

# Improving policy analysis and performance governance through outcome-oriented approaches to “localize” the SDG agenda

*Carmin Bianchi*<sup>1 i</sup> (corresponding panelist); *Jiannan Wu*<sup>2 ii</sup>; *Jeremy Hall*<sup>3 iii</sup>;

*B. Guy Peters*<sup>4 iv</sup>; *Musa Ali*<sup>5 v</sup>

## ***Super-wicked problems: the need for policy innovation***

In the last two decades, multiple crises have been threatening societal sustainability. Social conflicts, terrorism, poverty, natural catastrophes, marginalization, resource scarcity, economic downturns, and pandemic diseases are a challenge for societal equilibrium.

“Super wicked” problems (Levin et al., 2012) gradually emerge locally to explode globally, and vice versa. Global and local problems are more intertwined than ever. The rising blurriness of the systems where individual stakeholders operate provides a major source of interconnectedness across organizations and regions, which originate performance instability. This requires proper keys and methods for robust policy design and implementation.

To foster consistency on a local, regional, national, and transnational level, and over different time horizons to deal with such problems, scalability and stakeholder collaboration are needed conditions.

“Super wicked” problems are characterized by intrinsic dynamic complexity, due to multi-level, multi-actor, and multi-sectoral challenges (Head & Alford, 2013; Bianchi, 2021). Also, major delays and perception distortions may occur between their identification and a systematic analysis of their causes, leading to consistent policy implementation. Indeed, in designing interventions, policymakers should take into consideration the inconsistencies of policies aimed at tackling problems in the short run and in narrow domains, since they may trigger path-dependent processes that would inertially unfold unintended outcomes, over time and space (Levin et al., 2012).

Framing the dynamic complexity behind community outcomes in such settings requires policy innovation (Sorensen & Torfing, 2017, 828). This implies the involvement of stakeholders from different governance layers in pursuing a common shared view of the feedback structure underlying the observed system performance. To enhance stakeholder learning processes, mutual accountability, shared knowledge, and trust, using innovative outcome-based performance governance methods may play a crucial role. In fact, it may enable modelers/facilitators in the planning process to foster

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor of Public Management & Governance - Department of Political Sciences and International Relations, University of Palermo, Italy; [bianchi.carmin@gmail.com](mailto:bianchi.carmin@gmail.com) - [carmin.bianchi@unipa.it](mailto:carmin.bianchi@unipa.it)

<sup>2</sup> Chair Professor and Dean of the School of International and Public Affairs, Executive Vice Director of the China Institute of Urban Governance, and Director of the Centre for Reform, Innovation, and Governance, Shanghai Jiao Tong University; [jnwu@sjtu.edu.cn](mailto:jnwu@sjtu.edu.cn)

<sup>3</sup> Professor of Public Administration and Director of the Ph.D. Program in Public Affairs at the University of Central Florida (USA); [jeremy.hall@ucf.edu](mailto:jeremy.hall@ucf.edu)

<sup>4</sup> Maurice Falk Professor of American Government, University of Pittsburgh (USA); [bgpeters@pitt.edu](mailto:bgpeters@pitt.edu)

<sup>5</sup> Director and Founder of the Centre for Innovation and Productivity in Public Administration (PiPPA) at Universiti Sains Malaysia; [musa@usm.my](mailto:musa@usm.my)

stakeholder collaboration and learning (Sorensen & Torfing, 2012, 8) by also enacting feedforward mechanisms through policy implementation (Bianchi, 2021; 2022; Otley, 1999). To this end, using “hybrid” performance regimes (Douglas and Ansell, 2021, p. 956) in the context of collaborative platforms (Ansell and Gash, 2018, p. 20) may enhance learning forums in network performance governance.

Adopting policies based on a proactive system view allows stakeholders to discern how inertial changes can be fostered through earlier decisions, “having both a constraining or ‘lock-in’ effect and an opportunity-enhancing effect” (Bardach, 2008, p. 348). To detect the inertial changes undermining the socio-economic and biological system structure behind such problems, stakeholders should bridge short and long-term perspectives, through robust policy logics that challenge the dominant public values in a society (Osborne, 2010, 418-419) and enhance a sustainable holistic transition (Folke et al, 2003, p. 353; Stokols, 2013).

Implementing this approach major policy innovation entails framing contexts as systems populated by people and institutions, characterized by culture, goals, and perceptions. These are primary causes of societal behavior which impacts local area performance on both an ecological and a socio-economic dimension. Consequently, sustainable structural changes in a city should not be bounded to only physical mutations of its urban infrastructure. They are, instead, an outcome of a systemic change that goes beyond a sum of investments, engineering, and architectural projects for urban regeneration, or the adoption and enforcement of new regulations.

### ***Localizing SDGs: using outcome-oriented approaches in performance governance to improve policy analysis.***

An effort towards addressing the rising concerns on the described super-wicked problems has been made by the United Nations (UN) through the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Agenda.

The 17 SDGs and related 169 targets strive to encourage all nations to tackle these super-wicked problems by stimulating economic growth and enhancing societal needs (such as education, healthcare, social welfare, and employment opportunities), and coping with ecological challenges (such as climate change and biodiversity erosion patterns) (General Assembly, 2015).

The main problems in the UN agenda are associated with the difficulty to detect systemic connections between different SDGs and the related stakeholders who would participate through collaborative policies aimed at achieving them. Also, the SDG agenda does not suggest how the outcomes related to different SDGs could be affected, i.e., through what methods and at what governance levels, final and intermediate outcomes would be identified, gauged, and possibly monitored in the short term through proper performance drivers. Finally, the SDG agenda doesn't shed light on how to identify and gauge the shared strategic resources at context level, which collaborative policies aimed at affecting the SDG outcomes would leverage. Also, ensuring consistency between the planning process at context level and the planning process at organizational level for achieving SDGs may require innovation in performance governance.

Sustainable development and societal resilience need a multidisciplinary approach and multi-actor governance systems across local, national, and international boundaries, but also require the ability to adapt and support change without undermining future flexibility (Perry et al., 2018). This effort cannot be conceived as only bounded to only a scientific dimension. It should be rather transposed to a practitioners' field by involving community stakeholders through innovative and consistent

collaborative planning methods (Ostrom et al., 1999; Folke et al., 2003). To this end, there is a need to foster bottom-up initiatives, by enhancing the interest and participation in collaborative networks by “grassroot” organizations (Smith, 1999; Moore et al., 2007; Foster & Louie, 2010), and other kinds of institutions – e.g.: community-based organizations (Provan & Milward, 2001), backbone organizations (Kania & Kramer, 2011) – as an expression of the civil society participative efforts to generate community wellbeing.

Local government participation and effectiveness in localizing SDGs depends on multilevel governance structures in diverse national settings (Perry et al., 2021). Though translating SDGs into local contexts is a challenging effort, it is a fundamental step to properly frame them on a global scale, to foster policy analysis, goal setting, and joint accountability (Cashore et al 2019).

This requires endogenizing such goals consistently with the specific features of a local context (country, city, region, set of neighborhoods, etc.), in terms of socio-economic, cultural, and ecological systems. Such features contribute at the same time to shape the wicked problems detected at the global level and provide a relevant field where experimentation policies can be designed and implemented at local level. Therefore, endogenizing SDGs is not only associated with the need to cascade such goals from a global to a local level but also to understand the factors (e.g.: culture, history, shared strategic resources, institutions) which explain the local causes behind the global challenges captured in the 2030 UN agenda.

Global indicators would not be applicable at local level without proper data, resources, and capacity, including the use of methodologies enhancing learning in collaborative planning and implementation (Tan et al., 2019). To this end, cross-boundary performance dialogue (Laihonen & Mäntylä, 2017; Moynihan, 2008) may enhance collaborative networking initiatives characterized by long-term collective policy design, to “trigger and nurture path-dependent processes that lead to transformative change over time” (Levin et al, 2012, p. 131). Performance dialogue can act as a fundamental driver of behavioral change in society that may counteract the “irrational discounting” associated with an inclination to mildly perceive the negative future outcomes that the currently – latent, weak, or inconsistent – adopted policies will generate concerning “wicked” problems (Bianchi, 2022).

Also, collaborative networking provides a powerful engine to cope with one of the main challenges that “super-wicked” problems imply: decision-makers in a single public sector organization do not control all the choices required to alleviate the problem.

### ***Research challenges***

The need to move towards long-term sustainability and resilience through a socio-economic, cultural, and ecological transition provides a basis for a workshop aiming at exploring how enhanced and outcome-oriented performance governance approaches may act as an important factor triggering policy innovation to localize and implement SDGs.

A non-exhausting list of topics of which contributions (also including case studies) may refer to the following problematic issues:

- What role can performance governance play in implementing the SDG Agenda at the local level?
- How innovative performance governance methods can boost policy innovation to deal with super-wicked problems at local level?

- How can such innovative approaches to performance governance contribute to generating consistency between different layers of governance in dealing with super-wicked problems to address SDGs?
- What specific challenges localizing SDGs would imply?
- How to link the planning process at context and organizational level for achieving the long-term outcomes set by the 2030 UN Agenda?
- How to outline systemic connections between different SDGs and the related stakeholders to involve in collaborative networks?
- How to foster bottom-up initiatives, by enhancing the interest and participation in collaborative networks by “grassroot”, “community-based” , and other kinds of organizations, as an expression of the civil society participative efforts to generate community wellbeing?
- How to innovate performance governance in a way that the planning process may embrace intangibles (e.g.: trust and shared strategic resources) and delays between causes and effects in policy implementation?
- How can innovative performance governance at local area level enhance leadership and learning processes in collaborative planning for localizing and pursuing SDGs?
- How can innovative performance governance contribute to help policy makers in identifying different outcome layers, their drivers, and the levers on which to act for attaining the targeted SDGs?
- How to foster performance dialogue as a fundamental driver of behavioral change in society to counteract “irrational discounting”?

## References

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2018). Collaborative platforms as a governance strategy, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 28, 1,16–32.
- Bardach, E. (2008). Policy dynamics. In R. E. Goodin, M. Rein & M. Moran (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of public policy* (pp. 336–366). Oxford UK: Oxford University Press
- Bianchi, C. (2021). Fostering sustainable community outcomes through policy networks: A dynamic performance governance approach. In *Handbook of collaborative public management*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bianchi, C. (2022). Enhancing policy design and sustainable community outcomes through collaborative platforms based on a dynamic performance management and governance approach. In *Research Handbook of Policy Design* (pp. 407-429). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bryson, J., Crosby, B., & Stone, M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 1, 44–55.
- Cashore, B., Bernstein, S., Humphreys, D., Visseren-Hamakers, I., & Rietig, K. (2019). Designing stakeholder learning dialogues for effective global governance. *Policy and Society*, 38(1), 118- 147.
- Douglas, S. and Ansell, C. (2021). Getting a grip on the performance of collaborations: Examining collaborative performance regimes and collaborative performance summits, *Public Administration Review*, 81, 5, 951–961.
- General Assembly (2015). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015. *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. A/RES/70/1 25 September 2015. New York: United Nations.

- Folke, C., Colding, J., & Berkes, F. (2003). Synthesis: building resilience and adaptive capacity in social-ecological systems. *Navigating social-ecological systems: Building resilience for complexity and change*, 9(1), 352-387.
- Foster, C., & Louie, J. (2010). Evaluating community organizing. Center for Evaluation Innovation. <https://www.evaluationinnovation.org/publication/evaluating-community-organizing>.
- Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Winter 2011. Palo Alto, CA.
- Laihonen, H. and Mäntylä, S. (2017). Principles of performance dialogue in public administration, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 30, 5, 414–428.
- Levin, K., Cashore, B., Bernstein, S., & Auld, G. (2012). Overcoming the tragedy of super wicked problems: constraining our future selves to ameliorate global climate change. *Policy sciences*, 45(2), 123- 152.
- Moynihan, D. (2008). *The Dynamics of Performance Management*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Moore, S., Winders, J., Fröhling, O., Jones III, J. P., & Roberts, S. M. (2007). Mapping the grassroots: NGO formalisation in Oaxaca, Mexico. *Journal of International Development: The Journal of the Development Studies Association*, 19(2), 223-237.
- Osborne, S. P. (2010). *Conclusions Public governance and public services delivery: a research agenda for the future. The New Public Governance?*, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ostrom, E. (1999). Coping with tragedies of the commons. *Annual review of political science*, 2(1), 493-535.
- Otley, D. (1999). Performance management: A framework for management control systems research, *Management Accounting Research*, 10, 10, 363–382.
- Perry, B. G., Patel, Z., Norén Bretzer, Y., & Polk, M. (2018). Organizing for co-production: Local interaction platforms for urban sustainability. *Politics and Governance*, 6(1).
- Perry, B., Diprose, K., Taylor Buck, N., & Simon, D. (2021). Localizing the SDGs in England: Challenges and value propositions for local government. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 3.
- Provan, K. G., & Milward, H. B. (2001). Do networks really work? A framework for evaluating public-sector organizational networks. *Public administration review*, 61(4), 414-423.
- Smith, D. H. (1999). The effective grassroots association II: Organizational factors that produce external impact. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 10(1), 103- 116.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2012). Introduction: Collaborative innovation in the public sector. *The Innovation Journal*, 17(1), 1- 14.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2017). Metagoverning collaborative innovation in governance networks. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 47(7), 826-839.
- Stokols, D., Lejano, R. P., & Hipp, J. (2013). Enhancing the resilience of human-environment systems: A social ecological perspective. *Ecology and Society*, 18(1).

Tan, D. T., Siri, J. G., Gong, Y., Ong, B., Lim, S. C., MacGillivray, B. H., & Marsden, T. (2019). Systems approach for localising the SDGs: co-production of place-based case studies. *Globalization and Health*, 15(1), 1- 10.

---

<sup>i</sup> Carmine Bianchi is a Professor of Public Management in the Department of Political Sciences, University of Palermo (Italy), where is also the scientific coordinator of the CED4 System Dynamics Group. At Palermo, he is also the director of the Doctoral program in “Model Based Public Planning, Policy Design, and Management”, and of the Master in Public Management. Professor Bianchi has research and consulting experience with public and private sector organizations in designing policies and outlining consistent programs to link policy design and implementation. In the last decade, Prof. Bianchi’s scientific interests have been focused on the design of outcome-based dynamic performance management systems aimed at fostering collaborative governance and enhancing quality of life in local areas. Professor Bianchi is a member of the Editorial Board of leading international Journals, such as the *International Journal of Public Administration*, *Public Administration Review*, *Public Management Review*, and *Public & Performance Management Review*. He is also the Editor of the Book Series on “System Dynamics for Performance Management & Governance”, by Springer

<sup>ii</sup> Dr. Jiannan Wu is Distinguished Professor and Executive Vice Director of China Institute of Urban Governance and Head of Division for Liberal Arts and Social Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University. After obtaining his Ph.D. at School of Management at Xi’an Jiaotong University (XJTU) in 1999, he was appointed as a postdoctoral research associate at the Center for Technology and Information Policy (CTIP) of Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. He also worked as a Fellow in the Ash Center of Harvard Kennedy School in 2012.

Dr. Wu has worked on, performance management, Reform & innovation, and Urban governance for years. He has published extensively in Chinese leading Journals and some English work has appeared in *Public Administration*, *International Public Management Journal*, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *Administration & Society*, and *Public Management Review*. Dr. Wu has served on the Editorial Board of the *International Public Management Journal* and several Chinese journals.

Dr. Wu has served as Vice President of the National Government Performance Management Research Association of China since 2006, Executive member of the Chinese Public Administration Society and other Chinese academic societies. He has served as General Secretary of the Asian Association of Public Administration since 2018. He has been a peer reviewer for *Public Administration J-PART*, *IPMJ*, *JCPA*, *PPMR*, *PMR*, *ROPPA*, *Cities*, and so on.

<sup>iii</sup> Jeremy L. Hall is Professor of Public Administration and Director of the Ph.D. Program in Public Affairs at the University of Central Florida. An international expert on public management, performance and accountability systems, and evidence-based practice and policy, Dr. Hall is Editor-In-Chief of *Public Administration Review* and a National Academy of Public Administration fellow. An active ASPA member, Hall chaired the program committee for the 2016 ASPA annual conference in Seattle, Washington. He serves on the editorial boards of *Public Performance & Management Review*, *State and Local Government Review*, the *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, the *Commonwealth Review of Political Science*, and previously, *The Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, and *Public Administration Review*. His research appears in key academic journals including: *The Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *Public Administration Review*, *American Review of Public Administration*, *Economic Development Quarterly*, *Public Performance & Management Review*, *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, *Policy Studies Journal*, the *Journal of Public Affairs Education* and others. Hall is President-elect of the Southeastern Conference of Public Administration (SECoPA) where he has served four nonconsecutive terms on the board of directors. He joined Ted Poister and Maria Aristigueta as a coauthor of the revised edition of the seminal text on performance management: *Managing and Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organizations: An Integrated Approach*, published by Jossey-Bass/ Wiley in 2014. His 2010 book (*Grant Management: Funding for Public and Nonprofit Programs*) is the first to examine grant writing and grant management from a Public Administration perspective.

<sup>iv</sup> B Guy Peters is Maurice Falk Professor of American Government at the University of Pittsburgh and Professor of Comparative Governance at Zeppelin University (Germany). He is also an adjunct professor at the City University of Hong Kong. He has a PhD from Michigan State University and has three honorary doctorates from European universities. He is currently the founding co-editor of the *European Political Science Review* and was founding co-editor of *Governance*. He is now co-editor of the *Handbook of Public Administration in Latin America*, and of several book series for Macmillan. His recent publications include *Representative Bureaucracy in Action*, with Eckhard Schröoter and Patrick von Maravic, *Institutional Theory in Political Science*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. and *The Handbook of Public Administration*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., with Jon Pierre.

---

<sup>v</sup> Musa Ali is the founder and Director of Centre for Innovation and Productivity in Public Administration (PiPPA), Universiti Sains Malaysia. He has written four books one of which, ‘Transformasi Pengurusan Latihan Sektor Awam’ (Transformation of Public Sector Training Management) was launched by the Minister of Higher Education ( Malaysia) in 2008. In 2015, his book “ Transformasi Organisasi: Konsep dan Teknik Pelaksanaan’ (Organization Transformation: Concepts and Implementation Techniques) was published . In 2016 this book was published under the auspices of the Educational Competencies Consortium (ECC) UK and the book was also translated into Arabic in collaboration with the Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia (2019) and Japanese in collaboration with Japan Malaysia Association (2020). MyCPD, the lifelong learning system which he established, was launched by the Chief Secretary to the Government in 2008. In the same year, he was awarded a scholarship by the Centre for Creative Leadership, United States. He is a certified facilitator for Benchmarks® SKILLSCOPE®, Prospector®, 360 BY DESIGN®, Executive Dimension ® and KEYS® . He has also served as a human resource consultant for a government department in Australia and was involved in developing the competency framework for that department. He has developed and introduces the human resource e -systems namely myCPD, MyTalent, MyWorkProfiling , MyHR and MySO-KFA. He has been a Visiting Fellow at the CED4- System Dynamics group, University of Palermo, Italy and also Adjunct Professor at the DRB HICOM University.

<sup>vi</sup> Please also CC aapaoffice@163.com when submitting to this panel.