NS6

A New Synthesis of Public Administration

RESILIENCE AND EMERGENCE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:
The New Synthesis Project

The Netherlands Roundtable Report
The Hague, March 24-26, 2010

Edited by the Honourable Jocelyne Bourgon, O.C.

www.ns6newsynthesis.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A MESSAGE FROM THE PROJECT LEADER

The *New Synthesis Project* is dedicated to supporting practitioners, both elected and professional, who are called upon to face the challenge of serving in the 21st century.

The project is supported by a collaborative international research network – the NS6 – that draws on the collective knowledge and experience of senior public officials, researchers and scholars from six countries and 23 organizations.

Over the course of 2010, through a series of international roundtables, the NS6 Network will be searching for an *expanded framework* of public administration to guide the actions of practitioners serving in the *expanded public space* of the 21st century, where an *expanded range of possibilities* are open to government.

Their journey of exploration began in The Hague on March 24-26, 2010. It will be followed by events in Canada, Brazil, Singapore and the United Kingdom. There were many good reasons to start in the Netherlands. The Dutch have a reputation for daring public sector reforms. They are explorers – of new lands in the past – and of new ideas in modern times. They are pragmatic innovators. They were the first to formally join the NS6 Network.

Our host, the Department of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, brought together some of the most thoughtful practitioners, innovators and lead thinkers to engage in an exploratory discussion on the themes of *emergence* and *resilience*.

Complexity and uncertainty are characteristics of the 21st century. Governments are called upon to address a growing number of complex issues. Public administration is a dynamic system where public organizations, public servants and citizens interact. Society transforms government and government transforms society – the result of this co-evolution impacts the performance of a country as a whole.

The roundtable was designed to explore how governments can improve their capacity to anticipate emergent risks, trends and opportunities; how public organizations can contribute to stability and be used as platforms of collective exploration, cooperation and innovation; and how governments can prepare their society to adapt, evolve and prosper in the face of unforeseen circumstances.

We came to The Hague eager to exchange. We left enriched by the exchange of knowledge and experience, grateful for the hospitality of our host and inspired by their creative approach to managing the roundtable. We also all left with a shared understanding of how much more remains to be done over the coming months and with a renewed commitment to making a contribution to those who shoulder the difficult challenge … *of serving in the 21st century.*

The Honourable Jocelyne Bourgon, P.C., O.C.
President of Public Governance International, President Emeritus of the Canada School of Public Service, and NS6 Project Leader

A MESSAGE FROM THE HOST OF THE ROUNDTABLE

In the spring of 2010, the Dutch Ministry of the Interior had the honour to host the first of a series of five roundtables about how to prepare governments for the complex and increasingly unpredictable challenges of the 21st century. Just four weeks before the roundtable, the Dutch centre left government had fallen over the withdrawal of Dutch troops in Afghanistan. The banking crisis and subsequent economic crisis created a budget deficit of more than 6% of GDP and a considerable rise in unemployment rates. And research showed the confidence of the Dutch population in government, and in politics in particular, is now lower than ever.

No better time to host a roundtable about the future role of government.

Amidst of all this turmoil in the government city of The Hague, 35 practitioners and academics from all over the world, came together to discuss how to create new and meaningful connections between government and society. Delegations from six different countries have reached hands because they face common difficulties: society is changing fast, and the government is struggling to follow her lead. This means the effectiveness and legitimacy of our governments are challenged. In the Netherlands, we experience such challenges, for example, in our traffic management, in our youth care, in integration and in urban development. Practitioners face a difficult task by any standard. One thing is certain though: simple, traditional and unilateral solutions will no longer do. The roundtable in The Hague was a relatively small, but nevertheless, very meaningful and ambitious step to find new frontiers in public administration together.

Because it was the first in the series, the roundtable in The Hague was as much about introductions and explorations as it was about exchanging ideas and experiences. In our opinion, both goals have been achieved.

Hosting the first roundtable of the New Synthesis programme has been a formidable challenge for all involved. There are a number of people in particular that have been crucial to the success of the roundtable. First of all, we would like to thank all experts, discussants, case study presenters and delegation members for their contributions and open mind to participate in our sometimes confrontational Dutch style of debate. This report is the product of your combined expertise, creativity and inspiration.

Additionally, we would like to thank our Dutch knowledge partners: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Leiden University, Netherlands School for Public Administration and Partners + Pröpper, for their research efforts and intellectual support. We would like to thank Secretary-general Roel Bekker and his team, for actively supporting the roundtable and the New Synthesis initiative in all possible ways. We would like to thank our colleagues from the Knowledge Department, for making this successful roundtable happen. And finally, we would like to express our gratitude to Dr. Steven Dhondt (emergence section) and Dr. Peter Milley (resilience section) for their contribution to this very comprehensive yet accessible roundtable report.

Gerard van den Broek, Director
Knowledge Department
Ministry of the Interior and
Kingdom Relations

Tobias Kwakkelstein
NS6 Project Coordinator Netherlands

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This roundtable report would not have been possible without the involvement of many individuals. The following people contributed to the Netherlands Roundtable, 24-26 March 2010, and ultimately made this report possible.

The Chairs and Co-Chair

- Roos van Erp-Bruinsma
- Ardaan van Ravenzwaaij
- Roel Bekker
- Jocelyne Bourgon

The Roundtable Delegates

- John Alford
- Silvio Crestana
- Peter Ho
- Helena Kerr
- Natalia Koga
- Tobias Kwakkelstein
- Lena Leong
- Janet Newman
- Christine Nixon
- Gordon Owen
- Sue Richards
- Jill Rutter
- Hironobu Sano
- Frances Westley
- Yee Ping-Yi

The Presenters/ Speakers

- Steven van de Walle
- Erik-Hans Klijn
- Ing. Geert Teisman
- Eve Mitleton-Kelly
- Derk Loorbach
- Frances Westley
- Menno Hurenkamp
- Annet Bertram
- Bart Litjens
- Mark van Twist
- Martijn van der Steen
- Jouke de Vries
- Martin Gagner

The Rapporteurs

- Peter Milley
- Steven Dhondt

Technical Support

- Jocelyne Comeau
- Henri Kuschkowitz
- Kofi Kobia

THE NS6 PROJECT

The *New Synthesis Project* is dedicated to advancing the study and practice of public administration. It is supported by a collaborative network from six countries – Australia, Brazil, Canada, the Netherlands, Singapore and the United Kingdom.

The Project is exploring what *is* different about serving in the 21st century; what is new and what is of enduring value; how does this transform the role of government going forward? What new systems, skills and capacities will governments need to live up to citizens' expectations and face the challenges of their time?

This work is dedicated to *public administration practitioners* who are called upon to make decisions and take actions in an era that is more difficult and demanding than ever. The purpose is to provide them with a *narrative* supported by *powerful examples* that will help them face the challenges of serving in the 21st century.

While the task is daunting, a range of important new ideas and concepts exists that are relevant to the role of government in the future. Some of them can be found within fields traditionally associated with public administration, such as political science, law, administrative and management sciences, and organizational behaviour. However, many new ideas about complexity, networks, resilience, adaptive systems and collective intelligence from other domains are opening up promising new avenues.

While the goals of the New Synthesis Project may be ambitious, the partner countries and their research associates are united in the belief that the potential value of the project is well worth the effort.

THE NS6 NETWORK

In an effort to bridge the gap between academics and practitioners, the *New Synthesis Project* draws on the collective knowledge and experience of senior public officials, researchers and scholars through a collaborative network of 24 organizations from six countries, known as the NS6 Network.

The NS6 Network was created by a group of volunteers from the world of practice and academe who were willing to dedicate time and effort to develop a strong narrative supported by powerful examples to help public administration practitioners face the challenges of serving in the 21st century.

While the institutions and individuals forming the Network hail from different countries, different political systems and different historical, economic and cultural contexts, all share the view that public administration as a practice and discipline is not yet aligned with the challenges of serving in the 21st century. They also share a common understanding of the importance of the role of public institutions for society to prosper and adapt in the context of our global economy, networked society and fragile biosphere.

The NS6 Network

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

STATE SERVICES AUTHORITY OF VICTORIA

BRAZIL
ESCOLA NACIONAL DE ADMINISTRAÇÃO PÚBLICA

FUNDAÇÃO GETULIO VARGAS

UNIVERSITY OF SÃO PAULO

CANADA
CANADA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE

INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION OF CANADA

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

THE NETHERLANDS
MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR AND KINGDOM RELATIONS

UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN

ROTTERDAM UNIVERSITY

SINGAPORE
CIVIL SERVICE COLLEGE

PUBLIC SERVICE DIVISION IN THE PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

THE UNITED KINGDOM
INSTITUTE FOR GOVERNMENT

NATIONAL SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

SUNNINGDALE INSTITUTE

A project led by JOCELYNE BOURGON with the support of

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA   CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL GOVERNANCE INNOVATION (CIGI)

CISCO SYSTEMS   UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO   PGI (PUBLIC GOVERNANCE INTERNATIONAL)

THE INTERNATIONAL ROUNDTABLE SERIES

Throughout 2010, the focus of the partners in the NS6 network is on deepening, enriching and continuing to debate the "new synthesis". This will be pursued through three main strategies:

• a program of research, including case studies;

• a series of international roundtables; and

• ongoing dialogue and deliberation.

The roundtables are a place for the full expression of international collaboration. They are designed to give substantive and practical shape to a new synthesis of public administration.

Five of the participating countries will host one of these events, with The Netherlands having had the honour and challenge of hosting the first one.

Through the roundtables, renowned experts and leading senior practitioners from different parts of the world come together in a "safe space" that fosters free exchange and co-creation. Their central task is to explore, debate, and validate the main themes, propositions and ideas in a "new synthesis" of public administration. In doing so, they are expected to draw on their own expertise and experiences, and on the research findings and case studies that have been developed in the NS6 project. Ultimately, the goal is for roundtable participants to give substantive, practical shape to an up-to-date frame of reference for public administrators in the 21st century.

The roundtables will be a disciplined journey of discovery and co-creation. They have been sequenced thematically so the knowledge stemming from them is cumulative. A report, such as this one, is being produced from each event and made available in time for participants to prepare for the next one. As a result, they examine in a systematic way the key issues and questions that are central to the New Synthesis Project.

SCHEDULE OF ROUNDTABLES

Subject	Location	Date
An Expanded Public Space: Emergence and Resilience	The Hague	March 24-26, 2010
Achieving Public Results: Societal and Civic	Ottawa	May 4-5, 2010
Governance in the 21st Century: A Collective Enterprise	Rio de Janeiro	July 13-14, 2010
Serving Beyond the Predictable	Singapore	September 21-22, 2010
A Public Sector Reform and Renewal Agenda for the 21st Century	London	November 16-18, 2010

FOCUS OF THE NETHERLANDS ROUNDTABLE

This inaugural roundtable took place in The Hague on March 24 -26, 2010. It was convened to explore two themes of the New Synthesis Project:

- *Emergence*: Governments are increasingly called upon to serve in highly complex and uncertain circumstances, where public issues regularly emerge as surprises and require equally emergent responses. This transforms the role of government and the relationship between government and society. It emphasizes the need for more agile, innovative and adaptive approaches to governance and public administration.

- *Resilience*: Notwithstanding the efforts of governments and citizens to explore, innovate, prevent, pre-empt or course-correct, unforeseen events will arise and unpredictable shocks will occur. The role of government extends to promoting the resilience of individuals, communities and society.

This roundtable also looked at how governments can increase the possibility of making smart interventions in order to adapt to change.

IN SUMMARY

The inaugural NS6 roundtable was convened to examine the significance of "emergence" and "resilience" in governance and public administration. These related concepts, and their current applications, are seen to hold promise for enabling governments to "serve beyond the predictable".

Over forty senior practitioners, scholars and researchers from the six countries involved in the NS6 project participated. Their discussions were supported with pre-reading materials, expert presentations and case studies.

Two main messages about resilience arose from the discussion.

First, resilience is all around us. It is supported by some fundamental adaptive systems and cycles that humans have evolved over time. Governments can cultivate resilience by supporting these systems and cycles and 'doing no harm' to them—both neglect and dependency undermine resilience.

Second, resilience stems from self-reliance, relationships and optimism. Governments should emphasize strengths-based, collaborative, positive, learning-led approaches over negative, deficit-based, vulnerability-led strategies.

Participants identified a number of ideas and actions to guide practitioners in cultivating resilience.

- Use windows of opportunity to put resilience on the agenda and to expand capabilities for it.

- Multifaceted interventions (i.e., numerous strategies at various points in adaptive cycles) at multiple levels (i.e., individuals, families, communities) and attuned to culture and context provide cumulative protection; the best solutions will stem from collaboration across disciplines and levels.

- Social innovation is a key strategy for resilience; government's role is to create conducive conditions for social innovators and to help scale-up promising inventions.

- During and after crises, involve those affected. It may seem slower, but their recovery will be faster and better in the long run. Participation will also build community capacity and resilience.

- Don't artificially separate politics and policy in cultivating resilience; political leaders are central in moving issues onto the government agenda.

In terms of working in complex circumstances where unpredictable public issues emerge, four main themes came out of the discussion.

First, in terms of public policy:

- A conventional view of public policy processes as a series of authoritative decisions along a linear organizational pathway needs to give way to treating policy as results stemming from a combination of actions embedded in a dynamic context that coevolves with each action;

- Multiple local, micro strategies and 'learning-by-doing' are more effective

than all-encompassing, single strategies;

- Oversimplifying multidimensional problems can make them worse;

- Governments have a wide range of choices and measures available to them to address the multiple systems and players involved in complex issues.

Second, there are tools available to help governments to search, discover and thus anticipate better. Scenario planning, horizon scanning, risk assessment and organizational learning can help:

- reveal assumptions, 'blind spots' and emerging risks;

- calibrate medium and long-term thinking;

- build capacity to deal with disruptions and shocks.

Third, working across scales and levels is crucial in complex circumstances. Emerging issues that appear at local levels may very well appear at other levels. A specific case may turn out to be part of a cluster.

Fourth, it is possible to make 'smart' interventions. These involve:

- accepting complexity and working with the emergent properties that characterize it;

- balancing continuity with continuous change;

- sustaining anticipative, innovative and adaptive capacities.

These themes and the ideas generated about them will be further explored in upcoming roundtables.

1. INTRODUCTION

The roundtable was convened to examine the significance of "resilience" and "emergence" in governance and public administration in the 21st century. These related concepts and their current applications (which are mainly taking place in fields other than public administration) are seen to hold promise for better enabling governments to "serve beyond the predictable" (Bourgon 2009, 2010a, 2010b).

Senior practitioners, scholars and researchers from the six countries participating in the NS6 project joined in the discussion (see Annex A for names and affiliations of participants).

The event was organized as follows:

• Participants were given background materials to review in advance;

• One day was dedicated to exploring resilience, and one day to emergence;

• Scholars, researchers and expert-practitioners provided their perspectives on what resilience and emergence means in both theoretical and practical terms;

• Experts presented the results of case study research that related to the topics;

• All participants engaged in a moderated, lively and frank conversation governed by "Chatham House Rules";

• The conversation continued over lunch and dinner in a less structured format;

• The last half-day was spent in a smaller group to summarize and clarify the findings from previous days.

A key concern was to keep the discussion at a level to ensure the relevance of the concepts of resilience and emergence in responding to complex issues in an increasingly uncertain and unpredictable environment.

2. FINDINGS

2.1 SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS ON RESILIENCE

Professor Ann Masten from the University of Minnesota and Dr. Frances Westley from the University of Waterloo opened the discussion on resilience.

Mr. Steven Broers, a senior manager from The City of the Hague, provided a "practitioner's perspective" on resilience. Two discussants, Professor Paul Frissen from Tilburg University and Professor Menno Hurenkamp from University of Amsterdam provided commentaries and initial reactions to encourage discussion.

2.1.1 A Behavioural Science View on Resilience

Ann Masten is an expert in resilience from a behavioural sciences perspective. Drawing on her experience in studying and working with children and youth who have lived through adversity and major traumas, her presentation focused on resilience in human development. She challenged participants to make links between her field's findings on resilience in individuals and the more general, larger scale public policy and governance propositions that are being explored in the NS6 project.

A number of ideas resonated with the participants:

Humans are an adaptive species. The power of resilience comes from ordinary processes. We need to harness and work from that. (Ann Masten)

- Resilience is all around us. It is naturally supported by the fundamental adaptive systems humans have evolved over time to protect themselves.

- The greatest danger to individuals is when their adaptive capacity is undermined (e.g., dependency), harmed, destroyed (e.g., trauma), or "hi-jacked" (e.g., co-opted into criminal gang behavior).

- Behavioural science has unearthed some key predictors of resilience. These exist within an individual (e.g., proper brain function, intrinsic motivation), but they also extend beyond the person and into other systems, including their relationships with other people (e.g., pro-social peers, effective parents), organizations (e.g., effective schools and hospitals) and institutions (e.g., policies and laws that protect them).

- Human resilience can be cultivated through strategic interventions and promoting positive development to prevent problems. This includes:

  - Mission—framing positive goals using an appreciative, strengths-based approach;

  - Methods—using positive change strategies, such as prevention (e.g., reducing poverty), focusing on assets (e.g., improving access to education) and mobilizing elements of the adaptive system (e.g., provide opportunities to develop talents);

- Measures—tracking successes and positive outcomes along with problems and negative results;

- Multiple levels of intervention (e.g., families, schools, peer systems, communities) provide cumulative protection.

- To cultivate resilience, a developmental focus is useful. There are "windows of vulnerability and opportunity for change", including: prevention windows (i.e., before problems snowball; before and during key transitions; when key adaptive systems are organizing) and change and recovery windows (i.e., when conditions converge for change; when multiple systems are in flux; when motivation is high).

- Quick interventions may undermine long term gains in resilience. There are "adaptive trade-offs" that may be required.

- In addition, interventions that work best are culturally appropriate, take advantage of existing strength, mobilize the power of basic human adaptive systems, and promote competence as they reduce risk.

Masten concluded a new horizon that needs to be explored in much greater depth is how resilience operates across scales (i.e., individual, community, society; short and long timeframes). This will be of particular importance in improving the planning, prevention, response and recovery processes associated with such phenomena as terrorism, pandemics, and other crises and disasters.

2.1.2 Social Innovation and Resilience

Frances Westley is an expert in resilience from a complex adaptive systems perspective. Drawing on her experience in studying social-ecological systems and social innovators, her presentation focused on the role of governance and government in supporting social innovation and, with it, resilience.

Westley argued that governance and government have fundamental roles to play vis-à-vis social risk, social innovation and, ultimately, resilience.

- Understanding the nature of complex adaptive systems (CAS), how they change and what makes them resilient can help governments deal with complexity and the unpredictable public issues, shocks and surprises that emerge out of it.

- Social innovation is a key element in how change happens in complex social systems; governments can and should support social innovation.

- Dynamic relationships (e.g., interdependencies, feedback loops) are central to the functioning and evolution of complex adaptive systems. Doing things differently means changing relationships, and resilience is in relationships.

- In CAS, resilience is about balancing continuity with the need to continually change. This dynamic can be described as an "adaptive cycle", in which continuity and routine changes are ensured through "exploitation" and "conservation" processes and continual (or turbulent) change and adaptation is facilitated through "release" and "reorganization" processes.

- Government can use its policy levers to support various phases in the adaptive

Resilience lies in the capacity to continuously go through four phases of an adaptive cycle: exploitation, conservation, release and reorganization (Frances Westley)

cycle, ranging from national roundtables in the "release" phase, to reward and recognition programs in the "reorganization" phase, to targeted grants in the "exploitation" phase and regulations in the "conservation" phase.

- A continous supply of innovation is needed to sustain the adaptive cycle. Social innovation is an entry point to resilience. It keeps resilience alive. Governments can create conducive conditions for social innovation by helping to connect social entrepreneurs, stimulating competition, providing support for successful ideas, spreading awareness of success, and helping to "scale up" proven innovations.

- Where governments are involved in social innovation, they should match appropriate evaluation methods to the different phases of the adaptive cycle. Evaluation approaches need to support learning from false starts and failures.

2.1.3 A Practitioner's Perspective, Municipality of The Hague

In his presentation, Mr. Broers focused on the roles and relationships of governments and citizens, as resilience is seen to stem, in part, from participatory governance process and trust between government and citizens.

Many practical insights from the Dutch context were offered in the presentation and discussion that followed.

- Like many other countries since the 1960s, Dutch government has taken on more and more responsibilities. As a result, citizens have become less accustomed to taking responsibility for many things.

- In the last 10-15 years, government has been redefining its relationship with citizens, but the cycle of dependency and dissatisfaction continues.

- The question is how to move from a situation of multiple dependencies to a collective enterprise. This requires a shift in approach from command-and-control to active participation.

- Increasing citizen participation may not make things easier for public officials. Officials need to move to creating conducive conditions for public results, laying down guidelines but not managing in the classical sense.

- Expanding the room for citizens to choose means government will not be the sole decision-maker.

- The road to new relationships with citizens can be fraught with peril. It is important that the goals for new relationships with citizens are clear, and appropriate methods of participation are used for the circumstances.

2.1.4 Discussants' Perspectives

In his response, Professor Frissen contrasted the positive, strengths-based approach Masten advocated for cultivating resilience in children and youth with the problem-based, deficit model of state intervention where the state sees its role as single-handedly solving public problems. Frissen argued that overly interventist approaches on the part of government can serve to undermine resilience in the citizenry, communities and society by creating dependency.

Frissen raised a number of practical issues relevant to public administration:

- How to talk about resilience in a way that does not trivialize it through abstraction and motherhood statements?

- How to know what works, where and when?

- How can the role of politics and politicians factor into this discussion about resilience?

Speaking mainly from the Dutch context, Professor Hurenkamp profiled the need to reposition the role of government. This is something citizens care deeply about, even if they are not sure exactly what role government should play. Government is doing a good job, but citizens feel ignored, left behind, out of breath, uncomfortable economically. These feelings are affecting trust. Because the issues are emotional, the answer doesn't lie in more reforms and greater efficiency. Rather, government needs to tell citizens a compelling story that helps them believe in government and the roles government and citizens should play and what this all amounts to.

People recover better when they can engage in their own recovery process.

2.2 SUMMARY OF CASE STUDIES RELATED TO RESILIENCE

Three case studies were presented and discussed. These are summarized below.

2.2.1 Victorian Bushfire Reconstruction and Recovery Authority, Australia

The bushfires of 7 February 2009 caused an unprecedented scale of devastation to the state of Victoria, Australia. 173 people died, over 3,400 properties along with almost 430,000 hectares of forests, crops and pasture were damaged or destroyed. Over 55 businesses were lost and hundreds more significantly impacted. Damage was done to 950 local parks, 467 cultural sites and 200 historic places. Within three days of the disaster, while fires were still burning, the Victorian Government established the Victorian Bushfire Reconstruction and Recovery Authority (VBRRA) to coordinate the restoration and recovery of affected regions and communities.

Christine Nixon, chair of the VBRRA, presented on the work of the organization, which provided insights about how public organizations can help build community resilience in the face of great adversity. Key findings from her presentation are outlined here.

A Quick Response

The immediate establishment of a government authority tasked with recovery and reconstruction injected a sense of optimism and hope into communities.

Agility in Recovery Tasks

The scale and urgency of recovery tasks created an imperative for agility and responsiveness on the part of government. VBRAA's organizational structure, decision-making and management processes facilitated this. Six teams reported to the chief executive and chairperson. The objective of each daily meeting was to give people enough authority to take action. Decisions were made. If they were wrong, they were fixed.

People and Communities First

VBRRA's recovery and reconstruction framework put the needs of local communities at its centre. Each affected community was encouraged to establish a local recovery committee to prepare recovery plans that identified ideas, needs and proposed projects to support recovery.

This represented a significant departure from well-established models of government-community consultation. While VBRRA has provided guidance, each committee has set its own priorities and retains authorship over its plans, and each committee has tapped into its own local organizations and networks to generate support for its plan.

In addition, government case workers were trained and empowered to serve as "personal assistants" to communities.

Different Scale - Different Speed

Decision-making via community consensus can be a slow process. However, participative models of recovery can lead to better results. For example, communities have come up with innovative urban planning decisions that will make marked improvements. These would not have happened if government had immediately commenced rebuilding public infrastructure.

Participation Builds Community

VBRRA's focus on community-led recovery emphasizes capacity-building, engagement and decision-making at the local level. Despite adversity, communities are being strengthened through their recovery efforts. It means that communities are better equipped to lead their recovery, drawing on their own resources as well as support from government and other organizations. This has potential to improve their resilience and capacity to foresee and to adapt to future challenges.

Discussion

Participants noted that the immediate response of VBRRA was to engage the natural resilience existing within individuals and their communities. Here, the idea of "recovery at their own pace" was central. VBRRA sought to avoid creating dependency which would erode the natural adaptive processes within communities and thereby reduce long term resilience. The discussion also highlighted the significance of tailoring approaches to recovery for each community. Participants also took note that individuals and communities that had suffered previous disasters were better able to cope with recovery.

2.2.2 Transforming Justice Program, United Kingdom

The criminal justice system in the UK has more than doubled the numbers in prison over two decades. Re-offending rates are high and, despite falls in measured crime, public fear of crime and lack of confidence in the criminal justice system are both high.

Professor Sue Richards presented an ongoing case study on the United Kingdom's new *Transforming Justice* program. A priority of the program is to improve the system's capacity to divert young people from entering the criminal justice system in the first place. While criminal justice agencies have a part to play in that, other agencies in education and training, employment services, and other services relating to social and community well-being all have a part to play. Therefore the initiative aims to bring people from all these agencies together at local levels in order to coordinate their work and resources in order to come up with ways of dealing with the seemingly intractable problems in the system.

One of the program's initiatives was a workshop in December 2009 held at the conference centre at Swansea Football Club. The focus of the event was policy and service for young people who are at risk of becoming offenders. 70 people from 29 agencies, representing a range of backgrounds, organizations and levels, accepted the invitation. Working together in a disciplined but highly interactive process, they developed ideas and propositions for improving outcomes with young people at risk of criminality. An evaluation of the Swansea conference is forthcoming. The remainder of the case study will be presented at a future NS6 roundtable, where links to the New Synthesis Framework will be explored in more detail.

2.2.3 The Rotterdam Urban Renewal Approach: Rotterdam Tarwewijk, A Resilient Community?

According to the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Communities and Integration, there are about 100 problem neighbourhoods facing a combination of difficult issues, including high unemployment, poverty, school dropout, crime and insufficient integration of 'New Netherlanders.' Despite sustained attention and significant investments, the cities and Dutch Government have not been able to make major gains in addressing these intractable issues.

Dr. Igno Pröpper presented a case study focused on the use of citizen engagement in social policy to foster community resilience in the neighbourhood of Tarwewijk, Rotterdam. Tarwewijk was one of forty neighbourhoods targeted for intervention by the Dutch government in 2007. These 'empowered neighbourhoods' receive extra funding and support for housing, work, education, integration and safety. The aim is for the Dutch government, municipal authorities, housing corporations, local organizations and the people living in the community work together to define their goals and how to reach them. By doing so, the Cabinet aims to transform and improve these priority neighbourhoods with those involved. The Minister of Housing, Communities and Integration asserted that the approach is "based on the power of people because the resilience of the city is in the people."

The case study identified numerous challenges to effective participatory governance in Tarwewijk:

• The neighbourhood has a high percentage of transient residents (nearly 25% of them move each year), making it difficult to build constructive and close relationships with the community;

• Many residents are living around the poverty line and are dealing with social disadvantages, such as an inability to communicate in Dutch; they are concerned with basic survival and not in projects to create a "liveable neighbourhood";

• Residents who do participate have found a discrepancy between the slogan "it's your neighbourhood, so it's your call" and their actual impact upon policy decisions; they are disappointed when they contribute ideas that do not get past the planning stage due to a lack in funding and implementation capacity or conflicting priorities.

Discussion

Roundtable participants noted that this was an instance of long term erosion rather than a major disturbance or sudden crisis. They also noted the government approach in this case did not fit the unique needs of this neighbourhood. Community-building through citizen participation requires a certain type of "community". Some neighbourhoods, such as Tarwewijk, may benefit from a more direct role of government in halting further erosion. For instance, some government focus might be put on integration and citizenship in this neighbourhood.

It was also pointed out that citizen participation needs to be distinguished from community resilience. The two are not the same thing. There is a link between them, but the nature of this link may be different in different cases.

2.3 FOSTERING RESILIENCE IN SOCIETY

One of the goals of the roundtable was to establish a practical understanding of how governments can work with citizens and communities to foster resilience in society.

In an intensive discussion period, participants explored various aspects of fostering resilience in light of their own experiences and the expert ideas and case studies presented earlier.

This discussion was professionally moderated and framed by the simple question: "What are the do's and don'ts for public administration when trying to foster resilience?"

2.3.1 Defining Resilience

There was a general agreement among participants that the definitions of resilience provided by the two expert presenters in the morning were helpful and relevant.

Professor Masten's definition was:

"Resilience is the capacity of a dynamic system to withstand or recover from significant challenges that threaten its stability, viability or development."

She also pointed out resilience can be more succinctly understood as "doing well in life despite adversity". However, she was quick to note the practical application of such a definition involves making judgments about what constitutes both "doing well" and "adversity", and that such judgments have important implications in the policy process.

Professor Westley's definition was:

"Resilience is the capacity of any complex system to absorb disturbances and continue to adapt, learn and maintain its identity."

Resilience is derived from a dynamic balance between continuity (identity) and stability, on the one hand, and continuous change, on the other hand.

2.3.2 The Significance of Resilience

The discussion revealed several areas of convergence and some consensus regarding the significance of resilience to public administration:

- Resilience is an important matter in governance and public administration;

- Increasing complexity and uncertainty give rise to an increasing number of shocks and surprises in society;

- Individuals, communities and societies are complex systems that have a 'natural' ability to adapt to adversity;

- Some government actions may erode the adaptive capacity of society;

- Governments cannot "create" resilience, but they can support it and avoid undermining it in individuals, communities and society to bounce back and adapt;

- Extreme laissez-faire or overly-interventionist approaches are not the best way to support resilience—the former can be neglectful and deplete resources for resilience; the latter can create unhealthy dependencies and undermine resilience;

- Supporting resilience is a balancing act that is contextually and culturally specific—resilience has no fixed address; there are multiple pathways to it and there is not one best way to support it.

2.3.3 What Government Can Do

Participants identified a number of "do's" and "don'ts" for fostering resilience. These are summarized here (see Annex B for the moderator's "argument map" from the event).

(1) Framing Missions as Positive, Collective Enterprises

Participants agreed that having a positive and appreciative outlook is an important building block of resilience. Emphasizing a positive mission involves story-telling that taps emotions.

Such an approach is difficult in government where the focus tends to be on problem-solving. The challenge is to emphasize:

- strengths over deficits;

- learning and adaptation over risk avoidance;

- opportunities over problems;

- accomplishments over failures.

(2) Making "Smart" Interventions

Participants noted that, given what is known about resilience in public administration and other domains, government should be able to encourage "smarter" interventions.

Resilience has contextually and culturally specific meanings. Interventions should build on existing strengths in a given system and setting.

A developmentally informed view of resilience should be used to take advantage of "windows of opportunity" to cultivate it. For example,

- periods of adversity and crisis can be used for renewal and growth instead of decay and decline (e.g., the case of the bushfires in the State of Victoria);

- when signs of potential resilience emerge, work with it (e.g., citizen's groups eager to tackle a local issue);

- where innovation and innovators appear, nurture them and help to scale up promising initiatives;

- where rigidities exist that are making a system "brittle" and vulnerable to external events, the time may be ripe for making radical changes on a small scale (e.g., controlled burns in managing mature forests).

It should be noted that some forms of resilience may not be desirable from a public good perspective. Government may have a role to play in actively undermining resilience in these cases. The persistence of criminal gangs, terrorist organizations and violent authoritarian regimes are examples.

To take advantage of windows of opportunity, one needs to understand what to do and when. The "adaptive cycle" Westley presented was seen to hold promise. Of particular note:

- Specific policy measures are better suited to different phases in the cycle;

- Interrelated adaptive cycles take place at different scales (e.g., individuals, groups, communities, organizations, institutions, culture), with smaller scales cycling more quickly and larger scales cycling more slowly. Understanding

this dynamic may help to inform how and where one intervenes. It may also assist in seeing how intervening on one scale may have consequences for resilience at other scales.

There are three basic approaches to cultivating resilience:

- risk focused (reduce or mitigate vulnerability);

- asset focused (increase resources);

- process focused (mobilize adaptive systems).

Participants acknowledged that, in general, governments are much more experienced in the area of risk and assets. Yet, the biggest "wins" could come through mobilization of adaptive systems and capacities in society, and this is an area in which many governments have less experience and skill.

It is important to use multi-level, multi-channel approaches to fostering resilience. They provide better "cumulative protection".

(3) Fostering Adaptation and Supporting Social Innovation

A number of participants observed that over the past decades governments have struggled to find a workable balance between a "hands-off" and "hands-on" approach; that is, between a highly interventionist or laissez-faire role for government. What seemed to resonate about resilience theories and research findings was the notion that adaptive capacity is already "out there". Governments do not need to create it or even to build it. Rather, governments need to cultivate and support resilience—or, at minimum, they ought not undermine or destroy it (unless doing so is in the public interest, as is the case of resilient terrorist networks for example).

Participants tended to agree that fostering resilience means being attuned to the nature and status of the basic adaptive systems that exist in people, communities and society.

The use of citizen engagement, public participation and shared governance arrangements was seen as a means for improving public results by tapping the collective capacity.

There was a general acceptance that a basic adaptive system extends beyond individuals and into their relationships with other people and systems, including public organizations and institutions. Without the strength of these other entities, people may not be able to be resilient in the face of adversity.

Discussion also focused on the "whether" and "how" governments can work better with a dynamic cycle that includes continuous change while ensuring continuity and stability. In particular, how can governments improve capacity in society to go through the "release" and "reorganization" phases of the "adaptive cycle"? Some ideas:

- Operationalizing the notion of promoting resilience by working with "releases" at small scales in order to i) build adaptive capacity longer-term, ii) influence innovation to occur at larger scales, and iii) decrease the potential for undesirable changes to cascade across scales to produce crises in the larger system;

- Exploring how specific policy measures work better for governing particular phases in the "adaptive cycle";

- Encouraging experimentation and innovation.

Participants acknowledged government has a role to play in looking for social innovators, connecting them, setting conducive conditions for their work, and helping them scale up successful innovations.

(4) Using Participatory Processes

Give space to society

Participants in the roundtable endorsed the notion that participation is at the core of resilience. Cultivating resilience and, in fact, achieving public results means governments need to "give space to society". Participation meant different things for different participants; however, the underlying rationale was participation builds the capacity in society to spot, define and resolve public issues in ways that are suitable to those most affected by them. Some key ideas:

- Letting citizens and communities participate more in defining the nature of public issues and solutions to them; while this may not result in perfect solutions, it will derive workable ones that are supported in the community;

- To do this, government must allow for participation, be genuinely prepared to listen, and be prepared at appropriate times to allow citizens to make the actual decisions;

- Participation processes can take many forms and different "publics" can be involved; it is important to be clear on the goals, participants, terms of reference, design, and facilitation of such processes;

- It is important not to take a "naïve" view on participation processes; government needs to give careful consideration to their motivations and competence in this area;

- Giving "space" may not be enough; government may have to ask and answer hard questions in this space; managing expectations and being clear on who has the authority to decide and act are important considerations;

- Some participation processes, or the actions stemming from them, will fail; government needs to learn from failure—it is not reason to revert back to conventional methods that are comfortable but do not work.

Participants were quick to agree with the idea that "giving space to society" does not equate to abandoning citizens or relinquishing responsibility. They also agreed it is very uncomfortable for government to let go of power and control.

One participant summarized the discussion by observing the time is ripe for a repositioning of roles and establishing a new bargain between citizens and government.

(5) "Slow" Public Policy

Participation processes can appear slow but they can yield better public policy results than when government makes unilateral or "snap" decisions; moreover, participative policy can foster resilience. The more specific definition partici-

pants brought to this concept included:

- work with those affected, go at their speed and give time for solutions to emerge;

- use a developmental approach that takes advantage of windows of opportunity;

- treat policy as a mode of inquiry; experiment and allow time for feedback and evidence to emerge;

- start at small scales, go for "small wins", and yield better results over time;

- engage opposition and critique—creativity often stems from conflict;

- emphasize building capacity versus building perfect solutions; that way the capacity and ideas will be there when you need them.

Participants agreed there will be events and crises that require rapid responses and unilateral actions by government. But, slow policy includes doing proper planning and thinking about risks and vulnerabilities. Participative policy processes encompass anticipation and preparation phases as well as response and recovery phases, promoting a more methodical (and hence "slow") approach to addressing emerging issues and threats. It incorporates all four phases of the "adaptive cycle" and promotes resilience.

<div style="color: #29ABE2;">Patient policy is less risky, more achievable, more cost-effective</div>

Some participants observed that the current political context in many countries serves as a constraint to "slow policy". Some participants characterized contemporary politics as having a predominantly short-term focus on "issue management" attended by an "announcement culture". Others noted that many politicians know there the political system is in trouble. In the view of these participants, "slow policy" offers politicians a way out of the current situation. Step-by-step, participatory processes can be viewed as less risky politically; it can give time to build support and is likely cheaper in the long run.

It was noted that the public administration needs to bring politicians on-board with slow policy in order for them to discover for themselves the benefits it may afford.

(6) Building Social Capital

Social capital was acknowledged as an important element of resilience. There was not an extensive discussion on the "how" government can or "should" contribute in this area; however, it was pointed out that both "bonding" and "bridging" forms of social capital are needed.

Bonding social capital establishes and consists of solidarity and trust between similar people. This solidarity can be very important to weathering adversity. However, these tight bonds can also lead to rigidities and "brittleness" in the face of adversity if no novelty has a way of entering into them.

Bridging social capital establishes and consists of networks of relationships between different people, families and communities. It provides for diversity, variety and novelty, all of which are important for responding to surprises and weather adversity.

Importantly, the bridging relationships often require intermediaries, such as "social entrepreneurs" or "connectors" to build them. In addition, there must be a minimum level of social tolerance in the overall context for bridging to occur.

2.3.4 Pitfalls to Avoid

Participants identified a number of things governments should avoid.

Don't protect people from challenges and consequences they can handle themselves

(1) Don't be over-bearing or overly protective. An example is when government rushes to intervene before resilience has a chance to naturally emerge. The case study of the bushfires in the State of Victoria showed how the government quickly responded to a crisis, but did not take an over-bearing approach to the recovery and rebuilding process. Though time will tell, there is evidence already from the case that longer-term resilience is being built by letting people decide what to do with their communities at their own pace.

(2) Don't be afraid to ask citizens for help. When government pretends it is in control and has all the answers, when it provides "spin" rather than clear and frank communication, it can lose the credibility and trust it will need when it eventually has to call on others for help.

(3) Don't take a "naïve", incompetent or "disingenuous" approach to engaging citizens in participatory processes. This will cause those processes to backfire and erode many of the bases for cultivating resilience going forward. A related pitfall is getting captured by particular interests in participation processes.

(4) Don't separate politics and policy. Political realities and dynamics in the executive, in the legislature, in the public administration, and in the citizenry cannot be forgotten if you want to be effective. Political leaders are central in moving issues onto the government agenda.

3. FINDINGS ON EMERGENCE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

It is important for the civil service and society to be more resilient because of the unpredictable societal issues that emerge out of an increasingly complex, interdependent world.

One way to foster resilience is to understand how to deal with emergence in society. The fact that the world is becoming more complex makes it necessary to anticipate emerging patterns in order to limit the negative impacts and to seize opportunities. If we understand complexity better, then we can make better use of emergence, which is one of its defining features.

The roundtable organized several discussions with scholars to explore the relationship between emergence and complexity and to provide guidance to practitioners.

The Dutch Secretary-General, Roel Bekker, positioned the roundtable within the changing context of public administration. He highlighted how traditional patterns of government do not fit into the challenges of society. Social problems today exceed the authority of Ministries. Government needs new ways to tackle modern problems.

How should government and the civil service change itself to respond to new external developments? *Systems thinking* has directed government and the civil service to become more flexible to adapt to the ever changing environment. *Complexity thinkers* show that even flexible organizations, while necessary, aren't sufficient to accomplish this feat.

The roundtable explored the significance of complexity thinking for government and the civil service. Discussions centered on how to work with complexity and the effects on public results. Some guiding principles were identified which may help practitioners. But more developmental work is needed to respond to the needs of practitioners. These principles are taken up at the end of this chapter. We first summarize the presentations and case studies.

3.2 SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS ON EMERGENCE

Dr. Steven Van De Walle, professors Erik-Hans Klijn and Geert Teisman, all from the Erasmus University (Rotterdam), and Professor Eve Mitleton-Kelly from the London School of Economics opened the discussion on emergence. Dr. Derek Loorbach from Erasmus University acted as discussant, providing commentaries and initial reactions. Mr. Peter Ho, Head of the Singapore Public Service, provided a "practitioner's perspective" on emergence based on futures thinking strategies used in Singapore. Professors Mark van Twist and Martijn van der Steen from the Netherlands School of Public Administration presented a case study on Program Ministries in the Dutch government. Martin Gagner and Harry Kruiter from the Centre for Governance Studies, University of Leiden, presented a case study on

Public Safety Centres in The Netherlands.

3.2.1 A Literature Review on Emergence In Organizations

Steven Van De Walle provided an overview on emergence in public organizations based on a literature review in the fields of political science, organizational theory and systems theory. His analysis highlighted complications that can arise when public organizations embrace too much emergence.

What is known?

- The prevailing view in the traditional political science literature is that allowing for emergence (e.g. improvisation, experimentation) in public organizations constitutes "breaking the rules" and should be avoided.

- In the organizational literature, emergence can be seen in the practices of "organizational improvisation" and "bricolage" which help organizations to survive in changing circumstances. Emergence also has a place in strategy thinking—for example, Mintzberg talks about emergent strategy.

- The literature on systems theory gives a new perspective. Organizations should not be understood by their official goals, structures and functions, but rather seen as a comprised set of actors making decisions and taking actions based on their 'local' knowledge and interests, with goals and outcomes emerging rather than being predetermined. Organizational action is not linear. Actions and trends are difficult to predict. Central planning is quite difficult.

- According to Van de Walle, an approach to public organizations that embraces and encourages emergence can lead to some complications.

- Organizational performance is generally related to strict rules and plans. Without these, it is difficult to see how systems perform. In practice, this is not such a problem because performance systems change all the time anyway, and good managers know how to work with changing performance systems. The main issue is that emergence may be in contradiction with efficiency. If goals and outcomes are emergent, they cannot be measured and the costs of running organizations in such way might be high.

- In emergent systems, it is possible there may be no legal basis for actions. Such civil services may become vulnerable. Systems theory spends too little attention to due process and risks for citizens.

- The main advantage of emergence is that it makes organizations more resilient. Allowing for emergence helps organizations react quickly to changes.

- Van de Walle's conclusion was that the concept of emergence provides a useful analytical tool. However, it should not be used as a normative concept. You cannot strive for a certain level of emergence within an organization or society. He warns that emergence should not give way to relativity. Emergence itself does not give direction, so one should be wary of the way power comes into the picture. His advice is to try to simplify the complex systems

that give rise to emergence. This would help civilians to understand what is happening.

3.2.2 On Emergence and Complexity

Professors Teisman and Klijn are specialists on public projects. Based on research findings, they described how civil services and public managers need to develop new approaches if they want to deal effectively with the complexity of large projects.

Professor Teisman observed how complexity theory can help practitioners to deal with cost overruns and delays, the two main problems associated with large public projects. In the face of such problems, the normal response for managers is to try to get more control over the project; however, this can make things worse. Complexity theory can support a different approach, one that emphasizes that outcomes on complex projects and policy issues do not flow directly from the decisions of public officials and managers. Outcomes emerge out of the interactions of the array of actors involved and the context in which they act. Results are in some ways accidental. Command-and-control approaches do not capture this dynamic and are not helpful in steering action towards more, rather than less, desirable outcomes.

Teisman advocates that we need to develop management approaches that 'fit' in with existing complexity. He suggests a process system model based on embeddedness and interaction. Organizations are embedded in networks. Each organization itself is a network. Such a perspective shows that actors with a position become more important than the structure of the organization itself. The quality of processes is not only based on the quality of actors; it is also based on the quality of the interactions. Interaction is the primary performance indicator. Effective policies need to be created by persons in networks. Results need to be generated in informal networks. Only then, trust can be built up and actors can agree on joint action.

Klijn's view completes that offered by Teisman. If agency is more important than structure, what kind of action, actors and interactions do you need? Managers of complex projects need to be externally oriented and have a flexible non hierarchical attitude. Creating trust is more important than optimizing organizational structures. Stakeholder involvement is positively correlated to outcomes of projects. In his terms, you do not need to shape the environment to be successful, you rather need to be looking for the wind and sail this. These suggestions notwithstanding, Klijn sees three challenges for managers in dealing with complexity:

- How does an external orientation help in civil services where hierarchy is dominant?

- How do you deal with the mediatization of the public sphere? Short term volatility is not in line with long term dedication which is needed in such complex projects.

- How to include stakeholders into complex processes?

3.2.3 Co-creation, Complexity and

Creating trust is more important than organizational structure

Organizational Learning

In her presentation, Professor Eve Mitleton-Kelly dealt with the way emergence comes about in organizations. Her view is that organizational learning processes are responsible for creating new order and meaning. If learning processes are crucial for organizations to deal with complexity and to help steer emergence, then it is necessary to understand how to bring such learning about. Organizations do not organically develop into learning organizations. Some organizations try to use more behaviorist approaches to learning and are unable to guide processes in such a way that all elements in the organization are changed. Mitleton-Kelly advocates "Gestalt" approaches to learning to help create a context for a learning organization. Co-creation is a pre-condition for learning. Such learning organizations need to create a culture of trust to enable co-creation.

Mitleton-Kelly pointed out that if civil services want to be able to deal with complexity, they need to understand how to facilitate its members in consciously changing themselves and their context towards desired ends. Only if all actors are engaged in the change process, will real change take place. Change processes are always broad movements within organizations.

Mitleton-Kelly also pointed out public organizations will be more effective in the face of complexity if they rely on multiple local micro-strategies rather than large, one-size-fits-all approaches. They can also make gains by attending to "the adjacent possible".

Discussion

Derek Loorbach from Erasmus University commented on all four presentations. In his view, the discussions showed an abstract view of complexity. The practice of policy makers is not helped with such detached views. He also stressed that theorists need to look at emergence within society, the focus should not only be looking at what public organizations are doing. For the discussion to achieve a more practical value, Loorbach points to a better understanding on how to achieve transitions within society. Complex systems have special properties and are not always directed in the way we want. Social systems have path dependency; alternative pathways and structures threaten existing regimes, which tend to remain vested in the current trajectory. There is a need for fundamental change, but such change will not automatically come about. Such change goes past the autonomy of the individual actor, including governments. In the opinion of Loorbach, if we want change to be successful, this requires a shift towards multi-dimensional change. Complex processes needed to be better understood.

3.3 A PRACTITIONER'S PERSPECTIVE, CIVIL SERVICE OF SINGAPORE

Peter Ho presented on how the civil service in Singapore is dealing with complexity by improving its ability to anticipate, innovate and adapt to changing circumstances. In the past, government experienced unintended consequences from previous policy initiatives and path dependencies. For example, the two-child policy is now the cause of a rapidly ageing population that brings new policy challenges.

To improve its anticipative capacity, Singapore introduced scenario planning in

its budgetary and planning processes. This approach has been useful in surfacing hidden assumptions and mental models and has helped to forge a common language and frame of reference.

In addition to scenario planning, a risk assessment and horizon scanning (RAHS) program has been developed. This tool is used to get more insight into the strengths and weaknesses in the civil service to deal with the future issues.

Another initiative, Public Service for the 21st Century (PS21), which encourages the use of collaborative networking technologies, has been introduced to develop a culture of openness to change and innovative ideas in the public service. At the same time, these measures are complemented by strong leadership to foster a favorable environment for new ideas.

The most recent measure has been the development of a Centre for Strategic Futures to serve as the focal point of futures-related work in the Singapore government. The main tasks of this centre are to challenge conformist thinking, calibrate strategic thinking processes, cultivate capacity to deal with uncertainty and shocks, and communicate emergent risks.

3.4 SUMMARY OF CASE STUDIES RELATED TO EMERGENCE

Two case studies were presented and discussed.

3.4.1 Program Ministries, The Netherlands

Professors Van Twist and Van der Steen from the Netherlands School of Public Administration analyzed the Dutch Program Ministries as a new way for solving problems at the ministry level. Within the Dutch government, the feeling was that several social issues were not dealt with to a satisfactory degree. Program Ministries, which are essentially 'virtual' organizations that cut across other ministries, were developed for the issues of youth care and housing/integration. Such a method fits within an existing tradition as 'joined-up government' and ministries without portfolio. The hope was that the unbundling of the public administrations helps to create fluid government.

The new development is not without its practical hurdles.

- Program Ministries are odd forms within a context dominated by traditional values. The dominant model of traditional ministries hinders the new form to a great degree (e.g. civil servants within the program ministries are treated as outsiders). One way to overcome this dominance would be to turn the exception into the rule.

- Program ministries create matrix organizations in which civil servants are not used to working. Traditional bureaucracies resist innovation and do not help the new departments. One possible solution lies in creating a strong quartermaster in each department to solve such issues.

Furthermore, the move towards Program Ministries in the Dutch context raises several interesting issues. Van Trist and Van der Steen see program ministries as

an opportunity for new ways of solving societal problems building on emergent processes. But the new organizational solution is confronted with a traditional context which pushes it to abide by traditional compliance and performance systems.

Discussion

Roundtable participants focused on two central issues. The first was on the peculiar nature of the Dutch program ministries. Examples were offered of models in other countries for dealing with broad societal problems. The success of these models in other countries was based on the fact that the new ministries were resourced with external management and personnel. The question was put forward by a participant whether you need program ministries or rather a new model of public administration. Program ministries might be a very costly exercise.

The second was on the merits of the new model. Several countries have experienced the need to go beyond methods such as program ministries. One suggestion was to use 'variable geometry' to connect what needs to be connected from various organizations in order to address the societal problem.

The reason to look for new methods is that program ministries might not be the answer to the problem of dealing with social complexity. Bureaucracy may be good for stable areas such as education. A search for the best method is certainly still on the agenda. In the Dutch situation, one attempt to make civil servants more amenable to working horizontally was to give them generic government, rather than ministry, business cards and to locate ministry offices in close proximity to each other.

3.4.2 Public Safety Houses, The Netherlands

Martin Gagner and Harry Kruiter from the Centre for Governance Studies (University of Leiden) conducted research on Public Safety Centers (PSCs) in The Netherlands. Over the years, forty-seven Centers were created with the purpose of enhancing social safety at local levels. This was done by reducing fragmented public sector activities. PSC's are networks of public services (e.g. police, justice, social agencies) and non-public organizations that work on some aspect of public safety crime prevention. The main task of PSCs is to deal with cases referred to them by any of the contributing partners. The networks share physical and digital space, and use a cooperative approach. In essence, PSC's are a joined-up approach for multifaceted problems.

In their presentation, Gagner and Kruiter focused on how PSCs bring emergent policy about the fundamental tensions that exist in such a new approach. PSCs are examples of how to broaden the policy perspective by connecting individual cases into clusters. Such clusters could point to emergent or future problems (e.g. from drug abuse to more serious crimes). The growth of PSCs from being a local initiative to national policy showed the importance of small-scale experimentation and innovation in dealing with complex issues.

The PSCs are not a 'done deal' in the Dutch situation. The success of the PSCs is however linked to the motivation and talent of its participants. While the work within the PSCs needs to be valued, public support requires clear results. This is not yet evident. PSCs need to invent new ways of dealing with issues, and more space for innovation.

No correlation between organizational form of the project and outcomes

According to the presenters, the PSCs experience fundamental tensions in coming to solutions:

- Form: PSCs are new shapes to deal with societal problems, but structuring leads to new inflexibilities;

- Relationships: PSCs are still unclear about how to regulate relationships between the different actors involved—there is a tension between formalization versus loose linking;

- Goals of practice are not yet common: there is need to get 'offenders off the street', but some of the participating organizations just want to help;

- Goals of policy: PSCs are unclear if they are target-driven or are mainly 'ongoing process'.

Discussion

The participants centered their questions on the tension between organizations and professionals. It is unclear how interdisciplinary work could overcome the professional approach to issues. According to the researchers, for now it is important that the different professionals learn from each others' capabilities and limitations. This observation led to a discussion as to what degree the actual process within the PSCs is left to chance. At this moment in time, there is a belief in public administration that interdisciplinary discussion should be sufficient to solve tough problems.

3.5 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EMERGENCE AND COMPLEXITY

Participants explored various aspects of complexity and emergence, using the expert inputs, case studies and their own experiences as inputs. This discussion was professionally moderated and framed by the simple question: "What are the do's and don'ts for public administration achieving public results in the face of emergence?"

3.5.1 Defining Complexity and Emergence

Emergence and complexity are key concepts of complexity theory. To understand the importance of such concepts, it is necessary to delve into the relationship and differences between *systems thinking* and *complexity thinking*.

Systems and Complexity Theories

Complexity as a concept has been the centre of attention in *systems thinking*. The main idea is that organizations need to change their internal organization according to the demands of the external environment.

Complexity theory is less optimistic about new organizational designs being the solution to ever changing constraints. For instance, Klijn shows in his research that there is no correlation between organizational form and outcomes. There are,

however, strong correlations between policy outcomes and the use of multiple, local strategies, collaboration and trust.

In his overview of the literature, Steven van de Walle (2010) sees a close relationship between systems theory and complexity theory.

Systems theory is about "the interdisciplinary understanding of reality as composed of complex open systems with emergent properties and transformational potential" (Byrne, 2005). According to Eve Mitleton-Kelly, systems theory cannot explain how complex organizations function. In this sense complexity theory is a theoretical advancement; it provides an explanatory framework with concepts such as self organization, emergence and connectivity. You can't control complex systems; you can only constrain or enable them.

Emergence
The central concept in complexity research is *emergence*. Emergence functions as a descriptive term pointing to the patterns, structures, or properties that are exhibited on the macro-level. Emergence is a phenomenon that becomes apparent at the macro-level, but develops through micro-level dynamics.

Van de Walle relies on Goldstein's definition of emergence as being a feature of systems that have at least four characteristics: nonlinearity, self-organization, being beyond equilibrium and attractors. We summarize the ideas which Van de Walle collected:

- *Non-linearity* is essentially the driver behind emergence and is caused by positive feedback loops (Goldstein 1999). They can cause new dynamics in a system since the relation between incentives and outcomes can be disproportionate and the processes non-linear.

- Van de Walle follows De Wolf and Holvoet in saying that the essence of *self-organization* is an adaptable behaviour that autonomously acquires and maintains an increased order. Self-organization focuses on the development of order or structure in a response to the environment that cannot be dictated or enforced through external controls.

- *Beyond equilibrium* focuses on the constant adaptive behaviour in social systems. Indeed, the ability to grow, change, evolve and innovate indicates that society is in a state far-from-equilibrium. According to Van de Walle, far-from-equilibrium states in organizations or society explain the unpredictable characteristics of emergence. The flexible and dynamic environment in situations beyond equilibrium leads to unexpected consequences and random events. These events can in turn facilitate emergence in a way which cannot be foreseen. There is no predetermined 'final destination'.

Only complex systems can create new order—complicated systems cannot

- Van de Walle notes that complexity theorists' use of the notion of *attractors* and the attractor basin to visualize the changes from one temporarily stable state to the other. When the stable state of a system can be depicted as a point, a cloud of points represents the number of possible future stable states of that particular system. Since it is not possible to predict the exact next stable state of a system, there are multiple possible futures from a certain point in time. Social systems move incrementally between new stable states.

This discussion by Van de Walle emphasizes emergence within organizations. But emergence can be seen as a broader concept, pointing to the capability of society to develop new solutions with or without government. Self-organizing

social systems show the capability to come up with new societal solutions.

The challenge of the roundtable was to understand how looking at public service as a dynamic and open system changes our understanding of the role of government, the role of citizens and to explore the implications. This gives rise to questions on how emergence is happening in society and how public administrations may react. Teisman and Klijn addressed several issues concerning the skills, competencies and systems needed for government within this complex reality. They point to the importance of networks. There is a need for more knowledge on how emergence in society affects government and civil service.

3.5.2 The Significance of Complexity and Emergence

Should government bother with complexity thinking? By seeing institutions, economies, societies as complex co-evolving systems, and by understanding their characteristics, Mitleton-Kelly (2003) tells us we can facilitate learning, innovation, and sustainability. She warns us that we often inadvertently constrain innovation and the creation of new order. An understanding of complexity could help government to address apparently intractable problems such as conflict, major geo-political issues, and climate change.

Traditional patterns of government do not fit into the challenges of our society. We are in need of 'neue Kombinationen' to tackle societal problems.

But despite all the attention among policy makers for deregulation, decentralization, internal competition, partnerships, and so forth, traditional bureaucracy has proved to be a very durable, ultra-resistant and persistent organizational model. New Public Management did little for front-line workers, who are increasingly locked into a series of systems and procedures. The reaction to complexity has been to focus on organizational design and structure, and to increase controls and performance measurement. This approach hinders public organizations in reacting effectively to environmental changes. Public sector reforms may need to create room for "bricolage" and foster organizational memory and innovation by preserving some level of organizational redundancy.

3.5.3 What Government Can Do

Policy as Results
Teisman and Klijn tell us that complexity is not a matter of 'control'. Complexity theory applied to the domain of public administration shows us that policy results do not stem from what any decision-maker decides. They are achieved through the coincidental combination of actions and reactions in numerous subsystems. This reveals the limits of conventional strategic planning and what can be reasonably predicted.

A lesson from this complexity research is that "You need to sail the wind." This does not mean that all should be left to chance. Mitleton-Kelly (2003) sees organizational learning as the main way organizations can deal with complexity. Complexity provides an explanation of how environments can either inhibit or enable individual learning and the contribution of individuals to the learning

process. In this learning process, it is necessary to leave the traditional behavioral, cognivist or social-constructionist approaches for Gestalt-approaches to learning. Such approaches help us understand how public organizations can co-evolve with the emerging patterns in their environment.

New means for governments

Complexity theory shows us that governments need to work with complexity to achieve results. Participants in the roundtable put forward some practical guidelines in this regard for public managers.

Bricolage

The main presentations during the roundtable focused on 'emergent strategy' and 'behavior of managers'. Steven van de Walle pointed at methods and behavior which managers could use to deal with complexity.

A successful strategy is *bricolage* which can be defined as "the invention of resources from the available materials to solve unanticipated problems". Bricoleurs typically think and act beyond their current tasks and work units. They span boundaries and take initiative. Some degree of social capital and trust is required for bricolage to work. This is something that does not always flourish in an environment driven by control and compliance.

Leadership

Teisman and Klijn focused on *leadership* as the most important means to deal with complexity. Teisman studied major infrastructural projects which are traditionally confronted with delays and cost overruns. The conventional response is to exercise more control; however, despite doing so, delays and cost overruns continue. His view is that managers systematically misunderstand the complexity of such projects and therefore are unable to steward them. He finds the situation can only be improved by putting people in charge who are able to create trust. Such leadership starts with the acceptance of complexity. Combining organizational or personal goals with those of other actors in a structure of coordination is a key aspect. This can be done by collective sense-making and the coupling of ambitions and goals.

Network management is the most obvious illustration of this type of leadership. However, this leads to at least two policy paradoxes:

- Effective policy results must be generated by a network of organizations that must also promote their individual missions.

- Effective policy results emerge from trustful networks that operate in a context characterized by single interests and partisanship.

Competencies

According to Klijn, public managers able to guide and use emerging processes and outcomes exhibit the following qualities:

- Externally focused, non hierarchical, connected with society;

- Able to identify and use emerging trends, new policy paradigms and windows of opportunity to achieve outcomes.

- A good understanding of their environment and able to use this to make productive interventions.

- Able to 'ride the fitness landscape', grasping opportunities to fulfill a mission.

Current public managers find it challenging to combine the external orientation with the traditional hierarchical culture and structure of the public service.

Reduced Dependency

Mitleton-Kelly adds that organizations should strive for *multiple micro strategies* rather than pursuing a single strategy. The search for an 'optimum' strategy is neither possible nor desirable in a changing or turbulent environment. Multiple micro strategies are essential for innovation and the co-creation of an enabling environment.

3.6 GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR PRACTITIONERS

The Roundtable on emergence concluded with a general discussion on the do's and don'ts for achieving public results in the face of emergence. These principles complete the principles from the presentations. In the two graphs, the Argumentenfabriek summarized the do's and don'ts.

3.6.1 Vision: Embrace Complexity

- Practitioners need to appreciate that the world is complex. It is not a threat. Invest in capacity to understand complexity. Replace strategic planning by scenario planning. Emergence must be seen as an opportunity, rather than a threat.

- Practitioners should listen deeply to their co-workers. A participant suggested organizing 360 degree evaluation. Management needs to accept the challenges put forward. Enable people to deal with complexity by removing organizational and operational barriers.

- Sometimes, it is difficult to treat a crisis as a complex issue. But crises are an emanation of underlying systemic problems: you need tools as pattern recognition for such crises. Crises are the right moment to reflect on what is going on. Build the skills to deal with such crises or changes.

3.6.2 Organization: Create Space for Exploration and Experiment

- Create different sorts of space (financial and otherwise) within which front-runners of people can take the lead and experiment. Organize multi-disciplinary groups which can make sense of what is going on, identify patterns, develop a new narrative or understanding of complex reality. Within such an approach, the opinion was to leave space open for paradoxical views. Include the people that are working in interstitial spaces. People from outside can shake-up things.

- The question is then who should create this space? The advice was to let a civil servant with a mandate do this, but this must be a civil servant with good relations to the top. A warning was formulated when doing this. People at the top can be the 'stick in the mud'. This means that such actors shouldn't wait for the boss to start action.

3.6.3 Setting Goals: Be Careful with Measures

- Develop meaningful outcome perspectives that reflect real world outcomes and multiple accountabilities. Respond to outcome (not outputs): shape this in the best way possible.

- Engage stakeholders to shape accountability. Engage them in the activity of outcome development in order to see how these measures develop themselves afterwards. Stakeholders must decide what is meaningful.

- Use futuring techniques to develop the right perspectives for measurement.

3.6.4 Dont's

In the discussion, there were also some "don'ts" put forward.

- **Vision: don't be afraid.** The main thrust of this principle is that practitioners shouldn't back away from conflict. There is no need for panic: because simple rules drive complex systems.

- **Organization: don't rigidly stick to predefined plans.** Too much planning leads to analysis paralysis. It is important to prevent that from happening. Another argument that was put forward was to avoid having hidden agendas. This will only lead to conspiracy theories.

- **Setting goals: don't become complacent by success.** Success in dealing with complexity shouldn't cause complacency. Change the context so as to break the routine. Organize incentives not to become complacent.

3.7 EFFECTS OF EMERGENCE AND COMPLEXITY ON PUBLIC RESULTS

The final perspective on the emergence discussion is to what extent the discussions help to address the question about the legitimacy of government and public administration.

Some participants in the roundtable located emergent processes within the action framework of public organizations. There was little reference to how public administration could work with emergent processes in society. This meant the discussion on public results remained confined to the borders of the public administration itself and brought with it the risk of translating public results into organizational performance measurement. For most of the discussion on emergence, public results remained terra incognita. For instance, Steven van de Walle specifically dealt with the relationship between emergence and perfor-

mance systems within public administration. He pointed to the fact that systems facilitating emergence and anticipating change may be good at dealing with new, unpredictable and thus emergent problems:

"Solutions provided through such arrangements may be welcomed by a variety of actors. Behaviours such as bricolage, improvisation, incremental strategising, adaptive and enabling leadership may all lead to desirable outcomes, yet come with a disadvantage that such outcomes are not always predictable. This means there is no prior agreement on what is considered good performance, and this may lead to ex-post conflicts about the followed path."

He also warns that the absence of a performance orientation may lead to organizations operating at a very high cost. "Thus, while anticipative systems may be quite capable at achieving favourable outcomes, they are vulnerable in ex-post discussions about whether the system has actually performed."

It seems that the research field and some practitioners are locked into an organizational performance mode and have (still) little sensitivity for public results in a complex, modern society. A limited view on the significance of emergence in society might be a reason for the limited sensitivity for public results, including legitimacy.

4. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

The inaugural NS6 roundtable brought together scholars, researchers and senior practitioners from different parts of the world to examine the significance of "emergence" and "resilience" in modern governance and public administration, and to explore what public organizations and public servants can do to achieve results of high public value in an increasingly complex, unpredictable world.

Some key ideas emerged from the presentations, case studies and discussions that will inevitably be picked-up and refined in the discussion at upcoming roundtables in other countries. These include:

- Pursuing public results on complex issues in unpredictable circumstances;

- Fashioning effective participation and collaboration processes with citizens and other actors.

- Seeing and doing public policy in different ways;

- Accepting complexity and working with emergence;

- Balancing continuity with continuous change;

- Making multifaceted interventions, using windows of opportunity, pursuing multiple, local micro-strategies;

- Developing anticipative, innovative and adaptive capacities;

- Supporting social innovation.

The design and organization of The Netherlands' roundtable provided a helpful template for future ones. The substantive content set a high bar that will inspire members of the network and delegates at future roundtables to reach for even greater heights.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: NAMES AND AFFILIATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS

John Alford, Professor of Public Sector Management, Australia and New Zealand School of Government.

Roel Bekker, secretary general for Central Government Reform, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).

Kees Breed, Council for Public Administration (ROB), Netherlands (Emergence round table only)

Steven Broers, municipality of The Hague, The Netherlands (Resilience round table only).

Gerard van den Broek, director of the Knowledge Department, Ministry of the Interior, Netherlands (Resilience round table only).

Jocelyne Bourgon, P.C., O.C., Canada School of Public Service.

Silvio Crestana, Researcher of the Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (he is also the former Director-President of the Corporation, which is a Public Enterprise).

Steven Dhondt, Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research (TNO), Netherlands.

Roos van Erp-Bruinsma, secretary general of the Ministry of the Interior, Netherlands (Resilience round table only).

Paul Frissen, University of Tilburg, Netherlands (Resilience round table only).

Martin Gagner, Leiden University, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).

Merel de Groot, NS6 Netherlands deputy coordinator, Ministry of the Interior.

Lotte Helder, Ministry of the Interior, Netherlands.

Peter Ho, Head of Singapore Civil Service (Emergence round table only).

Menno Hurenkamp, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands (Resilience round table only).

Brian Johnson, Canada School of Public Service.

Jurgen de Jong, P+P Research and Consulting, Netherlands (Resilience round table only).

Philip Karré, Netherlands School for Public Administration (Emergence round table only).

Helena Kerr, President of the National School of Public Administration, NS6-coordinator for Brazil.

Erik-Hans Klijn, Erasmus University, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).

Natalia Koga, University of Westminster, United Kingdom.

Harrie Kruiter, Leiden University, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).

Anil Kumar, Ambassador of Singapore, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).

Tobias Kwakkelstein, NS6 Netherlands coordinator, Ministry of the Interior.

Shaun Lednor, De Argumentenfabriek, Netherlands.

Lena Leong, senior researcher Civil Service College, Singapore.

Derk Loorbach, Erasmus University, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).
Igno Pröpper, P+P Research and Consulting, Netherlands (Resilience round table only).

Prof. Ann Masten, University of Minnesota, United States (Resilience round table only).
Dr. Peter Milley, Research Director, Canada School of Public Service.

Eve Mitleton-Kelly, London School of Economics (Emergence round table only).

Janet Newman, Professor of Social Policy at the Open University, United Kingdom.

Christine Nixon, Chair, Victorian Bushfire Reconstruction & Recovery Authority, Australia (Resilience round table only).

Gordon Owen, Director General Partnerships and Best Practices, Canada School of Public Service, NS6-coordinator for Canada.

Yee Ping-Yi, Senior Director, Deputy Dean/CEO, Civil Service College; Senior Director, Strategic Planning Office, Public Service Division, NS6-coordinator for Singapore.

Sue Richards, Professor, Senior fellow, Institute for Government, NS6-coordinator United Kingdom.

Esther van Rijswijk, De Argumentenfabriek, Netherlands.

Jill Rutter, former Director of Strategy at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom.

Hironobu Sano, Professor of the Federal University of Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil.

Marie Sassine, Visiting Assistant Deputy Minister, Canada School of Public Service.

Andy Scott, P.C., University of New Brunswick, Canada.

Mandy Smits, Ministry of the Interior, Netherlands (Resilience round table only).

Martijn van der Steen, Netherlands School for Public Administration (Emergence round table only).

Geert Teisman, Erasmus University, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).

Mark van Twist, Netherlands School for Public Administration (Emergence round table only).

Dr. Steven van der Walle, Erasmus University, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).

Dr. Frances Westley, JW McConnell Chair in Social Innovation, University of Waterloo, Canada.

Prof. dr. André van der Zande, secretary general Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, Netherlands (Emergence round table only).

ANNEX B: LIST OF PRE-READING MATERIALS, PRESENTATIONS AND CASE STUDIES

Papers

Bourgon, Jocelyne. (2010) *The New Frontiers of Public Administration: The New Synthesis Project*. Ottawa, ON: Public Governance International.

NS6 Project Leader's Team (2009) Literature Scan no.1: On the Need for a New Synthesis of Public Administration. Ottawa, ON: unpublished working paper.

NS6 Project Leader's Team (2009) Literature Scan No. 2: Complexity Theories: What are They and What Do They Tell Us About Public Administration in the 21st Century? Ottawa, ON: unpublished working paper.

NS6 Project Leader's Team (2009) *Literature Scan No. 3: Resilience and Public Administration*. Ottawa, ON: unpublished working paper.

NS6 Project Leader's Team (2009) Literature Scan No. 4: Collective Intelligence: What Is It and How Can It Be Tapped? Ottawa, ON: unpublished working paper. NS6 Project Leader's Team (2010) Applications of Complex Adaptive Systems Theories in Governance, Public Administration and Public Policy. Ottawa, ON: unpublished working paper.

Van de Walle, Steven and Merel Vogelaar (2010) *Emergence and Public Administration: A literature review for the project 'A New Synthesis in Public Administration'*. Department of Public Administration, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Presentations

De Vries, Jouke Harry Kruiter and Martin Gagner (2010) *Public Safety Centres in the Netherlands*.

Ho, Peter (2010) *Public Service at the leading Edge: Governance in a complex future*.

Klijn, Erik-Hans (2010) *The managerial consequences of complexity: agency over structure*.

Masten, Ann (2010) *Resilience in Human Development: Perspectives from Behavioral Sciences*.

Mitleton-Kelly, Eve (2010) *On Co-Creation, Complexity and Organisational Learning*.
Nixon, Christine (2010) *The 2009 Victorian Bushfires*.

Pröpper, Igno and Jurgen de Jong (2010) *Rotterdam Tarwewijk, a resilient Neighborhood?: A case study for the New Synthesis project*.

Richards, Sue (2010) *Criminal Justice Case Study.*
Teisman, Ing. Geert R. (2010) *Governance as emerging process systems.*

Van de Walle, Steven and Merel Vogelaar (2010) *Emergence and public administration.*

Van Twist, M.J.W., P.M. Karre, and M.A. van der Steen (2010) *Organizing Government Around Problems: A case study of Dutch programme ministries.*

Westley, Frances (2010) *Building Resilience: The Role of Governance and Agency in Social Innovation.*

Case Studies

De Vries, Jouke, Harry Kruiter and Martin Gagner (2010) *Public Safety Centres in the Netherlands: A case study for the 'New Synthesis' project.* The Hague, The Netherlands: Centre for Governance Studies, Leiden University.
Karre, P.M., M. Pen, M.A. van der Steen, and M.J.W. van Twist (2010) *Organizing Government Around Problems: A case study of the two Dutch programme ministries for youth and family and for housing, communities and integration.* Netherlands School for Public Administration
Litjens, Bart, Mark Rouw, Rob Hammenga, and Igno Pröpper, (2010) *Rotterdam Tarwewijk, a resilient Neighborhood?: A case study for the New Synthesis project.* The Hague, The Netherlands: Partners + Pröpper.
Richards, Sue (2010) *Criminal Justice Case Study.* London, The United Kingdom: Institute for Government.
State Government of Victoria State Services Authority (2010) *Victorian Bushfire Reconstruction and Recovery Authority: A Case Study on Agility and Resilience.* Melbourne, Australia: State Services Authority.

Other

Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (2010) *International Roundtable Program and Introductory Note.*

What are do's and don'ts for public administrations when trying to foster resilience?

DON'TS

Vision: don't underestimate society
- Don't act unless necessary.
- Don't underestimate human competences and capacity.
- Don't protect people from challenges and consequences they can handle, they will learn and gain ownership.
- Don't rush to intervene until resilience has a chance to emerge.
- Keep in mind that help in the short run is not always the best in the long run.

Organization: don't do it alone
- Don't engage society without resources and the will to listen.
- Don't engage society without the support of societal partners, and give them the credit they deserve.
- Don't be dominant but also dare to be humble and vulnerable.
- Don't pretend to be in control when you're not, but ask citizens for help.
- Don't be captured by particular interests, seek out groups that can't make themselves heard.
- Don't forget politics: you need politicians for communicating and explaining policy.

Achieving results: don't forget to make choices
- Don't treat all solutions as being of equal value, and all communities as equally nice.
- Politics is (ultimately) needed to judge between different options and solutions.
- Keep in mind that fairness and inclusion are not always the right values to pursue.

Fruit

DO'S

Vision: be clear and transparent
- Explicate why, how and where the administration is fostering resilience.
- Be clear about the level of resilience: individual, community, organization, society.
- Formulate the need for resilience as a collective goal of all levels.
- Be clear about the kind of interventions that are needed.
- Accept that giving society space means relinquishing some power and control.

Organization: give society space
- Let communities participate in the problem definition process and in policy making.
- Talk to citizens in diverse groups, so that they appreciate the conflicts of interests and perspectives.
- Be prepared to be the facilitator that asks critical questions and the leader that makes choices.
- Start small with a small issue that has priority in the community.
- Build 'bridging' social capital by recognising it when it is already present.
- Train civil servants to set up dialogue with citizens and to respect their competences.

Achieving \results: make slow policy
- Be patient, take time to built policy and achieve results.
- Convince politicians that slow policy is less risky, more achievable and cheaper than traditional policy.
- Treat policy as an experiment in which you learn along the way.
- Allow time for feedback and response from communities
- Give communities time for solutions to emerge before intervening.
- Cheer and engage opposition and critique, from conflict comes creativity.

This mindmap was made at the first Round Table of the New Synthesis Project on March 24th 2010 in The Hague, during a two hour discussion on resilience, led by De Argumentenfabriek.