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Introduction


Research gap: Implementation and governance (Borrás & Edler, 2020).
→ What is needed on part of policy entities to become more ‘transformational’?

Focus (Theoretical approach):
- Investigation of specific governance arrangements and organizational changes for organizing a government’s interactions with other elements of the system.
- Governance modes define in what ways and on what legitimacy basis governments can act (Bourgon, 2011). Thereby, they shape policy options.
  - E.g.: Public admin. might not be ready for transition tasks (Braams et al., 2021).
**Research structure**

**RQ:** How do characteristics of transformative innovation policies unfold in different governance modes? What are the challenges associated with each governance mode?

**Theory:** Transformative policy characteristics & Governance modes

**Empirics:** Through which specific governance arrangements are transformative features being implemented, and what hurdles are being encountered, in 7 European transformative policy initiatives (TPI)?

**Objective:** Informing and inspiring the shift to transformative governance.
Theoretical framework - 1

Key characteristics of transformative innovation policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creating legitimacy and leadership</th>
<th>Multi-level, multi-actor and multi-instrumental coordination and alignment</th>
<th>Reflexivity, learning and experimenting</th>
<th>Resolving conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledging and managing the normativity of innovation policies for societal challenges (Uyarra et al., 2019; Schlaile et al., 2017)</td>
<td>Multi-instrumental policy approaches / Policy mix (Rogge &amp; Reichardt, 2016)</td>
<td>Adaptability (Janssen, 2019)</td>
<td>Embracing contestation (Wanzenböck et al., 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formative evaluation (Molas-Gallart et al., 2020)</td>
<td>Establish corridors of acceptable development pathways (Schot &amp; Steinmueller, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second-order learning (TIPc, 2017)</td>
<td>Tilting the playing field (Kattel &amp; Mazzucato, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of system-level impact (TIPc, 2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theoretical framework - 1

Key characteristics of transformative innovation policy:

• Multi-level, multi-actor and multi-instrumental Coordination and alignment (vertical/horizontal coordination; policy mixes; multi-disciplinarity)

• Creating legitimacy and leadership (demonstrating transformative failures; managing normativity; developing accountability mechanisms)

• Reflexivity in policy design and process: Learning and experimenting (reflexive / experimental governance; adaptability; second-order learning; formative evaluation)

• Managing conflicts (embracing contestation; anticipatory deliberation, ...)
### Theoretical framework - 2

**Governance modes**, based on distinct governance perspectives (Tenbensel, 2007; Treib et al., 2007; Van der Steen et al., 2015; 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance modes</th>
<th>Formality of institutions</th>
<th>Membership flexibility &amp; diversity</th>
<th>Governance of change processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration-oriented governance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low, public actors leading</td>
<td>Inside-out, hierarchical organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network-based governance</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium, public and non-public actors</td>
<td>Co-governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-oriented governance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High, societal actors leading</td>
<td>Outside-in, self-regulated, community building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administration-oriented TPI governance
Implementing strategies by maneuvering within bureaucratic procedures (e.g. for allocating resources), while respecting legality, responsibilities and rights.

Network-based TPI governance
Making agreements and covenants with representatives of different stakeholder groups; forming alliances by managing the quality of the process (e.g. openness).

System-oriented TPI governance
Facilitation of self-organization: enabling and interconnecting bottom-up societal initiatives to build momentum.

Governance modes (visual):

Theoretical framework - 2
Data and methods

- Desk research: policy documents, strategic agendas, monitoring reports, ...
- Interviews based on protocol: +- 17 interviews
- Validation by main policy officer
## Cases (TPI strategies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gov. Mode</th>
<th>Mission-orientation</th>
<th>Geogr. scope</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Year est.</th>
<th>Strategy type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green solutions for the future</td>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Extended R&amp;D programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German HighTech Strategy 2025</td>
<td>Adm.</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Broad</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Umbrella framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tomorrow / Building of Tomorrow</td>
<td>Netw.</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Extended R&amp;D programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalunya 2020 / RIS3CAT</td>
<td>Netw.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Umbrella framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam Circular Economy</td>
<td>Syst.</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Circular Ec.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Domain programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular Flanders (part of Vision 2050)</td>
<td>Syst.</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Circular Ec.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Domain programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Cases (TPI strategies)

## Link between cases and governance modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gov. mode</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Main characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Admin. TPI | • DK Grand Solutions  
• German HTS2025  
• Dutch MTIP | One ministry in the lead and responsible, while engaging other ministries. Transformation focused on coordination: redesigning policies and horizontal/vertical collaboration structures. |
| Network TPI | • Austrian City of Tomorrow  
• Catalonian RIS3CAT  
• (German HTS2025; Dutch MTIP) | Mobilizing capabilities and resources of societal stakeholders, via public-private partnerships, triple-/quadruple-helix teams (institutionalized representatives) and writing collective agendas. |
| System TPI | • Amsterdam Circular Economy  
• Circular Flanders | Identifying and accelerating bottom-up initiatives from societal stakeholders, by creating visibility and making ad-hoc connections with (policy) partners able to overcome bottlenecks. |
# Results

## Governance capacities, per principle & mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance modes:</th>
<th>Transformative principle:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimacy &amp; Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin. TPI</strong></td>
<td>- Legitimacy at high political level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network TPI</strong></td>
<td>- Engage in partnerships based on shared agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System TPI</strong></td>
<td>- Create a vision around perceived problem urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emphasize community-based problem-solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

### Challenges, per governance mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gov. mode</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Admin. TPI** | ▶ Departmental thinking  
▶ Rivalry for recognition and resources  
▶ Reliance on strict administrative and budgetary cycles  
▶ Sensitive to periodic changes in leadership |
| **Network TPI** | ▶ Sensitive to capture  
▶ Lacking ability to respond to signals  
▶ Uncertainty about commitment levels  
▶ Resistance against increased guidance |
| **System TPI** | ▶ Building momentum in a responsive way (without clear action lines)  
▶ No catalysing possibilities without sufficient bottom-up initiatives  
▶ Less options for ‘bold moves’ |
Discussion

• The mission-TPIs mostly fit the top-down admin.-oriented governance mode, which is more about adjusting policies and less about bottom-up initiatives. → Perhaps the mission-TPI’s are not so transformative after all?

• Is moving to bottom-up governance modes desirable / necessary, or can the shift towards transformative governance possible within the various modes?
  • There can be merits in multi-level governance mixes, combining bureaucratic power and local responsiveness (cf. ‘TIP as a third frame on top of the existing two innovation policy frames’; Schot & Steinmueller, 2018).
Conclusions

Theoretical contributions:
Different starting points (governance modes) imply different opportunities and challenges.
→ Alternative kind of contextualisation, besides e.g. mission types (Wittmann et al., 2021) and instrument types (Janssen, 2021).

Practical contributions:
Realism in terms of policy options and expectations in evaluation studies.
Basis for policy learning: inspiration from similar contexts, or more bottom-up ones?

Further research:
Link with assessment frameworks; are the TPIs truly transformative?
Co-existence of different TPI types; reinforcement?
Upcoming MIPO events:

January 17–22 2022, at TIP Conference:
Panel debate on ‘industrial transitions’, with JRC and INTRANSIT.

For more info, see:
Mission-oriented Innovation policy observatory (MIPO)