

Disrupting governance by Systemic Design and co-creating the public value

*Original*

Disrupting governance by Systemic Design and co-creating the public value / Giraldo, Carolina; Ferrulli, Eliana; Barbero, Silvia. - ELETTRONICO. - 2:(2021), pp. 4009-4024. ( Design Culture(s). Cumulus Conference Proceedings Rome 2021 Sapienza University of Rome June 8-11, 2021).

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2927992 since: 2021-09-30T12:17:46Z

*Publisher:*

Loredana Di Lucchio, Lorenzo Imbesi, Angela Giambattista, Viktor Malakuczi

*Published*

DOI:

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

(Article begins on next page)



DESIGN CULTURE(S) | CUMULUS ROMA 2021  
JUNE 08.09.10.11, SAPIENZA UNIVERSITY OF ROME

# Disrupting governance by Systemic Design and co-creating the public value

Carolina Giraldo Nohra<sup>a</sup>, Eliana Ferrulli<sup>a</sup>,  
Silvia Barbero<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Politecnico di Torino - Department of Architecture and Design

\*carolina.giraldo@polito.it

**Abstract** | Massive transformations characterize our current era at a multidimensional level, and our governments worldwide are facing the urgency to translate this complexity into a manageable common strategy. Strong synergies and cooperation on a quadruple-helix model are identified as primary conditions to build value for society. In that view, systemic perspectives and participatory methodologies - which Systemic Design combines - can trigger innovative processes of sharing knowledge and experiences among different stakeholders and can build innovation in the public sector. This paper investigates how Systemic Design methodology can be used for a governance “paradigm shift” for value creation, on a long term perspective. Such a method opens the way to a more adaptive and co-creative innovation in policy-design processes, by exploring new ways and tools provided by design, which enable broader and collaborative access to public governance. Applying a systemic perspective into those strategies means to favor a type of governance, whose outcomes are iterative and autopoietic, creating enduring public value.

**KEYWORDS | SYSTEMIC DESIGN, POLICY-MAKING, CO-DESIGN, GOVERNANCE, VALUE CREATION**

## 1. Introduction

Massive transformations characterize our current era at a multidimensional level. From the environment and climate change to market instability, towards waste pollution and enormous production, these are just a few examples of the complexity and “wickedness” of nowadays. Such trivial and interconnected phenomena cannot be solved with the traditional linear and analytical method of problem-solving, but they call for a radical shift in policy regulation around the world.

Even if there is an increasing acknowledgement of the systemic nature of global challenges, however, it is still a significant challenge for the different governments worldwide to translate this complexity into a manageable common strategy to address present and future transitions (EEA, 2019). Such wicked scenarios are often promoted and reinforced by a linear model of governance, which encloses problems into “silos”, and limits the understanding of the bigger picture (Head and Alford, 2015).

The need for quick response has brought to a “reactive policy-making” that contrasts with a model based on the generation of value in the public sector, which inevitably requires a long-term perspective. Moreover, this bureaucratic model rejects external views on topics and policies which are often generated “behind closed doors”, favoring a perceived sense of opaqueness from the outside and minimizing people participation. For this reason, there is an urgent need to disrupt these silos and to shift towards a more adaptive and collaborative policy framework.

Such system transitions in governance disrupt the established investments, jobs, behaviors, knowledge and values. The aim is to constraint governments to impose policy instruments that are consistent with long-term environmental goals, as Sustainable Development Goals. On that long-term perspective, how to build value in governance? It is necessary to change the conception of “value creation”, which is used and abused in our current economy, and which is mostly absent in the public sector (Mazzucato, 2018). In that view, the first condition to reach sustainable development is to build strong synergies and cooperation between the socio-economic components of the system. By providing a common understanding of complex problems and sharing responsibilities to cope with change, participatory approaches enable adaptive governance and resilient systems.

To approach such complex relations in governance and their wickedness, we need systemic and interconnected solutions (Brown T., 2011). In the last decade, Systems Thinking has provided practical approaches for raising social awareness about interconnected societal complex systems (Jones, 2018) and Systemic Design has shown the means and knowledge to navigate these wicked scenarios aiming to maximize the value of government.

Design practices like participatory design and co-design (Bødker & Grønbeck, 1991; Manzini & Rizzo, 2011) are born from this approach, and they all share a systemic perspective (Bødker, 1987). This one has been instrumental in the definition of a new role of design

inside complex social systems and set up the bases for social innovation as a space for design thinking and research (Jones, 2014). Design for policymaking has opened the space for design practices to be involved in the construction of policies addressing designers' skills and knowledge towards higher goals like sustainable behaviors and development (Kimbell, 2015). These practices have been vital in the development of the discipline and have helped designers to move from the production sphere, leading them to become significant actors of social transformations (Buchanan, 1992).

From that view arises Systemic Design, which approaches and tackles problems on a systemic and complex level through the creation of strong and synergic linkages among all the stakeholders involved. This co-creation process favors and reinforces the socio-economic systems connected, on a long-time perspective. Nevertheless, we must acknowledge that design is not yet "completely" inside the governance culture, even if there are examples around the globe of design-gov cooperation through the so-called "innovation labs".

This paper aims to explore the Systemic Design methodology for a governance "paradigm shift" towards collaboratives approaches for value creation. Such methods in policy-design processes explore new ways and tools of an adaptive and co-creative innovation. This opens doors for everyone to access public governance, while directly and effectively responding to people's needs and governments future trajectories.

The paper is structured as follows. In the first section, the research frames the understanding of the wicked problems' nature in the public sectors. The following section introduces the main challenges that our current governments are facing when approaching today's challenges. It reflects the importance of participatory approaches, on which design leverages, to build innovation and create value for policymaking in the public sector. Finally, the discussion is narrowed, explaining how systemic design can unveil the hidden assets of a context underlining its strengths and threats in a policymaking scenario.

## 2. Wicked problems and current state of the art

The last century, our extractive society model has brought irreversible impacts on ecosystems at every scale. Such problems are associated with climate change, pollution, chronic diseases, unemployment, poverty and corruption. The interactions between them are classified as the so-called "wicked problems". These, defined by Rittle and Webber (1973), are represented by their complexity, uncertainty, interdependence, and highly interconnected social-ecological systems. Later on, Martin (2009) reframed the wicked problems identifying them in four dimensions:

First, *causal relationships are unclear and dynamic*. Suggesting that the causes and effects of wicked problems are complicated to identify as their complexity makes them ambiguous. (Roberts, 2000). This uncertainty can also be considered political in a public sector context when it is overseen in the causes and effects of such wickedness. For example, is climate

change a problem or just a manageable consequence of the quest for growth? (Bason, 2018). A current example of such a situation in 2020 where the wildfires in Australia: was the government more prepared on preventing them or into fixing the consequences?

Second, *the problem does not fit into a known category*. The wicked problems undertake interconnected and overlapping challenges, and characterized by cutting nature over several policy fields and levels of governance. This cross-cutting nature means they are embedded in other problems like economic development or environmental preservation (Weber, 2008), increasing the levels of uncertainty (Van Bueren, Klijn, and Koppenjan, 2003). This interpretation of the problem presents a significant limitation to the managing authorities as their notion of problem-solving is “evidence-based policy”, which intends that those policy decisions are based on reliable information of “what works”. (Bason, 2018)

Third, *attempts at problem-solving change the problem*. Such dimension is related to the linear approach on problem-solving and how the reactive nature of it has perpetuated the wicked problems over time. In the case of governance, this is reflected in the classic top-down dynamics where the inflexible system only allows “one-shots solutions” for potential ideas, plans, laws or initiatives. From that perspective, wicked problems require more iterative and nonlinear ways of addressing problems (Halse et al.; 2010).

Fourth, *there is no stopping rule*. As wicked problems cannot ever truly be solved, there are no criteria to know if they have ever been addressed, meaning they imply a no “stopping rule” (Rowe, 1987) (Ritchey, 2011). Such argument comes from the assumption that every solution proposed can always be upgraded and improved in an iterative process.

In that view, understanding the nature of wicked problems can allow us to comprehend the nature of the current issues on the governments which address such problems linearly.

### **3. Governance challenges and decision-making**

The current system at the moment addresses problems into “solving” and “fixing” with reactive formulas and not considering that our complex situations are not something we can rationally analyze and ‘solve’ in predictable ways. The current practice of our governments to usually enclose problems into closed-off “silos”, limits the understanding of the bigger picture (Head and Alford, 2015), by generating a clash among policy planners and policy implementers (Bason, 2014). Indeed, environmental challenges are a perfect example of wicked and complex problems: ambiguous and unstructured, overlapping in their impact on different domains, not entirely and forever solved so this requires a continuous and iterative process of trying, learning and monitoring (Bason, 2018).

Indeed, in exposing the complexity, uncertainty and no-linearity of wicked problems make it clear that transitions towards particular sustainability outcomes cannot merely be planned and implemented. That means the public sector needs to comprehend the nature of wicked

problems to be able to generate systemic solutions towards long-term environmental and socio-economic goals. Moreover, to address increasingly globalized environmental challenges, active cooperation on a quadruple helix model (governments, industries, communities and research institutions) is needed. This introduces two key concepts of this paper, closely linked one to each other: on the one hand, the shift from “government” to the broader concept of “governance” and on the second hand, the practice of co-design in policymaking.

Firstly, with the term of “governance”, is intended "the totality of interactions in which government, other public bodies, private sector and civil society participate (in one way or another), aimed at solving public challenges or creating public opportunities" (Meuleman, 2008). Consequently, this implies the shift in the role of government: from acting as a pilot with the knowledge and tools to steer society towards sustainability, to act as an enabler of society-wide transformation processes (Bason, 2018). Such argument leads to the second concept of co-design. An appropriate definition of co-design methodology in policy-making delivered by Blomkamp E. (2018) who describes it as a design-led process, in which different kinds of people and knowledge cooperate in public problem-solving, guided by creative and participatory principles and tools.

It is a matter of fact that nowadays almost every government worldwide, especially in Europe, is facing the urgency to shift towards sustainability. In fact, the newborn *European Green Deal* (which aims to make Europe the first carbon-neutral continent by 2050), as well as the *New Circular Economy Action Plans* (which focuses on the use of sustainable resources, especially for high-impact sectors) and the broader and global SDGs, they all witness the willing to cooperate for a more sustainable future.

Nevertheless, the clash between wicked problems and traditional problem solving, together with the shift from government to governance represents a significant reframing of Europe's sustainability challenges and response options. Even if it is acknowledged an urgency shift towards sustainability, however, implications for public policy and institutions are mostly unexplored.

As pointed out by the European Environmental Agency (EEA) the complexity of sustainability transitions opens the way to additional governance challenges, especially in terms of directionality, coordination and the management of unexpected consequences.

Governments deliver the “Directionality” by defining visions, pathways and targets. Such action implies inevitably for an articulation of alternative futures and how to get there. Fundamental on that sense is specific normative choices, underlining the importance of public engagement and deliberation.

The different activities and the diversity of actors across sectors and scales of governance creates the need for coordination. Public institutions have a crucial role to play in ensuring horizontal coherence across policy areas, as well as vertical coherence between local, national and international levels.

Finally, new emerging issues implies a need for both analytical approaches (e.g. horizon scanning) and adaptive governance approaches, grounded in monitoring and learning, that enable the timely reorientation of transition processes. The table below presents the main governance challenges and how they relate to the characteristics of sustainability transitions.

*Table 1. Characteristics of sustainability transitions and their governance implications. Retrieved at European Environmental Agency report 2019.*

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUSTAINABILITY	GOVERNANCE IMPLICATIONS
Multidimensional Changes in Socio-technical Systems	Policy mix approach that goes across environmental, industrial, sectoral (mobility, energy, food, housing), tax and educational policies. This is important to achieve horizontal policy coordination.
Multi-actor Multi-scalar Process	Multilevel governance allows top-down guidance and funding as well as local policy experimentation. Such polycentric governance involves flexible and self-organising activities by non-state actors.
Mission Orientated Targets	Indicators about the governance direction (e.g. through financial incentives, regulation, targets) and more specific indications about innovation pathways (through roadmaps and foresight exercises).
Disruption and System Reconfiguration	Stimulate sustainable innovations but also engage incumbents and potential losers (via compensation or reorientation policies).
Promoting Transformative Innovation and Experimentation	Portfolio approaches, project-based learning and experimentation, especially with radical innovations (social, technical, business models)
Risks, Unintended Consequences and Adaptive Governance	Monitoring and adaptive governance, to ensure directional flexibility and address side-effects.
Urgency and Acceleration	More robust innovation and diffusion policies. Phase-out and innovation policies (through bans or stronger environmental regulations).

Nowadays, despite the significant investments of money and resources in tackling our current major challenges, it seems that most of them are just superficially solved (e.g. plastic pollution). While these problems continue to be a source of expenditure in the public policies agendas, new ones seem to emerge, increasing the pressure.

The aforementioned demonstrates again that wicked problems cannot be addressed as our institutions are used to - with a linear approach -, but it calls for a change in directionality - in a more systemic way -.

## 4. Co-creation for value creation

So how to address the wickedness in the current governance challenges?

Mostly the wickedness of our current scenario comes from the lack of value creation. On that view, value intends the wealth creation or the benefits that society obtains from the system - and vice versa -: provisioning services (e.g., food), education institutions, health and social care services, housing, social security, infrastructures, energy, water and waste system, regulating services (e.g., flood control,) and cultural services (e.g., recreation) (Cole and Parston, 2006). These categories of the public value are a way of measuring countries' progress towards the achievement of societal goals - such as the Sustainable Development Goals -.

Through this paper, we aim to expose furthermore an idea of innovation in which public policy actively shapes and co-creates services that drive more sustainable and inclusive forms of welfare and growth in our current system (Jacobs et al; 2016). From that perspective, we intend co-creation as a collaborative design process among public sectors, private sectors, research institutions and civil society. In this scenario of collective policy design, all the actors involved, including citizens, are all intended as equal partners in design and delivery, and people are assets and not just subjects of policies (Sanders and Stappers, 2008; Gillinson et al., 2010).

Certainly, this type of model faces several barriers:

- **the current reactive policy-making** which is more focused on fixing the market failures and re-distributing wealth among other value-extraction activities (Mazzucato, 2016);
- **a siloed-shaped public bureaucracy** which rejects external views on topics and policies, minimizing people participation;
- **lacking consciousness**, public servants are not even aware that there is a different way to develop new approaches (Bason, 2014);
- **lack of tools and platform** to conduct co-creation in practice (workshop, toolboxes, innovation labs).

Nevertheless, it is crucial to underline that input from a diverse group of stakeholders is needed to effectively incorporate both social and ecological dynamics in environmental decision-making processes (Irvin and Stansbury, 2004; Reed, 2008). Indeed, by confronting their different sets of values and world-views, a much broader scenario is analysed from the beginning. More specifically, including different stakeholders can contribute to:

- **a deeper knowledge on different scales**, which has a central role in order to support adaptive governance and ecosystem-based management programs (Gadgil et al., 2003);
- assure higher quality and an **endurable decision making** towards environmental challenges (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005);
- **make the implementation processes smoother**, saving time and money on political wrangling (Pahl-Wostl and Hare, 2004).

Besides the benefits brought from a diverse stakeholder engagement, participatory and co-creative approaches reinforce other social aspects necessary to address wicked problems:

- the enhancement of social learning and capacity building;
- the increase of transparency by building trust;
- the mediation of power through cross-sector collaboration.

By providing a common understanding of complex problems and sharing responsibilities to cope with change, participatory approaches enable the first conditions to build adaptive governance and resilient systems.

## 5. Systemic Design as leverage for policy-making and value creation

As our system challenges have turned into more wicked, the design discipline on its problem-solving nature has broadened its approach to services and systems (Ceschin & Gaziulusoy, 2016), by extending to a wider network of actors and co-design practices. That evolution of the discipline has brought to a considerable growth of the policy design field.

On that view, there is an increasing amount of literature on design in policymaking, which examines the use of design approaches in policy making teams or “policy labs” (Kimbell, 2017). Nevertheless, to clearly understand the relevance of the design discipline in the policy field, Bason (2014) explains that design provides a diverse way of understanding policy problems. In his view, design is intended as a hybrid blend of research methods from different disciplines like anthropology, systems thinking, and data science, through cooperation among different stakeholders. Other authors like Christiansen and Bunt (2014) make a similar affirmation defining the usefulness of design to cut the distance between policy and implementation (Mintrom and Luetjens, 2016) (Hobday, Boddington, and Grantham, 2012).

For a Policy Design practice, it is imperative to address the before mentioned pressing issues on value creation in our system. Moreover, it requires to implement a method that allows the combination of technology, design, business and social organization. On that view, systemic perspectives and participatory methodologies can trigger an innovative process of sharing knowledge and experiences among the actors mentioned above. To tackle such wickedness globally means that “Systemic and interconnected problems need systemic and inter-connected solutions” (Brown and Wyatt, 2015). To address that among the design methodologies is the Systemic Design (SD) which approaches the complex phenomena on a systemic level through design tools. This expertise provides a method that is focused on the holistic analysis of territory, allowing the design discipline to serve as a mediator among technicians, economists, humanists, and others (Celaschi, et al; 2013), generating autopoietic open systems based on contextual values. Furthermore, this method merges human-centred design inside complex, multi-stakeholder systems (Jones, et al; 2018) which can highlight the potential opportunities for value creation, delivering new collaborative relations among the local actors and entities (Barbero & Fassio, 2011). Jones (2014) also underlined that SD combines designer skills such as research, reasoning methods and visualization practices, creating innovative reconfigurations for complex services and systems.

The capabilities of SD can serve effectively to the components of participatory co-design that Policy Design processes require. On that view, SD favours the visualization of opportunities for value creation, enhancing the active collaboration between stakeholders, and boosting locally-based value chains (Barbero, 2012). To understand its implementation in a policymaking scenario, it is furthered explained its 6 main steps (Battistoni et al., 2019):

- **Holistic Diagnosis (HD):** Composed by a desk and field research, which scopes out the system context on the economic, social and environmental perspectives, taking into account the flows of energy and matter;
- **Definition of problems and leverages for change:** taking the framework established by the HD, the system connections and patterns are examined to highlight the possibilities for value creation and threats that inhibit it in future scenarios. The challenges and opportunities are regarded as leverages for change from which the new system strategies can be defined and initiated;
- **Design the system:** A new system model is designed whose aim is to create value in an autopoietic way and tend to zero emissions by optimizing energy and material flows and by valorizing resources;
- **Outcomes Evaluation:** assessment of the environmental, economic and social advantages that comes from the new model of value creation (production);
- **Implementation:** the execution of the new designed system for the specific scenario, considering an estimation of the new business plan feasibility;

- **Results analysis and feedback:** assessing the executed system and unlocking more opportunities, to make the system autopoietic.

Through these steps, SD unveils the hidden value of the socio-economic assets of a territory, creating new valuable relations and synergic linkages, in a long time perspective. Indeed, design capabilities reveal more about the individual and their context and can encourage civil servants to unlock opportunities for an iterative creation of value on a contextual level.

Based on the previous, we suggest SD as a useful method to translate the political vision into executive actions (policies) through the integration of SD steps into the so called policy cycle (Birkland 2001; Raulik-Murphy & Cawood 2009; Hobday et al., 2012). In both the processes, stakeholders and their relationships cover a central role in the socio-technical system targeted for the policies implementation, and they both acknowledge the iterative nature of the process itself. In 2008, Knill & Tosun elucidated the five main steps that constitute a policy cycle, namely: 1. agenda setting, 2. policy formulation, 3. policy adoption, 4. implementation, and 5. evaluation. A policy cycle starts with the problems classification and the priority setting in the policy agenda. It follows a draft of the policy proposals which will be later assessed and implemented. Ultimately, policy impacts are measured, evaluated and reformulated iteratively. This means that the policy cycle is constant and infinite (Maffei et al., 2013), and subject to continuous improvements.

The table below shows which SD's step can be integrated into each policy cycle step and its potential impact per phase.

*Table 2. Integration of the systemic design steps into the policy cycle.*

POLICY CYCLE STEPS	SYSTEMIC DESIGN STEPS	POTENTIAL IMPACT
1. Agenda setting	1. Holistic diagnosis 2. Definition of problems as leverage for change	HD highlights the hidden resources of a territory and helps police-officers in identifying more effective targets to address their policies, also leveraging on the criticalities and opportunities raised through the HD
2. Policy formulation	3. Design the system	Based on the holistic review of policy strategies, SD supports the policy formulation by designing a new and more resilient system based on the local assets
3. Policy adoption	4. Outcomes evaluation	A jointly and broader feasibility evaluation is given taking into consideration the environmental, economic and social benefits, implying a governance foresight vision

4. Implementation	5. Implementation	SD supports the policy cycle in developing programs to execute short and long term policy plans for a local value creation
5. Evaluation	6. Results analysis and feedbacks	SD supports the assessment of the implemented system, by measuring its resilience under the economic, environmental and socio-technical lens

SD methodology has already some implementation cases, on a policy design level, in projects or regional initiatives. For example, the Design School of the Politecnico di Torino has experimented the methodology both in European projects (e.g., RETRACE Interreg Europe project and ProGReg H2020 project) and collaborative studies with industries (e.g., Agrindustria Tecco s.r.l., Luigi Lavazza S.p.A., and Groupe Poult).

Even though design has still a long way to be recognised as a powerful means in a governmental environment, there are examples of innovation agencies worldwide that have similarities with the design approaches, at different governance levels. Among these:

- **MArs solution lab (social innovation lab):** Based in Canada, brings together governments, industry, non-governmental organizations, academia, and community to assess complex problems from the citizens' view. They collaborate with multiple stakeholders to develop, prototype, and scale new solutions, and create opportunities to learn how to shift the system and local policies.
- **The Finnish Innovation Fund - Sitra (National Agency):** is a future-oriented organisation that promotes Finland's competitiveness and the well-being of the Finnish people. It's aimed at anticipating societal change, fostering innovative models and boosting business that aim at sustainable development. Sitra focuses and assesses the social change and their impacts on Finland's policies.
- **OECD- Observatory of Public Sector Innovation (Intergovernmental Agency):** It is focused on assessing and reviewing examples and shared good practices of public sector innovation to deliver practical advice to governments on how to make innovations work.

These examples illustrate how the systemic approach is delivered in similar ways at different scales. Also, they prove there is ample room for SD to grow in the policy design field: by integrating it into governmental agencies, SD can have an impact on the policy at a micro and macro scale. These increasing practices aim to shift the role of public investment generating policy imperatives for governments seeking smart growth and wealth creation.

## **6. Limitations of the approach: challenges to establish a value creation model**

Such approaches, as SD for the generation of policies towards value creation, deliver an extensive and holistic research background. Nevertheless, it is likely to point out some constraints related to the SD methodology which have been introduced at the research phase.

One of the main challenges on tailoring SD for different scenarios is the accessibility to database consultation. In the early research phase, this challenge is widespread as database platforms in each country have different units, language, and update status. In most cases, the critical point is to find an average amount of available data, to make a holistic diagnosis properly. Moreover, this process of quantitative and qualitative data collection, requires a robust cooperation between stakeholders and managing authorities, which is limited by the siloed-shaped bureaucracy, as previously explained.

Secondly, to approach policy design processes with SD, it is required a direct engagement with civil servants, industry, and community representatives which allows increasing awareness on local resources, opportunities, and challenges. Unfortunately, the bureaucratic cultural paradigm, strongly fixed into a top-down approach, limits cooperation among all the actors. That is why this is recognised as a critical point for SD to enable a quadruple helix approach, which is needed for adaptive governance.

To overcome such barriers, SD has a system visualization component that eases the decision-making process. This one delivers a broader perspective for all actors and allows more enriching feedback from all the participants. The idea is to stimulate participants in the policy design process to think holistically.

Lastly, another crucial factor is the time frame that managing authorities need to establish in a Policy Design process: in many cases there is a fixed period to execute specific actions for which a specific budget has been already defined. In that frame, SD has to come with actions that only serve on a current scenario and for an immediate change, which is not possible because policies have effects after several years the policies are released. For the same reason, SD effects are complicated to measure because they are designed on a long time perspective. This means that the impacts must be planned with a foresight vision on short, medium and long term views, in order to address the change and a broader value creation.

## **7. Conclusions**

Today, to address the wickedness and the creation of public value, governments are focused on reaching targets such as the SDG by 2030. Even if those targets seem broad, governments' efforts must address them with a sufficient directionality. Nevertheless, in the

majority of the cases, policy servants can feel lost from the broadness of these concepts. Even if there is an increasing acknowledgement of the systemic nature of global challenges, however, our governments persist in using a linear approach to tackle those problems. It is still a significant challenge for the different governments worldwide to translate this complexity into a manageable common strategy to address present and future transitions (EEA, 2019).

As widely discussed in this paper, the first condition to reach sustainable development is to build strong synergies and cooperation between governments, institutions, businesses and citizens. In that view, this paper has discussed how collaborative policy design processes, developed among different stakeholders, are essential to move towards value creation in a long-term horizon: they enhance social learning and capacity building, they build trust, and mediate the power through cross-sector collaboration.

Systemic perspectives and participatory methodologies - which SD combines - can trigger innovative processes of sharing knowledge and experiences among different stakeholders and can build innovation in the public sector. Applying a systemic perspective into those strategies means to favour adaptive governance, whose outcomes are iterative and autopoietic, creating enduring public value.

Following this, SD can act as a mediator in those policy-design processes that address complex problems and deliver new solutions. Indeed, SD favours the visualization of opportunities for value creation, enhancing the active collaboration between stakeholders, and boosting locally-based value chains (Barbero, 2012). On that purpose, systemic design can unveil the hidden assets of a context as shown in projects and regional initiatives such as RETRACE Interreg Europe project, ProGireg H2020 project and many collaborative studies with industries.

Nevertheless, we must recognize that systemic design is not yet “completely” inside the governance culture, even if there are examples around the globe of design-gov cooperation through the so-called “innovation labs”. These agencies are approaching the public value at different levels and, even if the number is gradually increasing, it currently amounts to 162 spread around the world (<http://publicsector-map.designforeurope.eu/en/>). However, these innovative experiments certainly require fundamental changes in our current governance and economic system works.

This momentum must not be missed, expertises such as SD need to be at the forefront of a governance culture to unlock the generation of new public value and public policies that create and shape a different economic future.

## References

- Bason, C. (ed). (2014). *Design for Policy*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Bason, C. (2018). *Leading public sector innovation: Co-creating for a better society*. Policy press.
- Barbero, S. (2012). *Systemic Energy Networks Vol. 1. The Theory of Systemic Design Applied to the Energy Sector*. Morrisville, North Carolina, USA: Lulu Enterprises, Inc, Raleigh.
- Barbero, S., & Fassio, F. (2011). *Energy and food production with a systemic approach*. *Environmental Quality Management*, 21(2), 57-74.
- Battistoni, C., Giraldo Nohra C. (2017). *The RETRACE Holistic Diagnosis*. In Barbero, S. (Ed.). *Systemic Design Method Guide for Policymaking: A Circular Europe on the Way*. (pp. 112-120) Turin, Italy: Allemandi.
- Battistoni, C., Giraldo Nohra, C., Barbero, S. (2019). *A Systemic Design Method to Approach Future Complex Scenarios and Research Towards Sustainability: A Holistic Diagnosis Tool*. *Sustainability*, 11(16), 4458.
- Bistagnino, L. (2011). *Systemic Design: Designing the Productive and Environmental Sustainability*. Bra (CN), Italy: Slow Food.
- Blair, T., Cunningham, J. (1999). *Modernising Government*, Presented to Parliament by the Prime Minister and the Minister for the Cabinet Office by Command of Her Majesty.
- Blomkamp, E. (2018). The promise of co-design for public policy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77(4), 729-743.
- Bødker, S. (1990). *Activity theory as a challenge to systems design*. DAIMI Report Series, (334).
- Bødker, S., & Grønbaek, K. (1991). *Cooperative prototyping: users and designers in mutual activity*. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 34(3), 453-478.
- Brown, T., & Wyatt, J. (2015). *Design thinking for social innovation*. *Annual Review of Policy Design*, 3(1), 1-10
- Ceschin, F., & Gaziulusoy, I. (2016). *Evolution of design for sustainability: From product design to design for system innovations and transitions*. *Design Studies*, 47, 118-163.
- Celaschi, F., Formia, E., & Lupo, E. (2013). *From trans-disciplinary to undisciplined design learning: educating through/to disruption*. *Strategic Design Research Journal*, 6(1), 1-10.
- Chen, D.S., Cheng, L.L., Hummels, C., and Koskinen, I. (2015). *Social Design: An introduction*. *International Journal of Design*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1-5.
- Christiansen, J., & Bunt, L. (2014). *Innovating Public Policy: Allowing for social complexity and uncertainty in the design of public outcomes*. *Design for policy*, 41-56
- Considine, M. (2012). *Thinking outside the box? Applying design theory to public policy*. *Politics & Policy*, 40(4), 704-724.
- Cole, M., & Parston, G. (2006). *Unlocking public value: A new model for achieving high performance in public service organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.

- European Commission (2019) *Reflection Paper Towards A Sustainable Europe By 2030*. Available at: [https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/rp\\_sustainable\\_europe\\_30-01\\_en\\_web.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/rp_sustainable_europe_30-01_en_web.pdf)
- European Environment Agency (2019). *Sustainability Transitions: Policy and Practice*, EEA Report No 09/2019 . Available at: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/sustainability-transitions-policy-and-practice>
- Gadgil, M., Olsson, P., Berkes, F., & Folke, C. (2003). *Exploring the role of local ecological knowledge in ecosystem management: three case studies*. *Navigating social-ecological systems: building resilience for complexity and change*, 189, 209.
- Gillinson, S., Horne, M., & Baeck, P. (2010). *Radical Efficiency. Different, better, lower cost public services*. research paper. nef, the lab & nesta.
- Halse, J., Brandt, E., Clark, B., & Binder, T. (2010). *Rehearsing the future*.
- Head, B. W., & Alford, J. (2015). *Wicked problems: Implications for public policy and management*. *Administration & society*, 47(6), 711-739.
- Hobday, M., Boddington, A., & Grantham, A. (2012). *Policies for design and policies for innovation: Contrasting perspectives and remaining challenges*. *Technovation*, 32(5), 272-281.
- Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). *Citizen participation in decision making: is it worth the effort?*. *Public administration review*, 64(1), 55-65.
- Jacobs, M., & Mazzucato, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Rethinking capitalism: economics and policy for sustainable and inclusive growth*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Jones, P. H. (2014). *Systemic design principles for complex social systems*. In G. Metcalf (Ed.), *Social systems and design* (pp. 91–128). Tokyo: Springer.
- Jones, P., & Kijima, K. (2018). *Systemic Design* (Vol. 8). Translational Systems Sciences.
- Kimbell, L. (2015). *Applying design approaches to policy making: discovering policy lab*.
- Manzini, E., & Rizzo, F. (2011). *Small projects/large changes: Participatory design as an open participated process*. *CoDesign*, 7(3-4), 199-215.
- Martin, R., & Martin, R. L. (2009). *The design of business: Why design thinking is the next competitive advantage*. Harvard Business Press.
- Mazzucato, M., & Ryan-Collins, J. (2019). *Putting value creation back into 'public value': from market-fixing to market-shaping*.
- Mazzucato, M. (2018). *The value of everything: Making and taking in the global economy*. Hachette UK
- Meuleman, L. (2008). *Public management and the metagovernance of hierarchies, networks and markets: The feasibility of designing and managing governance style combinations*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Mintrom, M., & Luetjens, J. (2016). *Design thinking in policymaking processes: Opportunities and challenges*. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 75(3), 391-402.
- Pahl-Wostl, C., & Hare, M. (2004). *Processes of social learning in integrated resources management*. *Journal of community & applied social psychology*, 14(3), 193-206.

- Reed, M. S. (2008). *Stakeholder participation for environmental management: a literature review*. *Biological conservation*, 141(10), 2417-2431
- Ritchey, T. (2011). *Wicked problems—social messes: Decision support modelling with morphological analysis (Vol. 17)*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Rittel and Webber. (1973). *Dilemmas in a general theory of planning*. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155-169.
- Roberts, N. (2000). *Wicked problems and network approaches to resolution*. *International public management review*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Rowe, P. G. (1987). *Design thinking*. MIT press.
- Van Bueren, E. M., Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. F. (2003). *Dealing with wicked problems in networks: Analyzing an environmental debate from a network perspective*. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 13(2), 193-212.
- Weber, E. P., & Khademian, A. M. (2008). *Wicked problems, knowledge challenges, and collaborative capacity builders in network settings*. *Public administration review*, 68(2), 334-349
- Wilkinson, A., Mayer, M., & Ringler, V. (2014). *Collaborative futures: Integrating foresight with design in large scale innovation processes-seeing and seeding the futures of Europe*. *Journal of Futures Studies*, 18(4), 1-26.

#### About the Authors:

**Carolina Giraldo Nohra PhD** is a Research fellow at the Politecnico di Torino - Department of Architecture and Design. Her research is focused on the convergence between Systemic Design and Circular Economy approach with particular attention in policies and strategies that foster circular city models in post-industrial precincts (Italy & South Africa).

**Elia Ferrulli** is a PhD student in Management Production and Design at the Politecnico di Torino (Department of Architecture and Design, 2020-2023). Her doctoral research focuses on fostering industrial innovation towards a Circular Economy framework, with particular attention to reinforce the connection between consumers and companies in building more resilient socio-technical systems, through Systemic Design.

**Silvia Barbero PhD** is an Associate Professor at Politecnico di Torino (Department of Architecture and Design). She is a lecturer of Product Environmental Requirements at the Design and Visual Communication degree and of Open Systems at the Systemic Design Master degree at Politecnico di Torino. She is also responsible for the stage & job design curriculum. Her research mainly focuses on Systemic Design applied to territorial sustainable development.