

PHASING-IN

HOW TO INITIATE A PROCESS OF PUBLIC INNOVATION?

François Jégou, Christophe Gouache

f.jegou@gmail.com

christophe@strategicdesignscenarios.net

Abstract

Starting a process of public innovation is the beginning of a change. However, any transformation of practices, methods and tools within a structure, whatever it may be, takes time. Rather than trying to "order" the change, innovation processes should be implemented slowly, gradually; it shall be designed as a phasing-in strategy.

SDS builds on over 20 years of experience of varied types of innovation in all sectors and at all levels of governance. In particular, we will report on two recent public innovation processes conducted in Belgium: the first one being the organization of a Public Innovation Day at the Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles and the setting up of a Public Innovation Lab at the Service Public de Wallonie.

The two parallel experiences will be presented as an invitation to explore different methods and ways of doing policymaking and designing public services. These experiences will contribute to foster exchanges and reflection with the international community of policymakers, designers, practitioners and other stakeholders involved in this movement of public innovation. The last 10 years have seen the emergence of new forms and initiatives of internal and external innovation in public organizations. It is now time to capitalize on these multiple experiences and draw key lessons on things to consider when initiating a public process innovation : where to start from, accepting and recognizing complexity, setting the space for administrative innovation, protecting internal innovation initiatives, setting up an inside-outside conversation, identifying problems by resetting them, initiating work culture change, designing your own unique lab...

Keywords: Design for policy; public innovation; users-centered approach;

Introduction

HOW TO START?

Starting a public innovation process is the beginning of a change. However, any transformation of practices, methods and tools within a structure, whatever it may be, takes time (especially in large institutions known for their heaviness and inertia in the face of change). Rather than trying to "decree" the change, it should be implemented slowly, gradually; it is a phasing-in strategy. Initiating such a process is also like turning on a complex computer-like machine: how does one "boot" or "reboot" the administrative machine when it is facing multiple and emerging societal challenges? The primer is the bait the fisherman disperses on the surface of the water to attract the fish: so how to make one want to change? But it is also like a small spark which ignites fire powder : so how can we gather the necessary energy to face the magnitude of the task? And it is, finally, the band used to set up a film: therefore not only the trigger but also the implementation of the process of the long-term fluid transformation. Starting this process also requires a business' first source of capital, which are the human and financial means one must gather in order to start. Lastly Initiating this process could be compared to a chemical reaction which provokes several secondary ones leading us to the following question : how could the initial effort actually initiate a chain of transformations which will spread to the entire institution?

WHY THIS PAPER?

SDS builds on over 20 years of multi-faceted innovation experiences in all sectors and at all levels of governance. In particular, here we report two processes recently conducted in Belgium:

Innovation Day at the Federation Wallonie-Bruxelles (FWB)

We accompanied from April to June 2017 in Brussels' Public Innovation Network, an informal and transversal initiative bringing together volunteer civil servants from different departments of the FWB, in order to co-build the program, the activities and the scenography of this day set to highlight public innovation in the ministry and encourage civil servants to participate in the FWB Public Innovation Network.

Public Innovation Lab at Service Public Wallonie (SPW)

From January to September 2017, we, together with Usages (a Namur-based design studio) accompanied the public servants of the Operational General Directorate of Economics, Employment and Research (DGO6) of the SPW based in Namur, in the definition, experimentation and implementation of a public innovation laboratory. This pioneer Innovation Lab at the SPW aims to explore the different forms that an innovation function may take within a public administration and gradually spread through the other institutions of the Public Service of Wallonia.

Beyond accounting for these two experiences and their results, the principle of this paper is to use these two paths as models of a public innovation start-up process: first, the organization of a Public Innovation Day to raise attention and generate awareness within the institution; then the co-development and implementation of an Innovation Lab to support innovation processes and

the evolution of the institution's public services and work culture.

Finally this text intends to contribute in enriching the exchanges and reflexion with the international community of public innovation labs. (see public sector site) The past 10 years have indeed seen the emergence of new forms of internal and external innovation initiatives in the public sector (Weller Jean-Marc, Pallez Frédérique, 2017). It is now time to capitalise on these multiple experiences and is essential (Jégou, 2015) to make the effort to tell these stories and share these experiences.

ACCEPTING DISRUPTIONS

The launch of an innovation process within the public structure is a crucial moment. First because of its tautological nature : setting up an innovation culture in a formal – and quite conservative – bureaucratic sector is in itself an innovation which requires from the administration to accept to step out from its usual and classical “ways of doing”.

The actors we met all spoke of a breaking point, a moment of letting-go, in other words accepting to be disrupted to start the process.

TOP-DOWN OR BOTTOM-UP PROCESS?

It is paradoxical – and undesirable – to decide all of a sudden to establish an innovative administration. The FWB and SPW decision-makers must agree that this process needs a bottom-up compound to it and in that regard, the hierarchy should play the role of a facilitator and benevolent protector. In a sense this shall be a collaboration between top-down and bottom-up dynamics.

CREATIVITY, INNOVATION, TRANSFORMATION

Making public action more efficient goes beyond just creativity. For the actors taking part, innovation - as the action of introducing something new - is less a matter of lacking of new ideas than the ability to lead friendly hacking (Jégou, François. Vincent, Stéphane. Thevenet, Romain et al., 2013) within the institution and achieving the desired transformation while avoiding being slowed down by the institutions' processes itself.

INITIATING FORCES

Initiating a public innovation process requires both significant forces as well as a good balance between external and internal resources. In our two cases (the FWB and SPW) things were initiated differently – different frameworks with different allocated budget – but both had a strong combination of high internal support as well as external implication making the transformation process possible.

LOOKING BEYOND THE HORIZON

Starting up means keeping the future in mind while getting started : exploring possible futures as tools for democracy (Jégou, Gouache, 2015), creating space for a wide range of possibilities, inventing scenarios, rethinking organisations, values and ways of operating and generating desirable futures. (Junginger, 2014)

Methodological approach

INNOVATION DAY AT THE WALLONIA-BRUSSELS' FEDERATION

A public works' sign warns the visitors at the entrance "Caution, Innovation Site". Everything is set up in the Wallonia-Brussels Federation's (FWB) great inner court: white and red marker tape marking the site's borders, disrupting the civil servants' usual paths, downgraded office furniture installed in the atrium, construction work cones and pallets spread around, etc. All the ingredients are present to announce how this Public Innovation Day, organised by the FWB's internal Innovation Network, intends to create an interlude from the traditional ways of working in the administration. The objective of the day is multiple : speaking about innovation and new ways of working within the administration ; attracting more civil servants to join as active participants or as auditors of the internal Innovation Network and... announcing and forecasting the future FWB's Public Innovation Lab. The event starts with a first "live-exhibition" prepared by the Innovation Network and SDS presenting around sixty good examples of innovative ways of working and designing public services and policies. The exhibition is organized into 5 chapters : Exploring together ; Facilitating coproduction ; Making things visible ; Experimenting ; Improving constantly... (Jégou, 2016). The presented cases come from SDS' years of innovative collaboration with public administrations at different levels (local, regional, national, European), networks (URBACT (Jégou, Bonneau, 2015)) and/or action-research projects from all over Europe and touch upon the fields of social innovation, design for policies, innovation labs, participatory foresight, policy innovation, etc. The FWB has also included its own disruptive practices into the set of examples : the board of directors using Legos as a means to support brainstorming ; an Ephemeral Innovation Lab installed in an unused office ; meeting-proof furniture ; the mapping of the Ministry's public procurement management practices; etc.

So what is a "live-exhibition" ? We have created this non-conference format as part of the URBACT cities network animation. While a standard exhibition would have displays on the walls and visitors moving around silently, in a "live exhibition" there are no walls and no fixed displays but rather participants in a circle and mobile boards. What is shown on the boards is described out loud to the visitors then handed out to the participants who end up "being" the exhibition. Two basic principles are to be noted : one does not have to wait for the end of the presentation to start talking with the person next to them and one must pass their sign around to other people in order to spread the ideas. This becomes a performance, which catches people who are on their way to the cafeteria, mixing departments and hierarchy levels, generating conversations and debates... Now, let's analyse why this event is an interesting format : the event is not – like it is usually the case – subcontracted to an external provider nor fully run internally, it is an inside-outside partnership. Around ten Innovation Network workshops covering a 3 month period ; collective intelligence and external stimulation using examples of new ways of working, suggestions on the general choreography and staging ; collecting discarded furniture and public works' sign ; collective choice of the themes, from the scenography set up to the live-exhibition presentation. This model should be highlighted as it is itself a form of public innovation combining external and internal resources. Indeed there is enough external input all along the process to inspire, avoid routine and change habits and enough time and internal implication from the conception phase to the execution phase to ensure that the new tools and work methods are well internalised.

PUBLIC INNOVATION LAB AT WALLONIA'S PUBLIC SERVICE : MAKING A TOUR OF THE STAKEHOLDERS

"We cannot start without doing a "Project Start-up", Mr Director!" This practice established in Amersfoort's city administration (city in the Netherlands) (Jégou, 2015) is meant to ensure that any project cannot start without all the stakeholders being involved. This "Project start-up" expression is known as a must-have reflex, a good practice to oppose to a too much top-down hierarchy – which often tend to forget making sure that all the relevant stakeholders (who could potentially enhance or influence the project) are involved at the very early stage of projects.

The idea behind this stakeholders' tour is to meet the key actors linked/impacted more or less directly to/by the DGO6's future Lab, in order to understand their expectations, difficulties, positions, etc. The principle is to involve the stakeholders to contribute to the design of the lab early in the process and in a light and spontaneous way. This helps to gather conflicting, contrasted and divergent points of view. But the stakeholder's Tour - as its name might suggest it - is not only a consultation process but also and firstly a community building process. The stakeholders' Tour has therefore multiple advantages : it gives an opportunity to the administration to connect or reconnect with its partners and/or users and beneficiaries, it helps gathering preliminary feelings and impressions and finally it allows testing an idea by sharing it around even though still at concept-stage therefore saving time and energy on development stage (as you are able to take in account the first reactions and immediately re-orient your concept). This practice of revealing and sharing concept-stage innovations is not a natural practice as organisations tend to carefully nest and hide their ideas and reveal them only once fully developed and ready to be launched. Conducting a stakeholders' tour increases the relevance of the future solution, its legitimacy as it becomes somehow a collective production and potential efficiency as it builds upon greater collective intelligence and knowledge.

In the end, we met, within a week over 30 people face to face and covered with analysis posters 3 of the "project room" 's walls. We met people from all levels of hierarchy, different departments, different organizations in Namur city and beyond. One could think that there isn't much to take from listening to a panorama of actors discussing a future Innovation Lab for which they have no experience of and sometimes even no idea what it really means but what we grasp, here, beyond the feedback or lab' s functional specifications, are positive as well as negative mental projections : "the projects hosted in the lab should be off-radar", it should be a space in which we are authorized to experiment as we wish, in which the protocols of the laborious administrative machine do not apply" ; "the lab should be open (to all civil servants, to all sorts of projects...) but without being too exposed (to criticism, administration clichés...)" ; "The Lab should be instantiated by a physical place neither too far way (easily accessible) nor too close (beyond influences and routines)" ; "creating the Lab should be a symbol of praised and inaugurated desire for change", "it shall remain agile, mobile, in constant evolution, to avoid institutional sclerosis " ; etc

EXPO-ACTION

"... So they really are going to do this lab ..." says a civil servant of the Public Service of Wallonia as he walks in the elevator going up to his office after having gone through the entrance hall of the building where the Expo-Action of the future Lab of the DGO6 was installed during two days. This little remark is emblematic of the objective of an Expo-Action: making the concept exist, mocking it up in full size, embodying what is still only a project so that it begins to exist and become real.

The different scenarios of the future lab were developed and visualized in the form of models which were displayed in the hall in order for the civil servants working in the building to better imagine what this lab could be. For two days, the visualized scenarios as well as the other intermediate results of the co-development process (stakeholder mapping, evil creativity, mapping of uses, etc.) are organized in a light exhibition and installed in the main entrance of the Service Public of Wallonia building. The lobby is entirely transformed into an exhibition space and a temporary lab to ensure that none of the public servant entering or leaving the building can miss it and spend at least a few moments there. The installation in the hall prefigures somehow the innovation Lab as an open space, where different profiles of actors join to work together beyond their departments, hierarchy, roles, etc. During the expo-action top management leaders together with their teams come over for a visit and debate over the scenarios.

The value of an Expo-Action lies in the contradiction between the two terms: an exhibition is usually a presentation which visitors generally enjoy in a more or less passive way. On the contrary, the commitment of participants in an action supposes a strong implication of these to generate the results.

THE PROTO-LAB WEEK

A well-functioning Public Innovation Lab is the result of a process of progressive acculturation, of acceptance and positive contamination of the civil servants within the institution, and of progressive evolution of the ways of working. It is the result of a series of iterations of trial and errors, a continuous process of readjustments, of refining, or re-designing, or re-adapting. The projective and interactive methods used make it possible to collaboratively define the uses and specifications of the laboratory. Now, full-scale tests of the main functionalities of the lab shall be run by involving the internal and external actors in moments of simulations and micro-experiments.

These micro-experiments are meant as “proof of concepts” (POC). The idea is to try out, to experiment, to play as if the lab already existed, to do as if it was already there, and to do so on real issues and problems. These POCs will not only deliver results and solutions on the chosen topics but will also offer a good panorama of the diversity of subjects that the lab can work on and the variety of tools that it will use to resolve these different issues. It was therefore decided that the proto-lab would work on issues that were totally different from one to another, working on very concrete things (forms, applications, etc.) to more systemic and organizational ones, to more projective ones : experiencing an empathetic approach of users of the SESAM employment support system together with caseworkers; defining the issue of the chemistry sector in Wallonia within the framework of the Interreg S3CHEM project; generating ideas between several departments to improve the quality of how to welcome new civil servants based on the experiences of a sample of them; modelling the next steps of the development of the DGO6 Lab in different room options; testing and developing, with a sample of SMEs, prototypes of the De Minimis simplified form relating to cumulative State Aids.

Beyond finding solutions to specific problems, the proto-lab was also an opportunity for identifying the lab's future specifications : ensuring agility to better fit the needs of the field, preserving freedom and independence to be able to seize opportunities when they appear; to make the lab a "situated service" (within a dedicated space even though it goes beyond its walls) to become a visible point of reference, building a community of practice that progresses organically within the institution and starting with the first most convinced and motivated civil

servants; gathering a team coming from different departments, services and levels of hierarchy to avoid silo mentality, etc.

Results, discussion and implications

WHAT ARE THE LESSONS?

Following these two rich and boosting experiences, what lessons can we learn? What is recurring and could be transposed to other public institutions? What are the pitfalls to avoid, the experience's results to be shared? This synthesis is not meant as a conclusion but rather as an open list to be discussed, completed... They are organised into 10 key points but should be seen as an open set of principles, an invitation to a wider dialogue and a contribution to the collective knowledge of the – now well established – community of public innovation labs all around the world.

WHAT STARTING POINT?

The motivations lying behind the kick-off of an innovation process within the public sector are now well known : sense of inefficiency and incapacity to tackle societal issues, loss of meaning (bureaucratic machine), unpopularity of the public servants and public sector in general, inadequacy of the public services and policies in regards to the profound societal changes, needs for fast response and agility, over-proceduralized and normative systems which are unable to respond to specific cases, silo mentality which is unfit for tackling transversal and systemic problems, generalized decrease of public finances, citizens' pressure for more transparency and participation, etc...

ACCEPTING COMPLEXITY

Beyond being a new trend, the attraction for "Public Innovation Labs" seems to find its roots on one hand in the growing recognition and acceptance of the amplifying complexity of societal challenges and on the other in the incapacity and inadequacy of conventional responses and classical "ways of doing" to tackle these issues. And there are things that cannot "simply be simplified". As H. L. Mencken puts it : "for every complex problem there is an answer that is clear, simple, and wrong". When setting up an Innovation Lab, we accept to happily dive into this complexity and enter in the details, to dissect the systems to better understand them and identify where to push and what to work on. It may mean taking time to carefully listen and understand users having trouble filling out a questionnaire, having a real interest in mapping with precision the administrative treatment process of a file, as well as enjoying meeting with the freshly hired civil servants to explore together how they have experienced their arrival and how we could better welcome the next ones, rather than dealing with those issues in a top-down way from a far desk or trying to solve them alone based on preconceptions and general impressions, etc. With complex issues a patch, a correction, an improvement won't be enough, we need to change our tools, our postures, our "ways of doing" to better embrace, understand and respond to complex interlaced issues. It is therefore a matter of accepting the discomfort of navigating in the real world without knowing too much in advance where we are heading toward, exploring areas where we lack landmarks and where there's no pre-existing, clear and obvious pathways. It is about leaving preconceptions behind in order to look at problems with naïve and non-judging eyes and going beyond the comments of "we just need to...", "it's simple we just have to...", "it's easy, we simply do...".

PROTECTING INTERNAL SOCIAL INNOVATION

The FWB and DG06 (SPW) are both convinced that in order to start a process of internal innovation, the transformation should be put on the official agenda of the institution and included in the Administration's Contract (Belgian administration's 3 years plan). Being also aware of the difficulty of implementing innovation in a top-down manner, the Directorates are seizing the desire for change manifested by some civil servants as an opportunity to trigger the process. "Innovation can not be administered". One cannot administer innovation like one administers a medication by force feeding the users. The "management of innovation" that follows is cautious, confining itself to a role of facilitator and protector of the process. The Directors demonstrate some "lâcher prise", "letting go" - meaning refraining from applying the strict rules, setting specific objectives, overloading the process with series of indicators of success and criteria to be respected. The hierarchy plays the role of a "friendly facilitator". They seek "to impose nothing and to let things bloom". The change shall be led and carried by a team of civil servants not commanded by directors (but supported by them).

The Lab shall be "a space of authorization" protecting the innovation from the administration's own rigidities and heaviness. The space is like a bubble that benefits from the attentive ear of the hierarchy (a way to short-circuit the filtering administrative layers, limit intermediaries, etc.) while remaining far and independent enough (to be freer and independent, to be less accountable, etc.).

(RE) SETTING IN MOTION

The start of an innovation process is described in both public administrations literally as (re) setting in motion. External resources must be used to "reset the machine". The prolonged "corrosion" of the administration made it slower but also less agile. In the Lab's working methods we manipulate colorful and threedimensional objects, people move, change their points of view, create relationships between themselves. We try to remotivate the civil servants who "no longer believe in possible change" and are "disillusioned" with the capacity of the administration to reform itself. These innovation processes are, by their interactive, collective and creative nature, generating pleasure and enthusiasm for the staff. They contribute to "re-enchanted" the work they do. The movement is also understood as a back and forth move between civil servants and decision-makers each stuck in a caricatural vision of the other who will not want to hear anything nor change. The Innovation Lab equips itself with a "friendly broker", a liaison officer who ensures this mediation. They ensure a good translation between parties, reassure both sides and finally unblock processes that are stuck because of "misunderstandings".

SETTING UP AN INSIDE-OUTSIDE CONVERSATION

A inside-outside cooperation is to be installed to avoid outsourcing everything to outside providers (which must be managed without often having the time to capitalize) and to avoid having the administration trying alone to change by itself (with the aforementioned difficulty, to manage one's own transformation with the traditional tools and processes of administration). A Lab requires "enough internal involvement to take care of it and enough external resources to avoid operating in a vacuum". Optimism is expected in order to go over the periods of crippling

discouragement when facing the weight of the transformational tasks lying ahead and humility is expected in order to calm the over confidence when seeing the first signs of change happening. New models of internal-external collaboration seem to promisingly emerge. We "do with", we "work together", "in partnership". We enter the world of "co", co-learning, co-transformation, "inside-outside" collaboration, despite public procurement constraints, outsourcing habits and the interventionalist reflexes of financial providers.

RESETTING THE PROBLEMS

The Innovation Lab cannot limit itself to the creative resolution of defects or imperfections in public policies or services and confine itself to a "problem-solving" role. Placed at a sufficiently strategic level within the institutions and free of its moves, the Lab is also acting as a "problem-setting" level (re-examining the problems). This "problem-setting" role makes it possible to re-question the paradigms in place by proposing to change points of view, by investigating the problems by meeting users and exploring the field. The problem-setting role poses the following questions: Is the problem we are talking about really the problem? Why is this a problem? For whom? And if you change your cap, is it still a problem? Are we sure that what we consider to be the cause or causes of the problem are really the true causes? Etc. Resetting problems can often help go around them.

DESIGNING ALL DURING THE PROJECT

"All the administration's problems are not soluble in a creativity process". The search for the (brilliant) idea is the salient and visible part of the innovation process and naturally the one on which we tend to focus the most. General attention to Design Thinking tends to focus on the ideation process. But "The problem is certainly not a lack of ideas or creativity within the services. The difficulty is rather to make room for ideas and to take them all the way to their effective implementation". In a highly "viscous" environment like an administration, the main effort resides in accompanying the idea all the way to its actual implementation. A Public Innovation Lab is not the revisited version of an "idea box" 2.0 that nobody ever opens or does anything with. The lab is therefore not only there to generate innovative ideas but must ensure and support the effective implementation of solutions. It must help actual transformation to take place.

ATTACKING THE DEEP-SEATED CULTURE

The clichés that weigh on the administration also weigh on the civil servants who are either suffocating then quitting, or just deal with it and gradually lose faith in the capacity and effectiveness of public action. The labs are, therefore, meant to identify and solve problems but also to progressively change the culture of the institution. Not starting by climbing the north face is a good practice especially if the gap for improvement is considerable. We aim to start with "quick wins" (or small POCs, proofs of concept) to convince. Once things have moved a little, the challenge is to go further using this small step as a lever to gain confidence and effectively start climbing up the North Face. Starting with a highly challenging objective is to take the risk of disappointment and discouragement of the mobilized active forces. "Without this change of culture it will be difficult to innovate". The FWB talks about innovation values: "why we should

change the way we perceive failure, encourage risk-taking, be caring and optimistic, put the user at the center, materialize and prototype ideas, etc." At the DGO6, it is the very meaning of innovation that is different: we invest in innovation to make profit or cost less, in any case we expect, when it is well conducted, a " return on investment of innovation ". Moreover, the Innovation Lab as a physical place is an undeniable means of instantiating change, giving visibility and affirming that a desire for transformation is underway. But the construction of a "Lab-place" is not the main focus. This is a complement, a confirmation that a "Lab Mode" has been adopted as a new way of working. The physical space acts as a banner of change.

Conclusions

EACH LAB IS UNIQUE

As Stéphane Vincent, General Delegate of the Public Innovation Lab 27th Region, says in the world of public innovation labs, we can not apply the McDonald's copy-pasting-replicating the same restaurants principle. Each lab must find its own identity, by adapting itself to the administration's specific history and culture in which it has been created, by dealing with the civil servants' specific practices and ways of doing things, by collaborating with the actors and stakeholders, by anchoring itself in the unique territorial context in which it is settling, by gathering and mixing the present skills and the ones to come, etc. In these conditions, the famous "one size fits all" really does not suit. Each lab is and must be, by nature, ad hoc and unique despite the series of commonalities that can be identified between them. But this unique character means that there is no - unfortunately or fortunately! - ready-made recipe to apply. We must therefore accept that it will take time, energy, and lots of effort and courage over a long period of time. A lab is not built in a few days, or even in a few weeks, or even a few months, it takes years. And once it comes to life, it is alive and constantly evolving!

References

Jégou, François. 2016. Design de services publics collaboratifs & transformation de la gouvernance locale, in Milieux & créativité ouvrage collectif sous la direction de Jehanne Dautrey, Dijon, Les Presses du réel, p161-170

Jégou François Bonneau Marcelline. 2015. Social innovation in cities, URBACT II capitalisation, URBACT Publishing, Paris. <http://www.strategicdesignscenarios.net/social-innovation-in-cities>

Jégou François and Gouache Christophe 2015. Envisioning as an enabling tool for social empowerment and sustainable democracy in Responsible living: concepts, education and future perspectives edited by Victoria W. Thoresen, Robert J. Didham, Jorgen Klein and Declan Doyle, Springer, Switzerland, 2015. <http://www.strategicdesignscenarios.net/envisioning-as-an-enabling-tool-for-social-empowerment-and-sustainable-democracy-in-responsible-living-concepts-education-and-future-perspectives/>

Jégou François. 2015. case study, Amersfoort: designing a collaborative city administration, URBACT II capitalisation, URBACT Publishing, Paris. <http://www.strategicdesignscenarios.net/social-innovation-in-cities-amerfoort-case-study>

Jégou François. 2015. Coévolutions du design et des politiques publiques, in Chantiers ouverts au public. Ouvrage collectif orchestré par Pauline Scherer. La Documentation Française, 2015.

Jégou François. Vincent Stéphane. Thevenet, Romain et al. Friendly hacking into public sector: co-creating public policies within regional governments. Co-create Conference. Aalto University. Helsinki. 2013. pp 421-431. <http://www.strategicdesignscenarios.net/friendly-hacking-into-public-sector-co-creating-public-policies-within-regional-governments>

Jorgen Klein and Declan Doyle, Springer, Switzerland, 2015. <http://www.strategicdesignscenarios.net/envisioning-as-an-enabling-tool-for-social-empowerment-and-sustainable-democracy-in-responsible-living-concepts-education-and-future-perspectives/>

Junginger, Sabine. (2014). Towards Policy-Making as Designing: Policy-Making Beyond Problem-Solving and Decision-Making. 57-69.

<http://publicsector-map.designforeurope.eu/en/>

Naphegyi, Caroline (2017). Lille Metropole 2020, World Design Capital. lille–design Paper n°3

Weller Jean-Marc, Pallez Frédérique, « Les formes d'innovation publique par le design : un essai de cartographie », Sciences du Design, 2017/1 (n° 5), p. 32-51. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-sciences-du-design-2017-1-page-32.htm>