WP 5:

The Governance of Social Cohesion: Innovative Coordination Practices in Public Management

Annex I. Coordination practice and in-depth case study protocol

Version 18 January 2012

Contents

Introduction

The purpose of WP5 deliverable D.5.2 is to provide accessible fact sheets on innovative coordination practices and related steering instruments in the public sector. A central objective is 'to compile a good practice database and a case study catalogue of such coordination practices with direct utility to public managers and the research community'. The catalogue of coordination practices will feed into the online community of practice (D5.1) for the practitioners as well as to the WP5 final report and the policy brief (D5.3).

WP 5 will cover three areas:

> I. Coordination within central government (horizontal coordination)
>
> II. Health (horizontal and vertical coordination)
>
> III. Employment services (horizontal and vertical coordination)

Based on the template provided below, we ask each partner to deliver:

1. Country relevant background information:

   Sketch the main characteristics of the general politico-administrative structure of your country and the relevant policy area(s) your chosen coordination practice(s) fall(s) within, by filling out the form below. This part should be approximately 2-3 pages long.[1]

2. Coordination practice:

   Identify and describe at least one (but preferably two) innovative coordination practices in your country by filling out the form below. The coordination practice(s) should be within central government, health and/or employment services. This part should be approximately 8-10 pages long, or 2500-3500 words.

   This exercise should result in accessible factsheets to practitioners. See also example (Annex III).

3. List of practitioners:

   Provide a list of practitioners from your country in order to carry out dissemination activities.

UiB and TAL will provide a description of one coordination practice within each of the three fields. Other partners are asked to provide at least one example each. This will result in a data base consisting of at least 16 entries to the case study catalogue, i.e. 16 examples of innovative coordination practices.

For a further academic collaboration and publication in the form of a special journal issue or an edited book, we ask for:

4. One or more in-depth case study (/ies) based on the example(s) provided above in the format of an academic article/book chapter (max 15-20 pages/8000 words).

---

[1] If you choose to provide more than one coordination practice, and they are within different policy areas, please provide general information on each of the relevant areas.

1. Template for coordination practice(s)

Please consider the following guiding questions carefully and fill out the form as thoroughly as you can and in a coherent text. Consider the listed questions as a guide. Not all questions may be relevant in each case. Bear in mind that the main target group for the case study catalogue are the practitioners.

Deadline: June 15th 2012

1. THE COORDINATION LANDSCAPE	
Main country characteristics	
Provide background information on the general features of your country, and central characteristics of the relevant policy area(s); central government, employment services and/or health. Max 2-3 pages.	
General political-administrative structure	Provide general background information on the general political-administrative system of your country that is relevant to readers not so familiar with your country - General state structure (e.g. unitary state, federal state, parliamentary system, centralized or decentralized, etc.) - General administrative structure (e.g. administrative levels and competencies, agency structure) - Typical coordination practices (e.g. vertical arrangements, horizontal arrangements, relations between them) - Major and relevant public sector reforms over the last 20-30 years - Other important political-administrative features you think might be relevant, , in particular features that distinguishes your country from other European or Western models
Coordination discourse	What characterizes the recent debates and developments on themes like joined-up government, whole-of-government, post-NPM developments and coordination in your country? To what extent is there a debate on such issues? What are the main positions in the debate? What policy areas and/or institutional arrangements are discussed?
Context: policy area	Provide general background information on the policy area that your chosen coordination practice falls within, either central government/ health/employment sector. (If you provide more than one example and they fall within different areas, please give background information on all relevant policy areas by inserting new cells below this one). - Main political-administrative structure within the policy area in question (responsible ministries, agencies, local authorities - Private sector responsibilities within the policy area (if relevant) - Legal framework - Main types of coordination practices

| | - Major structural or policy reforms over the last 10 years relevant to the policy area in question |
| | - Other features of the policy area that you think might be relevant to the readers not so familiar with your country |

2. COORDINATION PRACTICE: NAME

2.1. Substance (what)

Country	
Area	Does the practice concern central government, health or employment?
Main characteristics of the practice	State the main characteristics of the coordination practice - What does it concern, what problem does it seek to solve? - Which organisation or part of an organization does the coordination practice concern? - What are the main stated goals and/or targets of the coordination practice?
Background and initiation of the practice	Provide relevant information concerning the background of the coordination practice, especially concerning its initiation - Why was the coordination practice initiated? - What characterized the initiation process (salience, conflict, and consensus)? - Was the coordination practice part of a larger reform? If so, please state the main features of this reform and how it influenced the coordination practice in question - Indicate the main legal instruments (if any) the coordination practice builds on
Time frame	When was the coordination practice initiated? When was it implemented? Is it a permanent or a temporary arrangement? If it is temporary, what is/was the time frame for the arrangement? To what degree is the practice implemented (partly/whole)? Describe.

2.2. Structure and actors (how/who)

Basic features	Describe the main features and characteristics of the coordination practice in terms of organizational structure and main actors involved - Have new organizations and structures been established? If so, provide short description.

	- Does it concern a special group of users or clients?
	- Does it concern a special geographical area or locality?
	- Does it imply policy design from the top or coordination at the bottom (through administrative process)?
	- What kind of legal instruments are involved, are they mandatory or voluntary? Is there any degree of discretion?)
Main tools/instruments	What are the main tools for implementing the practice?
	Is it mainly formal or informal?
	Is participant autonomy low (compulsory participation, little discretion) or high (voluntary, high discretion)?
	If the practice concerns a public service, is proximity to citizens distant (regionally/centrally based) or close (locally based, virtual accessible)
	Are technological solutions central to the implementation/operation of the practice?
	What kind of resources accompanies the practice (Budgets, personnel etc.?)
Main actors	Who initiated/designed and planned the practice?
	Who does the practice concern, and what are the roles/functions of those involved?
	- Does it involve politicians or is it an administrative issue only?
	- Does it involve the private sector or imply collaboration between the private and the public sector?
	Describe the type of relationship between the involved actors
	- Hierarchical, market-like or network structure?
	- Formal or informal structure?
	- Describe degree of conflicts, negotiations, bargaining, political salience

2.3. Impacts/effects

	Describe main results, impacts and effects of the practice.
	Are the results positive, negative, uncertain, as intended?
	Have unintended impacts/consequences appeared?
	How has the practice affected, for instance:
	- Service quality/output quality?
	- Quantity of output?
	- Performance/effectiveness/outcome?
	- Process or activity?
	- Efficiency or productivity?
	- Equity, fairness or impartiality?
	- Transparency?
	- Steering, control or accountability?

	- Public opinion, user satisfaction or trust in government? Has the practice resulted in more capacity to act for political and/or administrative leaders? How? Has the practice resulted in more coordination, collaboration and integration among public (and, if relevant private) actors and/or organizations? How? Has the practice affected social cohesion within your country? How? Are these effects measured or documented in some way (evaluations, research)?

2.4. Lessons learned and policy recommendations

	What have been the lessons learned concerning this practice in your country? The lessons may be based on policy discussions, documents or your expert opinion. What are the lessons with regard to: - Intended and unintended consequences of the reform? - Importance and influence of the organizational environment? - Constraining and enabling factors that influence how the practice has worked? What policy recommendations are, in your expert opinion important? - Are the lessons learned useful for other policy areas? If so, how? - Are the lessons learned useful for other countries? If so, how?

2.5. Further information

Data/references	Provide information on the data your information is based on. Mainly documents or interviews? What kind of documents, what kind and how many interviews, with whom? Please list any relevant key documents, preferably available in English or German. Insert the hyperlink to the website, if available (with a date when it was last accessible).
Contact	Please provide your contact details for possible further questions from the practitioners regarding this coordination practice

2. List of practitioners

Please provide at least 5 practitioner contacts from each of the three policy areas (central government, health, employment services) in your country in order to carry out dissemination activities.

Please state name, institution, and contact details (address, e-mail, telephone, and/or website).

Deadline: 1st December 2012

List of practitioners		
Central government		
Name	Institution	Contact details (address, e-mail, telephone, website)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
Health		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
Employment services		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

3. Academic publication

Based on the coordination practice(s) you have provided to the case study catalogue above, we invite you to provide one or more in-depth case study (/ies) in the format of an academic journal article to be published in a special issue or an edited book.

The special issue/edited book will explicitly address the solution of 'wicked', cross-cutting policy problems and portray experiences with different coordination practices in the public sector of a number of European countries. Our aim is to give attention to coordination practices within central government, health and employment.

The in-depth studies should be empirically focused, but also include theoretical and methodological considerations. They should address the main questions listed in the case study protocol. The in-depth quality should give room to elaborate more in detail on processes, mechanisms, driving forces,

explanations, comparisons, effects and impacts, etc. Here, you might consider co-authoring with partners within the COCOPS-project, or other colleagues who might be interested in contributing to a special issue.

Format: max 8000 words

If you are committed to contribute, please let us know as soon as you have decided, or by June 15th at the latest.

Deadline: December 1st 2012