.
often dwells in one single world view, denying that there are other kinds of knowledge that are relevant.
We must step out of the dominant paradigm

White Heterosexual
Western Male Technocrats

anything but... Robert Moses

Image source: http://www.newmuseum.org/blog/view/ideas-city-istanbul-or-how-to-obtain-a-building-permit-for-central-park
The problem of the 'non-expert actor' refers to the Foucaultian idea that knowledge is the property of certain groups, while other groups do not have their knowledge recognized as valid.
All this means that spatial planners must adopt a different attitude towards plan-making and implementation. They need to perform new roles...
THEN
All knowing
THEN

All knowing

Robert Moses

http://www.nemuseum.org/blog/view/ideas-city-istanbul-or-how-to-obtain-a-building-permit-for-central-park
THEN
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Robert Moses

http://www.newmuseum.org/blog/view/ideas-city-istanbul-or-how-to-obtain-a-building-permit-for-central-park

NOW

Verena is a young woman planner

Mediator
Role playing game based on Karina Sehested’s Urban Planners as Network Managers and Metagovernors (2009).

Click here to see the great planning game on the web.
Challenge (for planners?)

to clarify and strengthen the democratic anchorage of network forms of governance

© Ronald Vogel
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- Strengthens democracy
- Improves legitimacy
- Builds support and understanding for actions
- Likely to deliver more effective results
- A strong argument for participation is that knowledge is constructed in communication. It would be therefore unethical and unintelligent to impose top-down solutions that do not take into account the knowledge of stakeholders.
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