Paweł Białynicki-Birula, Piotr Kopyciński

Cracow University of Economics, Poland

THE CITY LAB AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE INTERACTIVE PERSPECTIVE ON GOVERNANCE

The aim of this article is to discussone of the practical ways in which the perspective of interactive governance can be applied to managing the sphere of public policy. It focuses on the city lab idea understood asa platform for generating innovationthrough the interaction of public authorities witha variety of stakeholders. The article begins with the presentation of the essence of interactive governance and the approaches to the idea adopted in the literature. Next, the idea of the city lab platformis considered in the context of its key operating principles. Drawing on three basic models of public management (i.e. ideal bureaucracy, new public management and public governance), and the concept of the neo-Weberian state, which has been gaining popularity in recent years, the authors identify and analyse the coordination mechanism used in the city lab. Conclusions offer a summary of the main aspects of the interactive perspective on generating innovation in urban areas.

Keywords: interactive governance, interactive policy tools, city lab

Introduction

The perspective of interactive governance is based on the assumption that nowadays political power is dispersed across society and is diverse in nature. This state of affairs is thought to be due to the fact that social processes are characterised by increasing diversity, complexity, and growing dynamics (Kooiman 2003).[1] The progressing democratisation and, on a broader scale, globalisation and integration processes also play an important part in this respect. As a result of these phenomena, social life is characterised by interdependence and uncertainty, which together constitute the determinants of governance. Interdependence results from the social division of labour due to increasing specialisation and implies the need to develop cooperative behaviours which affect, among others, the joint use of resources held bynumerous entities. On the other

hand, uncertainty is associated with the difficulty to accurately identify problems owing to a multitude of contributing factors, as well as the dynamic and unpredictable nature of social relations. Hence it is difficult to define collective goals, and the already established ones must besubject to constant review. Consequently, in order to ensure the stability of social life, one must refer to reliable and collectively defined institutions (Heuritier and Eckert 2008; North 1990).

The factors listed abovechallenge the traditional ways of exercising public authority. Following J. Kooiman (2003), it is agreed that today no entity is capable of governing effectively on its own due to the lack of sufficient potential and resources. This also, or perhaps above all, applies to the state, which is characterised by the loss of capacity to govern through unilateral and powerful interventions based on the principle of its omnipotence. As a result, it is often argued that the exercise of power requires recourse to logics other than the authoritarian one, in particular, those that involve broader social foundations and indirect forms of coordination. Thus, responsibility for the quality and outcomes of governance is no longer solely attributable to the state, but is treated as a shared concern of actors working together to solve collective problems (Denters 2003). In consequence, the interactive perspective offers a uniqueapproach to arranging relations between the state and society, which, in essence, boils down to the will to "do things together instead of alone" (Kooiman 1993).

This articlesets out to identify the conditions for applying the interactive governance approach in the practice of city lab understood as a specific platform for testing innovation in the city. The city lab concept as-

---

[1] In Kooiman's view, diversification resultsfrom a functional diversification of entities as a result of social specialisation, being an important source of innovation and a factor of social change. Complexity, on the other hand, refers to social relations and reflects their complicated nature. The concept is associated with the architecture of relations, which organises them and provides them with a structure. It is characterised by uncertainty and interdependence. The concept of dynamics describes the pace of change in relation to the flow of various streams (e.g. energy, information or goods) and reflects structural tensions which exist in social life. These phenomena, which are closely interlinked, mutually influence and strengthen one another, at the same time reflecting the influence of such factors as the development of knowledge and technology or improvements in communication.

sumes that new solutions to a variety of problems are generated by city residents (or more broadly, its users) acting in cooperation with representatives of enterprises, business environment institutions andresearch entities. In such a system, local authorities coordinate the process of generating innovation, while keeping an eye on the feasibility and legalityof the emerging solutions, but give up the right to independently decide on city development directions. The city lab concept is an interesting case of practical application and testing of the idea of interactive governance.

Interactive forms of governance

As its name suggests, the interactive approach is characterised by governance via interaction, which also constitutes a central analytical category. It is exemplifiedby a desire for a comprehensive study of the actions and relations amongthe actors involved in the processes of governance,hence the focus is on the entirety of these interactions taking place in society. In other words, the approach is characterised by a focus on interactions in different socio-political contexts, which at the same time explains its alternative name.[2] Socio-political governance is seen as a more or less continuous process of interaction among different actors, their groups, and state bodies. The defining feature of these (power) relations is a constant increase in interdependence, which translates into ever longer chains of interaction. Thus, governance processes reflect long-term trends in social differentiation and integration, which are ultimately institutionalised at multiple levels of organisation (Kooiman 2000).

There are different ways of conceptualising interactive governance in the literature. For example, J. Kooiman (et al. 2005, p. 17), considered a doyen of the approach, defines it as "the whole of interactions taken to solve societal problems and to create societal opportunities; including the formulation and application of principles guiding those interactions and care for institutions that enable and control them."Taking this definition as a starting point, the following constitutive elements of the concept can be identified: i) interactions, ii) guiding, iii) purpose, and iv) the institutional dimension. Emphasising interaction in the context of exercising power leads to a fundamental redefinition of its model, i.e. a shift from one-way relations to two- or more-way patterns reflecting the collective nature of governance. The idea of guiding underscores steering;here,in contrast to the generally understood concept of governance,

the focus of attention is not so much individual actions or generally defined relationships as interactions. The essence of the approach is thus expressed in steering interactions in the sphere of exercising power. Next, the aspect of purpose points to the pursuit of a specific public good, whether by solving problems or creating new opportunities. It implies a certain degree of involvement of actors who are bound together by a strong sense of interdependence. Finally, the institutional aspect reflects the importance of rules both in relation to the 'game' itself and to the rolesplayed by its participants. It allows us to identify typical interaction patterns and thus to recognisethe characteristic structural features of governance.

Referring to the currently fashionable tendency in social sciences to explain phenomena in processual terms, interactive governance can also be defined by emphasising this aspect. For example, Torfing et al. (2013, p. 13) combine the essence of the concept with "the complex process through which a plurality of actors with diverging interests interact in order to formulate, promote, and achieve common objectives..." These authors point to the following constitutive elements of the concept: i) the complexity of the process, ii) the community of objectives, and iii) the decentralised decision-making. Interactive governance is therefore implemented in a complex process of linking public and non-public actors in a range of various structural solutions. The notion of process reflects the existence of dynamic relations between policy actions and their institutional frameworks. These relationsare interactive in nature, i.e. they result from the interactions of a variety of views, preferences, and interests. The political process is thus driven by a collective ambition to define and pursue common goals, despite the divergent interests and preferences. Finally, it is decentralised in the sense that common goals are worked out in interactions between actors. Although the state often plays an important supporting or managerial part in the sphereunder discussion, there is no single privileged policy-making centre in society. In fact, we should assume the existence of numerous actors and arenas which contribute their respective resources, experience and skills (*ibid.*).

In the light of the cited definitions, the uniqueness of the interactive perspective seems to be due to the fact that it equatesthe essence of governance with steering interactions which reflectthe relations of interdependence in the sphere of exercising power. By the same token, the discussed approach breaks with an understanding of governance in terms of the exclusive competence of the state. It recognises that in the new reality, its current unilateral activity is increasingly being supplemented and substituted by interactive forms,where"steering, control and coordination are result of many hands rather than the iron fist of government" (*ibid.*, p. 14). It therefore consists in active partic-

---

[2]In the concept of interaction, the tension between action and its structural level can be considered as an expression of social dynamics. R. Rhodes (1997) described this approach as "social-cybernetic," emphasising the importance of dynamics for social relations and governance.

ipation of various actors in steering and managing social processes in the belief that governance demands collective involvement and responsibility. Let us add that this vision is distinctly different from the traditional one that defines relations in the area of power in terms of domination and subordination, with an emphasis on unilateral state acts. Instead, the concept of interactive governance is associated with raising the profile of horizontal and partnership relations, whereas the inclusion of a wide variety of actors, be they private or social, leads to the blurring of distinctions amongst individual sectors.

The interactive approach therefore perceives governance in terms of all the activities of various actors aimed at solving social problems collectively. It perceives them as specific governing mixes that respond to the challenges generated by the processes of social dynamics, differentiation, and complexity (Kooiman 2003). Thus, they are characterised by a kind of holism owing to theplacement within the framework of governance of a whole set of socio-political interactions, i.e. those taking place at different levels of organisation, in different scales, and styles. In this respect, it encompassesthe relations taking place in society as a whole, starting from the local level, through the regional and national ones, up to the global level. It includes all forms, including both the horizontal ones(subject to special attention) and vertical ones (characterised by hierarchies). Finally, it takes into account both formal and informal interactions. It takes account of the fact that governance often manifests itself as a range of informal processes with rules and roles that are significantly different from the existing institutional system of representation. To a certain extent, they constitute parallel or prior negotiation and decision making systems with respect tothe formal institutions (Edelenbos et al. 2010).

The approach discussed here is thus characterised by pluralism and openness to various styles of exercising power. It assumes that the nature of relations is strongly determined by external factors requiring, in various situations, recourse to different styles of governance and political tools.Consequently, the question of applying specific solutions is actually determined by the nature of relations as well as their wider context. Therefore, the choice in this respect is supposed to be mainly of a technical nature and closely reflect the structural aspects of governance. This means going beyond narrow the understanding in terms of networks, and rejecting the tendency to clearly contrast its notion both with hierarchical authority and voluntaristic market mechanisms. In view of the tangiblediversity of social and economic life, it allows for the possibility of using both different styles of governance and hybrid solutions that combine the two (Kooiman 2003).[3]

The interactive approach shows a clear preference for the widest possible involvement of non-public actors in the processesof governance. From this point of view, it reveals a dual character in the cognitive sense. In positive (descriptive) terms, it emphasises numerous benefits resulting from the fact of establishing and maintaining social relations, such as mutual inspiration, motivation, consensus building or support. Stakeholder participation in decision-making processes is meant to ensure, among other things, limiting the veto power, improving the quality of politics through the use of information and solutions presented by various actors, or closing the distance between citizens and politicians (Edelenbos et al. 2010). For these reasons, interactions are seen as a more effective way of governance than unilateral actions (Kooiman et al. 2008). The normative dimension constitutes a reference to democratic and liberal values. It underpins the belief that broad social participation in governance processes is highly desirable owing to the opportunity to deliberatewhile fully respecting the participants'subjectivity. Moreover, as an important power-legitimising factor, itcontributes to its effectiveness. It should also be added that the increasing social risks emerging in many areas requirea search for collective ways of solving problems, which stands in opposition to the neoliberal proclivity to leave the citizens to fend for themselves or to uncriticallyimplement market mechanisms.

The interactive approach is characterised by a focus on interactions involving both public and non-public actors.As a result, the subject of interest here are co-arrangements that facilitate undertaking joint efforts in terms of eliminating social problems, creating new opportunities, and taking care of institutions. From this perspective, interactive governance can be seen as a conscious intervention by both categories of actors with a view to creating predictable and stable interaction patterns (Kooiman 2000). The overriding aim of these efforts is to shape the socio-economic system in a way consistent with the participants'ideas and interests. In this context, the actual actions taken by the state result not so much from an authoritative implementation of previously established rules as from a unique co-production of solutions by the administration and its clients (*ibid.*).

In this approach, governance is identified with specific patterns or styles of interaction emerging from the entirety of actors' activities(Kooiman 1993). Inter-

---

[3]The interactive approach underscores to the need to treat the imperative authority typical of hierarchies as an equal style of government. Contrary to popular opinion, it is not exclusively unilateral in nature, but also includesinteraction-based relations, although certainly to a lesser extent than in the other cases.

action,or more accurately, the process involving sequences of interventions and interactions, seen as essential to the concept at hand, leads us to consider it as an emergent phenomenon. Thus, governance can be treated as an emergent order on account of a variety of impacts on the area of exercising power. This order is largely spontaneous; itresults from both the actions of the actors and the factors that determine them. As such, it is neither imposed by anyone nor reducible to the activity of any entity or group of actors (Kooiman 2003).

Accordingly, governance is conceptualised as a unique structure emerging in the socio-political system as a result of combined influences of actors; its styles being both similar and stable when it comes to structuring their mutual relations. At the same time, the approach is inherently dualist in nature, because, on the one hand, it resultsfrom interactions, and on the other, it determines the rules and principles concerning their course. In other words, it defines'the rules of the game' in the area of governance. In this sense, the process can be understood as a specific medium through which actors act in pursuit of their own interests and goals (*ibid.*). In practice, governance is effected via the combination of different styles, and even if one appears to dominate in a certain area, it is usually complemented by others. What matters is that in the perspective under discussion, governance always demonstratesits collective nature regardless of the implemented style.

By way of summarising this preliminary presentation of the approach, we should return to the issue of roles and tasks accorded to the state in the area of governance. It should be noted immediately that the interactive perspective takes an indirect position in the dispute between the supporters of domination in the discussed sphere of non-public (i.e. society-centric)factors, and the proponents of the opposite view of the superior position of the state (i.e. state-centric). Although the approach assumes that all participants are equal, in many respects the state is the leading actor. Thus, it is treated them as a kind of*primus inter pares*.[4]It acknowledgesthat changes in the logic of its operation and forms of influence are necessary, but at the same time, it contests the view that it reduces or even loses its ability to govern as a result of an alleged "hollowing-out" (Torfing et al. 2013; Rhodes 1997; Bell and Hindmoore 2009). Therefore, it rejects the possibility of withdrawal from steering social processes or other attempts to separate it from society. At the same time, it emphasises the fact that its influence can be significantly expanded as a result of the capacity to mobilise and use the resources held by non-public actors (Kooiman 2000).

---

[4]Therefore, in an analogy to the relational approach proposed by Bell and Hindmoor (2009), interactive governance can be described as state-centric relational, although precisely speaking, the 'state-centric interactional' form seems to be more appropriate.

The interactive approach is thus based on the assumption of a changing role of the state in the area of governance, but at the same time it contravenes the views of its marginalisation. In other words, this role is different, but not less important. Accordingly, the task of the state in complex societies is to influence social interactions in such a way as to ensure the complementarity of political actions and social self-organisation processes (Kooiman 2000). Governance is generally about structuring and directing interactions in order to carry out collective tasks. More specifically, it is about assigning the following types of activities to the state (Dunsire 1993): i) creating favourable conditions for social actors and systems to 'organise themselves' (enabling), ii) steering and coordinating interactions by creating institutional solutions in support of joint actions and responsibility sharing (steering, coordinating), and iii) ensuring that interactions run smoothly by 'balancing' various social forces and interests (collibrating). The fulfilment of these tasks requires both the use of dedicated resources and appropriate instruments.

The city laband its actors

Undoubtedly, an excellent example of practical application of the interactive approach to governance isthe city lab. P. Kopyciński (2018) recently reviewed literature on the understanding of this concept. The idea can be understood as a set of actions initiated by public authorities, aimed at long-term city development planning (public purpose). Therefore, these are innovations planned in an open formula (open innovation), where a variety of entities are allowed to experiment under actual conditions, including first of all the city users and local authorities.

School and Kemp (2016, pp. 99–100) identifythe following characteristics of the city lab:

1. **Hybrid form of organisation**, i.e. the management of the initiative is shared between local authorities and other participants. Such a formula makes it possible to partially bypass the bureaucratic logic of local authorities, which is necessary to generate innovative solutions. A variety of urban environments integrate around public authorities, scientific institutions, entrepreneurs and residents;

2. A **place to experiment with new forms of co-management (governance)** – an inspiration for public authorities to change the city management processes;

3. **Co-participation and co-decision by various entities**, with a particular emphasis on local authorities. Such a system responds to increasingly complex development challenges faced by cities, which cannot be solved by local administration alone;

4. **Using co-creation** while searching for new solutions (experimenting). Local authorities usually do not get involved in these experiments, but provide the pro-

cedures (and modify in the learning process) which can make the experiment a success in a given city;

5. Solving complex problems in an interdisciplinary manner, using knowledge from multiple disciplines.

Considering the concepts of the *quadruple helix*(Carayannis and Campbell 2009) and *working regions*(Clark 2013), where important actors are intermediaries, such as development agencies, and based on the work of authors dealing with *city labs*(Nyström et al. 2014; Perjo et al. 2016; Scholl and Kemp 2016; Westerlund and Leminen 2011), the following types of city lab participants can be identified: public authorities (politicians and officials), enterprises (different in terms of size and area of activity, depending on the task to be solved in a given city lab), city users/residents (individuals or members of formal and informal organisations, e.g. NGOs, city movements), research institutes, and other intermediary institutions.

Managing the city lab

Taking into account the way decisions are made, public policy management approaches can be divided into top-down and bottom-up ones. The former involves hierarchical, unilateral (top-down) setting of objectives and management of public affairs, whereas the latter underscores the importance of local actors familiar with the local context and needs. This issue was widely analysed in the literature on the subject, and was neatly summed up by P. A. Sabatier (1986). The above distinction can be applied to a wider problem of modes of governance that determine the management of public policies. This issue is addressed in depth elsewhere; hence it will only be briefly mentioned here. (cf. e.g. Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011; Kooiman 2003).

There are three basic models ofpublic management (coordination of collective actions):

1. The hierarchical model of ideal bureaucracy as described by M. Weber. In this approach, the state and the bureaucratic apparatus which represents it are the main originators and executors of public policies. The Weberian model is based primarily on legal regulations, hence the importance attached to formalising the goals, rules, and mechanisms of governance. The advantages of such an approach include precision, stability, discipline and loyalty (Weber 1965, p. 337). This method of coordination is the essence of the top-down approach.

2. New public management (NPP), which reflectsa market-oriented approach to coordinating public affairs, based on business techniques intended to improve the efficiency of the public sector and business management styles as a remedy to the perceived problems of the functioning of the state and its administrative apparatus (Osborne, Gaebler 1992; Pollitt, Dan 2011). In this case, both top-down and bottom-up aspects can be identified.

3. Public governance and its derivatives (including multi-level governance) where the interactivity and interdependence of governance processes is emphasised (Hausner 2008), implemented at many levels of government (national, regional, local, and supranational), with the participation of various stakeholder groups. Governance is a networked way of coordinating activities, where the bottom-up approach to solving public issues is important.

Despite the emphasis on differentaspects of governance, subsequent methods of coordination were not developed in complete isolation from the previousones. It is worth noting their evolutionary nature, for example,some of the assumptions of the Weberian bureaucratic model were incorporated into NPM and public governance. Nowadays, failure to implement reforms in the spirit of the NPM is emphasised and contrasted with the advantages of public management understood as public governance or multi-level governance (Drechsler and Kattel 2008; Randma-Liiv 2008). Moreover, the latter model is now considered to be the default mechanism for coordinating complex collective actions (e.g. Committee of the Regions 2009; European Commission 2010). This applies to public policies in general, including innovation policy and urban innovation. However, this mechanism also has certain shortcomings, such as those identified by Kopyciński (2015, p. 238):

1. "The risk of collision of competencies related to the multiplicity of decision-making bodies.

2. Difficulties in making interventions in the context of protracted negotiations and low level of trust among stakeholders.

3. Inappropriate choice of intermediate organisational forms between market and enterprise aimed at stimulating innovation.

4. Difficulties in ensuring socio-economic cohesion of a given country in the context of too far-reaching regionalisation.

5. Inappropriateness of interventions planned at the supranational level to the specific institutional circumstances of individual countries."

In the face of the above challenges associated with choosing the mode of governance that best fits given circumstances, it is not hard to explain a revival of interest in Weberian thought, which stipulates that one of the basic conditions for the success of reforms is an efficient and stable public administration. This way of thinking is also present in the literature on the city lab concept, where the following are mentioned:

1. The need to protect the public interest;

2. The importance of public authorities as a funder, regulator and veto power, while maintaining creative, not procedural way (Scholl, Kemp 2016, p. 92);

3. The actors'"clear responsibility, mandate and legitimacy to drive the process" (Perjo et al. 2016, p. 15);

4. Strengthening the public trust and legitimacy by political leaders;

5. The capacity of public authorities to manage conflicts (Perjo et al. 2016, pp. 15, 18).

In other words, the generation of creative ideas in a city lab requires an efficient public administration capable of protecting the public interest and managing conflicts amongst the stakeholders, which has sufficient trust and legitimacy to manage these processes, including the assignment of responsibility for the implementation of tasks within its framework, while preserving the achievements of public governance, which in this case may include the possibility to collectively (i.e. with the participation of numerous stakeholders) solve complex urban issues. The issue of administrative efficiency is not paramount in the case of the newly-created concept of city lab, where city authorities play a key role. Theideas of neo-Weberian state may constitute an attempt to reconcile thinking in terms of efficient administration with the participation of various stakeholders in governance processes.

The first reflectionsbased on neo-Weberian ideas date back to the 1980s, when P.B.Evans et al. (1985, p. 68) in their*Bringing the State Back In*identify the conditions for effective public intervention. In their opinion, first, "...the state must constitute a bureaucratic apparatus with sufficient corporate coherence..." (1985, p. 68), and second, the bureaucratic apparatus should be guaranteed "...a certain degree of autonomy from the dominant interests in a capitalist society..." (Evans, Rueschemeyer and Skocpol 1985, p. 68). In recent years, in the context of innovation policy, which is associated with the issue of city lab, the neo-Weberian ideas have appeared in the works of Drechsler (2009a), Drechler (2009b), or Drechslar and Kattel (2008). Citing the failure to implement the Lisbon Strategyand its attendant innovation policy, the aforementioned authors claim that its reasons should be sought, among others, in the lack of sufficient attention being devoted to issues associated withthe functioning of public administration. In their view, innovation should be perceived in terms of general interest rather than the interest of individual enterprises, while the effective implementation of long-term innovation policy requires a competent civil service corps focused on the execution of long-term tasks.

Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011) offer a comprehensive analysis ofgovernance in the spirit of the neo-Weberian state.References to a variety of public policies can also be found in the book by Mazur and Kopyciński (eds., 2017). At this point, due to the limited space available, we will only identify certain characteristics of the neo-Weberian state as they apply to innovation policy, and then discuss them in the context of city lab. Table 1 comparesselected features of the neo-Weberian state with multi-level governance as a mechanism recommended for the implementation of public policies in the EU (cf. e.g. The Committee of the Regions 2009, European Commission 2010).

Table 1

Multi-level governance vs the neo-Weberian state – features of public policy coordination mechanisms

Features of coordination mechanism	Multi-level governance	Neo-Weberian state
Coordination method	Network	Hierarchical, but some market elements (NPM) and network (MLG) present
Entities	Political authorities in collaborative relations with stakeholders	Clear separation of political authorities and public administrations at various levels, consideration of opinions of other actors (cooperation in the diagnosis, planning, implementation, and monitoring)
Basis for intervention	Consensus among various stakeholders approved by public authorities	Provisions of administrative law
Basic tools	Communication among various stakeholders	Administrative: integrated strategies affecting various public policies at the same time
Implementation method	Negotiations	Integrated, joint activities of public administration at various levels with a clear division of tasks and responsibilities

Source: Kopyciński 2017, p. 89.

While MLG is a network coordination model, NWS refers to the hierarchical Weberian one, while retaining certain features of NPM and MLG, such as orientation on the needs and expectations of the residents participating in the exercise of power through various consultation mechanisms (cf. Politt and Bouckaert 2011). While in the case of MLG the participants in governance processes include primarily political authorities in regularcontact with stakeholders, NWS emphasises a precise division of powers among individ-

ual bodies and levels of government, which may, of course, invite other actors to co-govern. The basis for public action in MLG is the consensus of various stakeholders under the aegis of public authorities, while in the case of NWS; it is primarily administrative law – which does not exclude, of course, the use of various consultation mechanisms with interested parties. MLG is characterised by the use of communication tools, and NWS – administrative ones, but not to the exclusion of integrated strategies, especially now, in the era of overlapping interventions. In the case of public policy implementation, negotiations (MLG) or actions of public authorities based on legal regulations (NWS) come to the fore (Kopyciński 2017, p. 88).

Based on the above remarks, it is worth considering why the concept of neo-Weberian state should be considered as appropriate for managing a city lab. The following city lab characteristics of seem to favour its application:

1. Public authorities serve as the primary decision-maker, initiator and coordinator of activities and their important participant, as well as the provider of procedures.

2. There is a clear separation of tasks in the public sector between political authorities and public administrations.

3. Legitimacy and trust in city authorities must be built; the efficiency of public services should no longer be regarded as their basic assessment criterion.

4. A focus on public goals (i.e. improving the quality of life of city users) rather than private ones (businesses).

5. A long-term perspective oncity development planning.

6. Flexibility in the methods and forms of working towardsuniversally acceptable solutions (a departure from rigid bureaucratic city development planning in favour of experimenting in real-life contexts)while maintaining their feasibility and legality to facilitate their implementation in the city.

The above distinguishing features of the city lab suggest that the neo-Weberian state should be considered as a suitable method for coordinating the activities of such initiatives. It is worth noting that NWS does not underminethe achievements of public governance or its unique interactive approach to managing public affairs, but rather amplifies the role played by one of the actors and the ultimate decision-maker, namely the public authorities.

Having discussed the factors in favour of the NWS approach to the processes of managing the city lab,it is now worth checking whether it is already being applied within the framework under discussion. For this purpose, let us expand Table 2 to include the relevant features of MLG and NWS.

As the above list shows, the coordination mechanism used in the city lab has the characteristics of both MLG and NWS. From the perspective adopted in this article, it is important to emphasise that city lab activities are not coordinated exclusively by means MLG, but, owing to the significant involvement of public authorities, NWS also constitutes an important coordination mechanism. At the same time, this mechanism fully corresponds to interactive governance assuming that processes in the public sphere are based on broad social foundations with an emphasis on the role of public authority (called state-centric interactional). This proves that the interactive perspective not only provides a useful framework for the analysis of public policy processes, but is also fully applicable in practice.

Summary and conclusions

The aim of this article was to demonstrate the application of the interactive governance perspective to the city lab. The foregoing discussion justifies the conclusion that such an interactive governance mechanism, which has the features of both multi-level governance and neo-Weberian state, is used in solving urban issues withinthe city lab platform. This is evidenced by the following observations on its operation:

1. Dispersal of power among numerous actors – active participation of various actors in steering and managing the processes of social and economic development of the city.

2. Interdependence of public authorities, residents (city users) and other actors of the city lab, resulting from the fact that none of them is capable of governing independently due to the lack of sufficient potential and resources.

3. Decentralised decision-making combining the activities of public (primarily city authorities) and non-public (primarily city residents/users) actors.

4. Unique pluralism and openness to various styles of governance – the city lab cannot be unambiguously subsumed under a single public management model;it is rather more appropriate to talk about managing a city lab usinga variety of coordination mechanisms – not only (multi-level) governance, whose characteristic features include participation and joint decision-making, but also the neo-Weberian state, where city authorities ensure the feasibility and legality of the proposed solutions, having the right toveto the submitted proposals.

5. In the city lab, interactions involve both public and non-public actors. The focus here is on joint solutions to eliminate social problems and create new development opportunities in the city.

Table 2

Coordination methods in the city lab – the perspective of public authorities

Features of coordination mechanism	Multi-level governance	Neo-Weberian state	Mode of governance in city lab
Coordination method	Network	Hierarchical, but some market elements (NPM) and network (MLG) present	**MLG:** problems can be addressed and solved using network-based methods (co-operation of city users, public authorities, enterprises, research institutions and intermediaries) via experimentation in real-life contexts but **NWS**: work is done within a hierarchical framework imposed by public authorities, especially in terms of ensuring the feasibility and legality of the proposed solutions
Entities	Political authorities in collaborative relations with stakeholders	Clear separation of political authorities and public administrations at various levels, consideration of opinions of other actors (cooperation in the diagnosis, planning, implementation, and monitoring)	**MLG**: cooperation of public authorities with other actors, but to a limited extent; public authorities are primarily a passive participant responsible for overseeing the procedures but **NWS**: involves the separation of political and administrative tasks; taking into account the opinions of different actors in the process of long-term city development planning
Basis for intervention	Consensus among various stakeholders approved by public authorities	Provisions of administrative law	**MLG**: in the course of generating solutions, moving away from a rigid bureaucratic framework; what is important is to work out a consensus but **NWS**: consensus within the procedural limits and applicable legal provisions
Basic tools	Communication among various stakeholders	Administrative: integrated strategies affecting various public policies at the same time	**MLG**: communication as a basic tool for resolving disputes and reconciling positions while **NWS**: activities are undertaken as part of a broader strategy for long-term city development
Implementation method	Negotiations	Integrated, joint activities of public administration at various levels with a clear division of tasks and responsibilities	**MLG**: Negotiations on at least three levels, i.e. between: 1. public authorities (politicians and officials) at different levels 2. public authorities and various actors in the city lab 3. various city lab actors (e.g. developers and residents) **NWS**: Long-term development requires joint actions by various public administration entities – local and central government

Source: Own study.

The foregoing discussion supports the view that interactive governance in the city lab is not only a theoretical concept, but alsoplays an important part is solving the actualproblems of social and economic development. It shows the great potential of providing public policy with a broader social basis and ensuring interactions of various stakeholders in order to execute public tasks and deliver innovative solutions. However, due to the fact that the idea of city lab is fairly new,the topic requires more in-depth research.

References

1. Bell S., Hindmoor A. (2009), Rethinking Governance: The Centrality of the State in Modern Society, Cambridge University Press.

2. Carayannis, E.G., Campbell D.F.J. (2009) '"Mode 3" and "Quadruple Helix": toward a 21st century fractal innovation ecosystem', *International Journal of Technology Management*, Vol. 46, Nos 3/4, pp. 201–234.

3. Clark, J. (2013) *Working Regions: Reconnecting Innovation and Production in the Knowledge Economy*, Routledge, London/New York.

4. Denters S.A., van Heffen O.,Huisman J., Klok P.J. (2003), The Rise of Interactive Governance and Quasi-Markets, Springer 2003.

5. Drechsler, W. (2009a) 'Towards a Neo-Weberian European Union? Lisbon Agenda and Public Administration', *Halduskultuur*, Vol 10, pp. 6-21.

6. Drechsler, W., (2009b) 'The rise and demise of the New Public Management: Lessons and opportunities for South East Europe', *Uprava*, letnik VII, 3/2009, pp. 7-27.

7. Drechsler, W., Kattel, R., (2008). Towards the neo-weberian State? Perhaps, but certainly adieu, NPM !.The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy", Special Issue: *A Distinctive European Model ? The Neo-Weberian State*,Vol. I, no 2 (Winter 2008/2009).

8. Dunsire 1993 Modes of Governance in: Kooiman 1993 Modern Governance New Government-Society Interactions, SAGE Publications

9. Edelenbos J., van Schie N., Gerrits L., (2010), Organizing interfaces between government institutions and interactive governance. Policy Science, 43: 73–94.

10. European Commission (2010). Fifth Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion – Investing in Europe's Future. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

11. Evans, P. B., Rueschemeyer, D., Skocpol, T.(1985-first published, 2002-reprint) *Bringing the State Back In.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/ New York.

12. Hausner, J. (2008). *Zarządzanie publiczne.* Warszawa: Wyd. Naukowe Scholar.

13. Héritier A., Eckert S. (2008), New Modes of Governance in the Shadow of Hierarchy: Selfregulation by Industry in Europe. Journal of Public Policy, no. 28, pp 113-138.

14. Kooiman(2000) Societal Governance: Levels, modes and orders ofsocial-political governance", in: Pierre J. (2000), Debating Governance, Oxford University Press, pp. 138- 166.

15. Kooiman J. (2003), Governing as Governance, Sage Publications.

16. Kooiman J., Bavinck M., Chuenpagdee R., Mahon R., & Pullin R. (2008), Interactive governance andgovernability: an introduction. Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies, 7(1), 1-11.

17. Kooiman J., Bavinck M., Jentoft S., Pullin R. (2005), Fish for Life:Interactive Governance for Fisheries. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

18. Kopyciński P.(2015), Governance and innovation policy, [in:] Mazur S. [ed.],Public governance, WN Scholar, Warszawa.

19. Kopyciński, P. (2017). The neo-Weberian approach in innovation policy. In: Mazur S., Kopyciński P. (eds.), *Public Policy and the Neo-Weberian State*, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge.

20. Kopyciński, P. (2018), City Lab as a Platform for Implementing Urban Innovation. The Role of Companies [in:] K. Wach, M. Maciejewski (eds), (International Entrepreneurship as the Bridge between International Economics and International Business: Conference Proceedings of the 9th ENTRE Conference and 5th AIB-CEE Conference. Cracow: Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny w Krakowie, 257-274.

21. Mazur, S., Kopyciński, P. (eds.) (2017). Public Policy and the Neo-Weberian State. Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge.

22. North D. (1990), Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance Cambridge University Press

23. Nyström, A. G., Leminen, S., Westerlund, M., Kortelainen, M. (2014) 'Actor roles and role patterns influencing innovation in living labs', *Industrial Marketing Management* 43 (2014), pp. 483–495.

24. Osborne, D., Gaebler, T., (1992). *Reinventing Government. How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.* Reading.

25. Perjo, L., Fredricsson, Ch., Costa, S. O. (2016) *Public-Private-People Partnership in Urban Planning*, Baltic Urban City Lab.

26. Pollitt, C., Dan S., (2011), *The Impacts of the New Public Management in Europe. A Meta-Analysis.* COCOPS Work Package 1 – Deliverable 1.1, 14 December.

27. Pollitt, Ch., Bouckaert, G., (2011). *Public Management Reform a Comparative Analysis-New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

28. Randma-Liiv, T. (2008), *New Public Management Versus the Neo-Weberian State in Central And Eastern Europe, (*in:), The NISPAcee Journal of Public Administration and Policy (2008), 1:2, Special issue: 'A distinctive European model? The Neo-Weberian State'.

29. Rhodes R. A. W. (1997),Understanding Governance. Policy networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability, Open University Press

30. Sabatier, P. A. (1986) 'Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: a Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis', *Journal of Public Policy*, Volume 6, Issue 1, January 1986, pp. 21-48.

31. Scholl Ch., Kemp R. (2016). „City Labs as Vehicles for Innovation in Urban Planning Processes", Urban Planning, Vol. 1, Iss. 4, s. 89–102.

32. The Committee of the Regions (2009). *White Paper on Multilevel Governance.*Brussels.

33. Torfing J., Peters B. G., Pierre J., Sørensen E. (2013) Interactive Governance. Advancing the Paradigm.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

34. Westerlund, M., Leminen, S. (2011) 'Managing the challenges of becoming an open innovation company: Experiences from Living Labs', *Technology Innovation Management Review*, October 2011, pp. 19–25.

Reviewer: Dr. Sc., Doc. O. Diegtiar, O.M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Author: BIAŁYNICKI-BIRULA Paweł
PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Economy
Cracow University of Economics
E-mail – bialynip@uek.krakow.pl
ID ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1736-2003

Author: KOPYCIŃSKI Piotr
PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Economy
Cracow University of Economics.
E-mail – piotr.kopycinski@uek.krakow.pl
ID ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8895-9432

МІСЬКА ЛАБОРАТОРІЯ ЯК ПРИКЛАД ІНТЕРАКТИВНОЇ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ВРЯДУВАННЯ
(THE CITY LAB AS AN EXAMPLE OF THE INTERACTIVE PERSPECTIVE ON GOVERNANCE[5])
Paweł Białynicki-Birula, Piotr Kopyciński

Краківський економічний університет, Польща

Метою статті є обговорення одного з практичних шляхів використання інтерактивного підходу до управління сферою публічної політики. Основна увага приділяється ідеї міської лабораторії (city lab), що сприймається як платформа для генерування інновацій через взаємодію органів публічної влади з різними зацікавленими сторонами.

Стаття починається з викладу сутності інтерактивного управління та підходів до його розуміння, що розглядаються в літературі. Також розглядається ідея платформи міської лабораторії в контексті основних принципів її роботи.

Спираючись на три основні моделі публічного врядування (тобто ідеальна бюрократія, новий публічний менеджмент та публічне врядування) та концепцію нової веберівської держави, яка набирає все більшої популярності в останні роки, автори визначають та аналізують механізм координації, який використовується в міській лабораторії. Висновки пропонують короткий підсумок основних аспектів інтерактивного напрямку розвитку інновацій у містах.

Ключові слова: інтерактивне врядування, інструменти інтерактивної політики, міська лабораторія (city lab)