IIAS
International Institute of Administrative Sciences

KU KONKUK UNIVERSITY

SK hynix

IIAS2026 CONFERENCE

Seoul, South Korea **November 17-20**

Growth for Society: Collaborative Governance, Social Innovation, and Public Value



iias-iisa.org/iias-2026-conference/

IIAS 2026 Conference: Call-for-Papers

Van Jaarsveldt L. et al., “Growth for Society: Collaborative governance, social innovation, and public value” 2

Bum Lee Y. et al., "Pay-for-Success Governance for Social Value: Social impact bonds, outcomes-based contracting, and the measurement of social value” 6

Prasojo E., "Public Administration and Governance in Indonesia: Comparative insights on strategic governance of Southeast Asia’s largest democracy” 10

Giani L. et al., "Governing Uncertainty: Public Administration between natural–urban risk governance and the agentic AI transition” 14

De La Cruz M. & Mergoni A., "Data-Driven Governance: Performance, monitoring, and AI-enabled public administration” 19

Inatsugu H. & Shibuya Y., "Civic Tech and Collaborative Governance for Social Innovation and Public Value” 23

Kudo H. et al., "AI Readiness in Local Governments” 25

Ferraz D. & Yabut S., "Public Administration Education, Professionalisation and Executive Learning for State Capacity, Democratic Resilience and Public Value in an Era of AI and Populism” 28

Dorasamy N. & Mazenda A., "Plural Knowledge Systems and Collaborative Governance: Reimagining Policy Studies Beyond Western-Centric Frameworks” 33

Saner R. et al., "Collaborative Governance for Regenerative Silver Economy” 37

Komseli F. & Bourmbouli A., "Leadership Skills and Competencies for Anticipatory Social Innovation and Collaborative Governance” 40

Gomes R. et al., "Transparency, Citizenship and Digital Government in Latin America” 44

Holtzhausen N. & Wessels R., "Africa’s Digital Future: Governing Artificial Intelligence, emerging technologies and institutional transformation” 48

Qarmout T. et al., "Resilient and Adaptive Governance: Policy, Administration, and Recovery in Fragile States” 52

Vicher D., "Revival of State-Owned Entreprises” 54

Practicalities 57



Growth for Society: Collaborative governance, social innovation, and social value

Prof. Dr. Liza Van Jaarsveldt; University of South Africa;
manuela.barreca@usi.ch

Prof. Dr. Seung-Bum Yang; Konkuk University;
sbyang@konkuk.ac.kr

Dr. Steve Troupin; International Institute of Administrative Sciences;
s.troupin@iias-iisa.org

Sustainability is being recentred in a world of persistent and overlapping crises — climate change, demographic shifts, digital transformation, and deepening inequality. These challenges expose the structural limits of traditional capitalism and of government-only responses, generating a growing need for social innovation, effective solutions to complex societal problems, and the preservation and strengthening of public value. Steering society toward these goals requires new forms of collaborative governance. Because the scale and complexity of the issues exceed the capacity of public administration alone, the private sector is increasingly called upon as an active partner in co-designing and co-implementing solutions through policy-market linkage platforms, corporate social-value strategies, and ESG (Environmental, Social and Governance)-linked initiatives.

At the same time, the emergence of a multipolar order has prompted a critical re-examination of global interdependencies. What was once celebrated under the liberal international order is now widely perceived as a source of vulnerability and potential zero-sum competition. In this context, social and environmental concerns are increasingly subordinated to the pursuit of economic competitiveness while national champions are expected to secure meaningful insertion into global value chains and the soft-power architectures that accompany them. This dynamic points toward a rejuvenation of the classic developmental-state model, in which the public sector retains strategic leadership and long-term planning to nurture technological capabilities and convert societal resources into sustained national competitive advantage.



Both perspectives (collaborative governance and the new multipolar world order) ultimately converge on the realisation and re-establishment of national priorities. These priorities may be framed either as a national adaptation of the global SDG/ESG agenda — emphasising social innovation and public-value creation — or as the building of competitive advantage in a changing global context. In either case, the overarching objective is to harness economic growth for broader societal resilience and legitimacy.

What both visions share is the imperative to mobilise society for these national goals. The central question that remains open — and that public administration scholarship must address — is whether this mobilisation is best achieved through direct governmental steering or through intermediary structures such as national champions operating under new governance frameworks of accountability, transparency, and performance.

The rise of artificial general intelligence (AGI) provides a powerful illustration of this shared challenge. Participation in the AI revolution demands the creation of broad skills and talent pools so that society at large can benefit from productivity gains and leapfrogging opportunities, while national champions must simultaneously secure strategic insertion into global value chains and the soft-power systems they sustain. Public administration is called upon to deliver the enabling conditions: coordinated investment in human capital and training systems, forward-looking regulatory and ethical frameworks, and governance mechanisms that ensure corporate collaboration serves national priorities without compromising public value or administrative legitimacy.

Against this backdrop, the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), in partnership with Konkuk University and with the support of SK Group and the Korean Chamber of Commerce and Industry, invites scholars, practitioners, and policymakers to contribute to the international conference *"Growth for Society: Collaborative Governance, Social Innovation, and Public Value"* in Seoul.

We welcome theoretical, empirical, comparative, and policy-oriented contributions that engage with classical public administration themes — including bureaucratic capacity, institutional design, administrative law, and the politics-administration nexus — while addressing contemporary challenges. Submissions may relate to the following themes (non-exhaustive):

- National industrial policies: public-sector strategies for mobilising social and environmental enablers to build and sustain competitive advantage; the role of



administrative autonomy, expertise, and coordination; collaborative platforms linking public goals with corporate social-value initiatives.

- Resilience in an evolving global context: governance of supply-chain architectures, strategic autonomy, and alliance management amid shifting interdependencies; implications for intergovernmental relations and administrative adaptability in a multipolar world.
- Public administration guiding the AGI transition: talent development, regulatory and ethical frameworks, harvesting broad productivity gains, and mitigating social and environmental risks; the interplay between bureaucratic discretion, corporate collaboration in global value chains, and innovation governance.
- Comparative policies and projects: lessons from developmental experiences across the Global North and South in adapting industrial, resilience, and innovation strategies to new realities; comparative public administration perspectives on state capacity, institutional variation, and collaborative governance models.
- The internal-external interface: how domestic social cohesion, welfare institutions, human-capital policies, and public-value creation interact with external competitive positioning; the role of administrative traditions and public service values in mediating these relationships.
- Social innovation: the role of public administration in fostering and scaling innovative responses to complex social challenges; governance of cross-sector collaboration among government, civil society, and private actors; institutional conditions for diffusion and sustainability; and implications for inclusive growth, social cohesion, public value creation, and alignment with national development priorities.

We warmly welcome individual papers and panel proposals. A selection of high-quality papers will be considered for a special issue of the *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. In addition, an edited book volume focusing on one of the core conference themes will be announced at a later stage.

This conference offers a unique platform to advance rigorous debate and practical insights on how public administration — in its classical and evolving forms — can shape sustainable competitiveness and growth for society in an era defined by geopolitical flux, technological disruption, and the search for collaborative solutions to shared societal challenges. We look forward to your contributions and to welcoming you in Seoul.



Selected references

Johnson, C. (1982). MITI and the Japanese miracle: The growth of industrial policy, 1925–1975. Stanford University Press. J

Juhász, R., Lane, N., & Rodrik, D. (2024). The new economics of industrial policy. Annual Review of Economics, 16, 213–242. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-081023-024638

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2019). Bound to fail: The rise and fall of the liberal international order. International Security, 43(4), 7–50. https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00342

Noman, A., & Stiglitz, J. E. (Eds.). (2017). Efficiency, finance, and varieties of industrial policy: Guiding resources, learning, and technology for sustained growth. Columbia University Press.

OECD. (2025). Governing with artificial intelligence: The state of play and way forward in core government functions. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/795de142-en

Rodrik, D. (2014). Green industrial policy. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 30(3), 469–491. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/gru025

Zuiderwijk, A., Chen, Y.-C., & Salem, F. (2021). Implications of the use of artificial intelligence in public governance: A systematic literature review and a research agenda. Government Information Quarterly, 38(3), Article 101577. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101577



Pay-for-Success Governance for Social Value: Social impact bonds, outcomes-based contracting, and the measurement of social value

Prof. Dr. Young Bum Lee; Vice-President for External Affairs, Konkuk University; Director, Konkuk Institute of Health and Aging Society (KIHAS); yblee97@konkuk.ac.kr

Prof. Dr. Seung-Bum Yang; Department of Public Administration, Konkuk University; sbyang@konkuk.ac.kr

Prof. Dr. Min-Han Kim; Department of Maritime Administration, National Korea Maritime & Ocean University; minhankim@kmou.ac.kr

Prof. Dr. Yoon Jin Lee; Konkuk Institute of Health and Aging Society (KIHAS), Konkuk University; leeyoonjin@konkuk.ac.kr

Dr. Sangeun Lee; Konkuk Institute of Health and Aging Society (KIHAS), Konkuk University; samslee@konkuk.ac.kr

Alignment with the conference theme

This track speaks directly to the central conference theme, "Growth for Society: Collaborative Governance, Social Innovation, and Public Value," and develops its Social Innovation strand. It takes as its starting point the conviction that economic growth and social value must advance together rather than as competing objectives, and asks how public administration can institutionalise that linkage. Where the main call frames the question of how to mobilise private and social actors for national and social goals, this track examines one of the most concrete answers now being tested worldwide: paying for measurable social outcomes rather than for inputs or activities.

Background and rationale

Grant- and subsidy-based funding has well-known limits. It disburses public money against budgets and activities rather than against results, offers weak incentives for providers to innovate, and rarely tests whether a social problem has actually been solved.



As fiscal pressure rises and social problems grow more complex — ageing societies, health and care, youth unemployment, recidivism, homelessness — governments are searching for instruments that channel private and social capital into the social experimentation of innovation, while shifting performance risk away from the public purse and paying only for what works.

Outcomes-based instruments respond to this search. The principal policy mechanisms are variously called social impact bonds (SIBs), pay-for-success, outcomes-based contracting, or social outcomes contracts. In the basic model, private or social investors provide the upfront capital, service providers deliver an intervention to solve a defined social problem, an independent evaluator verifies the agreed outcomes, and government repays investors — with a return — only when those outcomes are actually achieved. The instrument thus operationalises a simple but demanding idea: when social experimentation produces verified results, paying an incentive for those results is both fairer and more efficient than paying for effort alone.

A growing body of comparative experience makes this an opportune moment for stocktaking. The clearest institutional structures have emerged in the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, Portugal, and Finland, where governments define a social problem, private and social actors attempt to solve it, outcomes are measured, and compensation is paid when social value is demonstrably created. These cases differ in their commissioning architecture, the role of intermediaries and outcomes funds, the sectors addressed, and the degree to which the model has been embedded in routine public administration rather than remaining a pilot. Together they raise a deeper governance question that this track places at its centre: how can social value be measured, priced, and — ultimately — monetised and traded, without distorting the public purpose it is meant to serve?

The track welcomes both case-based and theoretical contributions. Empirical case studies of individual schemes, national programmes, or outcomes funds are as welcome as conceptual and theoretical work on outcome measurement, social-value valuation, incentive design, and the administrative-law and accountability implications of paying private actors for public results.



Indicative thematic areas

- Institutionalising outcomes-based payment: how SIBs, pay-for-success, and social outcomes contracts move from one-off pilots to embedded instruments of public administration and budgeting.
- Beyond subsidies: comparing input-, activity-, and outcome-based funding, and the incentive structures each creates for innovation and risk-taking by providers.
- Collaborative financing architectures: the roles of government commissioners, social and private investors, intermediaries, outcomes funds, and independent evaluators.
- Measuring and pricing social value: outcome metrics, counterfactuals and attribution, social return on investment, and the methodological limits of monetising social value.
- Monetising and trading social value: outcome markets, social-value exchanges, and the opportunities and risks of treating verified social outcomes as tradable assets.
- Sectoral applications: health and long-term care, governance for sustainable ageing, employment, education, housing, and reintegration.
- Comparative governance: lessons from the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, Portugal, Finland, and emerging adopters, including transferability to the Korean and Asian contexts.
- Accountability, equity, and public value: transparency, gaming and cream-skimming risks, administrative-law questions, and safeguards that keep outcome payment aligned with the common good.

Guiding questions

- How can public administration institutionalise the principle that growth and social value should advance together, rather than treating social value as a residual of growth?
- Where grant and subsidy funding reaches its limits, when are outcomes-based instruments a superior alternative — and when are they not?
- How should the outcomes of social experimentation be defined, measured, and verified so that incentive payments reward genuine social value rather than measurable proxies?



- Can social value be credibly monetised and traded, and what governance safeguards would such outcome markets require?
- What do the experiences of the UK, US, Australia, Portugal, and Finland reveal about the institutional conditions under which pay-for-success scales, stalls, or fails?
- How can outcomes-based contracting be designed to avoid cream-skimming, gaming, and inequitable access while preserving accountability and public legitimacy?

Methodological approach and submissions

The track adopts an open and pluralistic stance. It welcomes individual papers and panel proposals, and both case-based and theoretical contributions: comparative and single-case studies, programme and policy evaluations, and mixed-methods work, as well as conceptual and theory-driven papers on social-value measurement, incentive design, and the public-administration foundations of outcomes-based governance. Submissions are invited from early-career and senior scholars, and from practitioners and policymakers engaged in designing or commissioning outcomes-based schemes.

Selected references

Albertson, K., Fox, C., O'Leary, C., & Painter, G. (2018). Payment by Results and Social Impact Bonds: Outcome-based payment systems in the UK and US. Bristol University Press.

Carter, E., FitzGerald, C., Dixon, R., Economy, C., Hameed, T., & Airoldi, M. (2018). Building the tools for public services to secure better outcomes: Collaboration, prevention, innovation. Government Outcomes Lab, Blavatnik School of Government, University of Oxford.

Fraser, A., Tan, S., Lagarde, M., & Mays, N. (2018). Narratives of promise, narratives of caution: A review of the literature on Social Impact Bonds. Social Policy & Administration, 52(1), 4–28. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12260

Mulgan, G. (2010). Measuring social value. Stanford Social Innovation Review, 8(3), 38–43.

OECD. (2016). Understanding Social Impact Bonds. OECD Working Paper. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Warner, M. E. (2013). Private finance for public goods: Social impact bonds. Journal of Economic Policy Reform, 16(4), 303–319. https://doi.org/10.1080/17487870.2013.835727



Public Administration and Governance in Indonesia: Comparative insights on strategic governance of Southeast Asia's largest democracy

Prof. Dr. Eko Prasojo; President, Asian Group for Public Administration (AGPA); Chairman, Universitas Indonesia Council of Professors
prasojo1@ui.ac.id

Alignment with the conference theme

This panel speaks most directly to the conference theme of Comparative Policies and Projects, while bridging into Social Innovation and The Internal-External Interface. It contributes a developing-democracy perspective grounded in more than two decades of administrative reform in Southeast Asia's largest democracy and the world's largest Muslim-majority country and engages directly with classical public administration themes that the call for contributions invites participants to reconsider in light of contemporary challenges.

Introduction and rationale

Over the past quarter century, Indonesia's public administration has undergone successive waves of transformation: the redrawing of authority and fiscal relations between levels of government following the 1999 decentralisation, followed by series of rebalancing attempts in the last decade; comprehensive institutional and personnel reform under the banner of *reformasi birokrasi* (bureaucratic reform), combining New Public Management, neo-Weberian, and New Public Governance elements; and the accelerated digital transformation of public services and governance. These developments unfold within a multilevel system spanning more than 500 local governments and 80,000 villages, placing Indonesia among the most administratively complex states in the Global South.

This panel brings together scholars working on Indonesian public administration and governance, with the aim of placing this case in structured dialogue with the IIAS 2026 themes. Contemporary Indonesian public administration, including its spanning



multilevel governance; the governance of resources, tasks, and services; modernisation processes; and the management of public policies, offers a distinctive comparator for engaging global discourse on collaborative governance, social innovation, and public value. The panel is open to additional contributions from scholars whose work speaks to these themes.

The panel addresses three interlocking questions. (1) How does a developmental democracy in the Global South orchestrate collaborative governance within its multi-level settings to deliver public services and produce public value? (2) What breakthroughs have emerged from Indonesia's reform trajectory, and what institutional conditions have enabled or constrained their scaling and diffusion? (3) How do domestic administrative traditions, decentralisation, participatory institutions, and public trust dynamics mediate Indonesia's positioning amid shifting global interdependencies, and what lessons does this offer for comparative public administration?

Panel format

Each session of the panel consists of three to four presenters. A session comprises 10-minute paper presentations for each presenter, followed by a 10-minute response from the discussant and a 15- to 20-minute moderated discussion with the audience. The chair opens with a brief framing of Indonesia's reform trajectory and the analytic logic linking the papers to the conference themes and closes with a synthesis identifying comparative implications for public administration scholarship and policy practice.

Speakers and Presentations

The presenters listed below are confirmed to take part in the panel and have expressed their interest in attending the Seoul conference. The panel remains open to additional contributions from scholars working on related themes, up to the conference's submission deadline.

- Prof. Dr. Eko Prasojo (Universitas Indonesia), "Administrative Reforms in Indonesia: From approaches to practices": This paper examines Indonesia's reformasi birokrasi as an assemblage of New Public Management, neo-Weberian, and New Public Governance approaches layered into a single national reform trajectory. It traces the approaches, strategies, and structural challenges of more than two decades of administrative reform, and asks what a hybrid,



path-dependent reform path reveals about administrative learning, the limits of imported reform templates, and the institutional preconditions for collaborative governance and public-value creation in a developing democracy context.

- Dr. Defny Holidin (Universitas Indonesia), "Non-Western Public Administration in Practice: In Search of the Indonesian Public Administration": Following the Non-Western Public Administration (NWPA) agenda, this paper asks whether Indonesian public administration constitutes a distinctive paradigm in its own right. Indonesia's PA sits at the intersection of colonial administrative legacies, Islamic values rooted in a majority-Muslim society, and assimilated Confucian traditions, while indigenous cooperative institutions have long practised culturally-embedded co-production and self-governance. The paper traces how these practices have survived modernisation, nation-building, regime change, and successive waves of donor-supported reform, and asks what they imply for global debates on collaborative governance and public value — particularly for theorising forms of state–society collaboration that pre-date and complicate the Western canon.
- Desy Hariyati, "Democracy, Participation, and Public Trust: Citizen Engagement in Indonesia's Public Administration": This paper examines the fluctuating relationship between Indonesian society and the state through the lens of citizen participation in public policy. It analyses the two-sided dynamic of public trust — citizens' trust in the government and the government's trust in citizens — as a foundation for collaborative governance and public-value creation. Drawing on Indonesia's two-decade democratic trajectory, the paper identifies the institutional conditions that strengthen or weaken participatory governance, and considers what these dynamics suggest for the role of public administration in sustaining democratic legitimacy under conditions of political volatility.
- Zuliansyah Putra Zulkarnain, "Performance Management, Accountability, and Transparency in Indonesia's Public Administration": This paper examines how the democratic governance principles of accountability and transparency have been operationalised — with their modifications and deviations — across Indonesia's reform era. It focuses on the dynamics of performance accountability, with particular attention to the government performance accountability system (SAKIP), and traces the unintended consequences, gaming behaviours, and ritualisation that performance regimes can produce. The



paper draws comparative implications for how public-value creation can be reconciled with managerial accountability in developing administrative states.

A long-standing scholar of public management reform, strategic governance, and public-sector innovation; the discussant will engage the papers in comparative perspective. Drawing on his extensive comparative scholarship across European and Asian administrative traditions, he will identify cross-cutting themes, points of tension, and questions for dialogue with participants from other administrative traditions.

Endorsements

- Asian Group for Public Administration (AGPA)
- The Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (Kemen PANRB) of the Republic of Indonesia
- Indonesia Association for Public Administration (IAPA)
- Universitas Indonesia Center for Study of Governance and Administrative Reform (UI-CSGAR)
- Faculty of Administrative Sciences Universitas Indonesia (FIA UI)



IIAS 2026 CONFERENCE
Seoul, South Korea November 17-20

Growth for Society: Collaborative Governance, Social Innovation, and Social Value

Governing Uncertainty: Public Administration between natural–urban risk governance and the agentic AI transition

Loredana Giani; Università Europea di Roma
loredana.giani@unier.it

Gabriella Racca; Università di Torino;
gabriella.racca@unito.it

Aristide Police; LUISS Business School;
aristide.police@policepartners.it

Marina d'Orsogna; University of Teramo;
marina.dorsogna@gmail.com

Contemporary public administrations operate at the intersection of two transformations that, although often examined separately, share a common analytical core: the management of uncertainty. On one side, climate change, environmental degradation, rapid urbanisation and the growing frequency of extreme events – floods, wildfires, heatwaves and earthquakes, as well as urban unrest and threats to public safety – are exposing structural vulnerabilities in traditional regulatory frameworks and governance models. On the other side, the diffusion of Artificial Intelligence, and increasingly of agentic AI systems capable of autonomously coordinating multi-step administrative procedures, is reshaping the organisation and exercise of public power, the design of regulation and the legitimacy of digital decision-making. This track brings these two perspectives into a single conversation, asking how public administrations can govern interconnected natural, urban and technological risks while preserving constitutional principles, fundamental rights, the rule of law and institutional trust.

The track treats security and risk as foundational paradigms of contemporary public governance. Security is understood not merely as the preservation of order or the control of crime, but as the outcome of institutional processes designed to anticipate, interpret and manage uncertainty. Urban environments are privileged laboratories for observing this shift: cities concentrate environmental vulnerabilities, social inequalities, infrastructural interdependencies and security demands, compelling administrations to



manage overlapping hazards through integrated, multi-level arrangements. Within this frame, urban security emerges as a multidimensional governance challenge that links public order, social cohesion, spatial planning, technological infrastructures and citizens' trust – and that is increasingly mediated by data ecosystems and algorithmic tools.

A central concern is administrative decision-making under conditions of scientific uncertainty, contested or incomplete knowledge and severe time pressure. Public authorities must continually balance precaution, proportionality and urgency against fundamental rights and democratic accountability, while translating expert assessments and probabilistic risk analyses into regulatory design, emergency preparedness, crisis response and long-term planning. The integration of AI and agentic systems intensifies this challenge: where algorithmic agents interpret data, coordinate workflows across institutional and territorial boundaries and interact dynamically with external actors, the relationship between scientific expertise, administrative discretion and political responsibility is recomposed. Public law is therefore called upon not only to regulate technological and environmental innovation, but to guide and shape it, ensuring that AI strengthens rather than replaces human intelligence and remains aligned with the public interest and the common good.

The track also foregrounds the normative and democratic dimensions of risk governance. Accountability, transparency and responsibility are especially salient where decisions are taken under uncertainty and may carry significant social, economic, environmental and public – safety consequences – and where those decisions are increasingly supported, or partly delegated, to automated systems. Questions of administrative responsibility after disaster, of explainability and contestability of AI-supported choices, and of post-event institutional learning are examined together, as facets of a single problem: how administrations sustain legitimacy when they act on the basis of imperfect knowledge and powerful but opaque technologies. Particular attention is devoted to public trust, citizen engagement and communication strategies as conditions for societal and urban resilience and for the acceptability of administrative action in both environmental and digital domains.

Adopting a comparative and interdisciplinary perspective, and welcoming experiences and regulatory approaches from within and beyond the European Union, the track invites theoretical and empirical contributions that bridge administrative theory, public law, public management, political science, computer science and ethics. The objective is to



advance understanding of how public administrations can adapt their structures, capacities and decision-making processes to govern complex, systemic and transboundary risks – natural, urban and technological alike – fostering resilience while maintaining democratic legitimacy in an increasingly uncertain and interconnected environment.

Indicative thematic areas

Risk, security and the governance of uncertainty

- Administrative decision-making under scientific uncertainty: precaution, proportionality, discretion and accountability in natural risk management.
- From prevention to resilience: institutional capacities for anticipation, adaptation and long-term risk reduction.
- Urban security as risk governance: prevention, anticipation and democratic legitimacy beyond reactive law enforcement.
- Multi-level and networked governance: coordination challenges across local, regional, national and supranational levels, and with private actors and civil society.
- Accountability after disaster: administrative responsibility, blame avoidance, public trust and institutional learning.

Artificial intelligence, agentic systems and the transformation of public power

- Agentic AI in public organisations: autonomous management of administrative procedures and cross-boundary workflow coordination.
- Designing and governing AI to remain aligned with constitutional principles, fundamental rights and the rule of law.
- Experimental and narrative-based governance: regulatory sandboxes, digital identity and trust frameworks, ID wallets and interoperable infrastructures.
- AI-driven spatial and urban governance, AI-enabled health governance, and AI in local public services.
- Innovation-driven public procurement, interoperable data ecosystems, and AI for welfare, inclusion and the common good.



Crossing the two perspectives

- The interaction between scientific expertise, algorithmic mediation and administrative discretion in risk-based regulation.
- Legitimacy, transparency and contestability of AI-supported decisions in environmental, urban security and emergency contexts.
- Resilience, preparedness and crisis response in the age of data-driven and agentic public administration.

On-site sentinels: environmental sensors and in-field monitoring infrastructures

A distinctive area concerns "on-site sentinels" – the networks of environmental sensors and Internet-of-Things monitoring devices increasingly deployed in territories and urban environments to detect, measure and transmit data on natural and infrastructural hazards in real time. These distributed monitoring infrastructures act as the perceptual layer of risk governance and as the empirical basis for early warning systems, agentic decision-support and data-driven coordination. Their diffusion raises questions that are simultaneously legal and non-legal, and that public administrations must address jointly.

- Legal: allocation of competence and responsibility for the installation, ownership and maintenance of sensor networks across administrative levels and between public and private actors.
- Legal: liability and accountability for harm arising from sensor malfunction, false negatives, missed alerts or failure to act on transmitted data.
- Legal: data protection, privacy and surveillance limits where environmental monitoring intersects with the observation of persons, spaces and behaviours in urban settings.
- Legal: evidentiary value and procedural use of sensor-generated data in administrative decisions, emergency measures and post-disaster proceedings.
- Non-legal: technical reliability, calibration, sensor coverage gaps and the risk of uneven monitoring across territories and vulnerable communities.
- Non-legal: organisational capacity to interpret continuous data flows, integrate them with expert knowledge and translate them into timely operational decisions.
- Non-legal: interoperability, data governance and cybersecurity of sentinel infrastructures within wider digital ecosystems and agentic AI systems.



- Non-legal: public trust, transparency and citizen engagement in sensor deployment, including community-based and participatory monitoring.

Methodological approach and submissions

The track adopts an open and pluralistic methodological stance. It welcomes qualitative designs – comparative and single-case studies, legal and policy analysis, document analysis, interviews and process tracing – as well as quantitative and mixed-methods work drawing on survey data, administrative datasets and policy evaluations. Longitudinal and post-event studies that capture institutional learning, adaptation and reform are particularly encouraged, as are conceptual and theory-driven contributions that refine existing frameworks or develop new analytical models. Submissions are invited from early-career and senior scholars across public administration, public law, public management, political science, computer science and ethics.



Data-Driven Governance: Performance, monitoring, and AI-enabled public administration

Dr. Marco De la Cruz; Research Fellow, KU Leuven;
marco.delacruzs@kuleuven.be

Anna Mergoni; Senior Researcher, HIVA, KU Leuven;
anna.mergoni@kuleuven.be

Core Question

How can states measure, monitor, and improve governance performance under conditions of technological disruption, strategic competition, and rising societal complexity?

Background

This autonomous track explores how public administrations can measure, evaluate, and enhance governance performance in an era shaped by AI, geopolitical fragmentation, industrial transformation, and complex societal challenges. The track focuses on quantitative and comparative approaches to governance analysis, with particular attention to the role of data infrastructures, computational methods, and performance-monitoring systems in supporting adaptive and resilient states.

We welcome contributions examining how governments assess administrative capacity, public value creation, policy effectiveness, institutional resilience, and innovation outcomes across different national and regional contexts. The track is especially interested in the opportunities and risks associated with AI-enabled governance, including algorithmic decision-making, digital-state capacity, accountability mechanisms, and new forms of public-private coordination within global value chains.

Relevant topics include, but are not limited to:

- Quantitative indicators of governance quality, administrative capacity, and public-sector performance
- AI and data-driven approaches to policy monitoring and evaluation



- Comparative measurement of industrial-policy effectiveness and innovation governance
- Metrics and methodologies for resilience, strategic autonomy, and supply-chain governance
- Computational public administration and digital governance analytics
- Bureaucratic capacity, institutional adaptation, and comparative state effectiveness
- Public-value measurement and social-impact evaluation
- Governance of AI ecosystems and cross-sector collaboration
- Big data, machine learning, and predictive analytics in public administration
- Ethical, political, and methodological challenges in governance quantification
- Comparative perspectives from the Global North and South
- Open-government data, transparency, and accountability systems
- Human-capital measurement and talent strategies in AI transitions
- Governance dashboards, observatories, and real-time administrative monitoring

Beyond presenting individual research findings, this track is designed to contribute to the consolidation of an emerging field at the intersection of computational public administration, governance analytics, and AI-enabled state capacity measurement.

The track seeks to generate three types of outputs:

- Conceptual convergence, by identifying shared analytical frameworks for governance performance in AI-driven environments
- Methodological advancement, by encouraging the development and comparison of computational, quantitative, and mixed-methods approaches
- Comparative empirical grounding, by bringing together evidence from diverse institutional and regional contexts, particularly across the Global North and South

A key ambition is to move beyond isolated case studies toward a more systematic understanding of how states measure and adapt performance in technologically mediated governance systems.



Intellectual rationale and research gap

Despite rapid advances in digital government, AI-enabled administration, and performance management systems, governance measurement remains conceptually and methodologically fragmented. This fragmentation reflects a deeper disjunction between how performance is traditionally defined, through relatively stable administrative indicators, and how it is increasingly produced in practice through algorithmic systems, real-time data infrastructures, and geopolitically shaped governance environments. As a result, existing frameworks struggle to capture how these technologies and constraints jointly reshape what "state performance" means, how it can be observed, and how it should be evaluated.

In particular, three gaps remain insufficiently addressed. First, governance indicators remain largely static and institutionally bounded, limiting their ability to capture dynamic and adaptive state capacities. Second, emerging AI systems in public administration are often studied in isolation from broader performance measurement regimes, resulting in a disconnect between technological capability and governance evaluation. Third, comparative research on governance performance still lacks robust frameworks for systematically integrating Global North and South perspectives under shared analytical standards.

This track addresses these gaps by advancing a unified research agenda on data-driven governance measurement and AI-enabled performance monitoring systems.

Track format and scholarly exchange

To strengthen cumulative learning, the track will adopt a structured discussant model. Each paper session will include designated discussants, and authors will be invited to provide short written reflections on at least one other paper within the track.

Members

- **Marco De la Cruz** holds a PhD in Public Governance, an MSc in Statistics and Data Science (KU Leuven), and an Advanced Master in Development Evaluation (University of Antwerp). He is Scientific Director at the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), leading applied research on government performance and coordinating international projects.He has



contributed to projects including COST Action EfficientJustice (EU court benchmarking), REMIT (EU Horizon semiconductor policy), and MLUMSE (ERASMUS+ higher education reform). As former Senior Research Expert at Ipsos, he served on the AI Advisory Board for European Public Affairs, applied machine learning to Eurobarometer sentiment analysis, and delivered analytics to the European Central Bank (Consumer Expectations Survey, SPACE payment study). He designed methodology for a European Commission DG Competition study on payment cards and analyzed the OECD Trust Survey. He recently trained the European Parliament on AI integration for policy research. His work bridges governance, advanced quantitative methods, and responsible AI use in research.

- **Anna Mergoni** is a Senior Researcher at HIVA, KU Leuven, within the Poverty and Migration Research Group. Her research focuses on education policy, equal opportunities in education, school funding, ICT use in schools, school leadership, and AI integration. Her methodological interests include policy evaluation, literature reviews, econometrics, and programming in R.



Civic Tech and Collaborative Governance for Social Innovation and Public Value

Prof. Hiroaki Inatsugu, Waseda University,
inatsugu@waseda.jp

Assoc. Prof. Yuya Shibuya, University of Tokyo,
yuya-shibuya@iii.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Sustainability and societal resilience are being re-centered in a world facing persistent crises such as demographic shifts and digital transformation. Addressing these complex challenges requires "Collaborative Governance" and "Social Innovation" that go beyond traditional government-only responses. This panel examines the critical role of Civic Tech in driving collaborative governance, fostering social innovation, and creating public value in the digitized society.

Civic Tech involves citizen-driven activities and technologies designed to shape society and solve local public issues. While digitization provides a powerful foundation for civil society engagement—enabling real-time, location-independent information exchange and idea refinement—its real-world implications for public value creation require deeper exploration.

Building on the highly successful Civic Tech panel at the IIAS-DARPG India Conference 2025, which featured diverse empirical studies ranging from AI for the SDGs, inclusive digital ID authentication, and citizen-led eco-activity platforms to remote sensing for agricultural insurance, this panel seeks to further explore the transformative impact of Civic Tech. We invite papers that examine how Civic Tech and digital platforms can serve as policy-market linkages to co-design and co-implement solutions to complex societal problems.



Topics of interest

We are particularly interested in trends, practices, and implications of Civic Tech for democratic participation and problem-solving. Submissions may relate to the following themes (but are not limited to):

- Civic Tech practices and their implications for collaborative governance and social innovation.
- The relationship between e-Government, digital public goods, and citizen participation.
- Inclusive design in digital platforms to overcome the digital divide and prevent unintended exclusions.
- Civic Tech's contribution to public value, sustainability, and societal resilience.
- The impact of emerging technologies (such as AI) on citizen engagement, community formation, and administrative reform.

Submissions employing qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods approaches are welcome. In addition, papers addressing both empirical and normative questions are highly encouraged.

References

Ayre, L. B., & Craner, J. (2017). Technology column: public libraries as civic technology hubs. Public Library Quarterly, 36(4), 367–374.

Buell, R. W., Porter, E., & Norton, M. I. (2021). Surfacing the Submerged State: Operational Transparency Increases Trust in and Engagement with Government. Manufacturing & Service Operations Management, 23(4), 781-802.

Hamm, A., Shibuya, Y., Pargman, T. C., et al. (2024). What Does 'Failure' Mean in Civic Tech? We Need Continued Conversations About Discontinuation. Interactions, 31(2), 34–38.

OECD. (2025). Governing with artificial intelligence: The state of play and way forward in core government functions. OECD Publishing.

Raetzsch, C., Hamm, A., & Shibuya, Y. (2023). Mainstreaming civic tech and citizen sensing: a research agenda on co-creation methods, data interfaces, and impact pathways. Frontiers in Environmental Science, 11.

Tai, K. T., Porumbescu, G., & Shon, J. (2019). Can e-participation stimulate offline citizen participation: an empirical test with practical implications. Public Management Review, 22(2), 278–296.

.



AI Readiness in Local Governments

Hiroko Kudo, Professor, Faculty of Law, Chuo University;
hkudo001a@g.chuo-u.ac.jp

Aleksander Aristovnik, Professor, Faculty of Public Administration, University of Ljubljana;
aleksander.aristovnik@fu.uni-lj.si

Masao Kikuchi, Professor, School of Business Administration, Meiji University;
kms@meiji.ac.jp

Matej Babšek, Matej, Research Associate, Faculty of Public Administration, University of Ljubljana;
matej.babsek@fu.uni-lj.si

Tadateru Sugawa, Associate Professor, Faculty of Policy Studies, Doshisha University;
tsugawa@mail.doshisha.ac.jp

Dejan Ravšelj, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Public Administration, University of Ljubljana;
dejan.ravselj@fu.uni-lj.si

Kazunari Togawa, Associate Professor, Faculty of Policy Studies, Chiba University of Commerce
k-togawa@cuc.ac.jp

This panel tries to explore organizational and individual readiness for artificial intelligence (AI) adoption in local governments.

Local governments are the institutions responsible for delivering essential public services toward residents and community, and improving efficiency of their operations is critical to the citizens' well-being. Across many countries, local governments have pursued a wide range of reforms in organizational management and service delivery; however, the structural rigidities inherent in legal frameworks and administrative organizations have impeded reform efforts and large-scale organizational restructuring. This administrative



inertia is particularly evident in the context of AI. While many organizations - predominantly in the private sector - have leveraged rapidly advancing AI to achieve greater efficiency and optimization in decision-making, management, and operational processes, AI adoption in public administration remains limited. This limited uptake stems from structural barriers such as legacy administrative systems and rigid procedures, alongside chronic shortages of qualified personnel and financial resources.

While the importance of integrating AI into the public sector has been growing, empirical evidence regarding the status quo of AI readiness in public administration, especially among local governments, remains scarce. What critical factors, then, determine the success and/or failure of AI adoption in local governance? How do public sector employees, particularly public managers, perceive these technologies and envision their application in practice? These questions are critical to any rigorous inquiry into the future of public management.

This panel aims to identify the organizational and human resource conditions necessary for AI adoption in local governments, examine the roles AI is expected to play, and shed light on the challenges currently faced by pioneering municipalities and their practices. In doing so, the panel seeks to explore both theoretical contributions and empirical insights relevant to academic research and local government practice alike. We warmly welcome contributions that offer – especially -comparative analyses or diverse regional perspectives from around the world. Contributions from practitioners are welcome to enrich the discussion with researchers.

Recommended topics include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Top-down vs. bottom-up approaches to AI adoption in local governments
- Who determines policies and strategies and prepares financial resource for AI adoption? National government or each local government?
- The scope and limits of standardization in AI use within local governments
- Who should take responsibility for developing and securing human resources with AI competencies, and how?
- How to deal with human resources? In-house capacity building or outsourcing?
- Who should regulate AI use in local government, and by what mechanisms?
- Who should evaluate use and application of AI in local governments, and how?
- Dialogue between theory and practice: bridging academic research and local government practitioners



References

Ahn, M. J., & Chen, Y. C. (2022). Digital transformation toward AI-augmented public administration: The perception of government employees and the willingness to use AI in government. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(2), 101664.

Aristovnik, A., Murko, E., Kristl, N., & Ravšelj, D. (2025). Disruptive technology capabilities in local governments: An empirical study. *Information Polity*, 30(1), 14-33.

Babšek, M., Ravšelj, D., Umek, L., & Aristovnik, A. (2025). Artificial intelligence adoption in public administration: An overview of top-cited articles and practical applications. *AI*, 6(3), 44.

Mikalef, P., Lemmer, K., Schaefer, C., Ylinen, M., Fjørtoft, S. O., Torvatn, H. Y., et al. (2022). Enabling AI capabilities in government agencies: A study of determinants for European municipalities. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(4), 101596.

OECD (2025), "Governing with Artificial Intelligence: The State of Play and Way Forward in Core Government Functions"

OECD (2026), "Digital Government Outlook 2026: From Foundations to Transformational Impact"

Sandoval-Almazan, R., Millan-Vargas, A. O., & Garcia-Contreras, R. (2024). Examining public managers' competencies of artificial intelligence implementation in local government: A quantitative study. *Government Information Quarterly*, 41(4), 101986.

Tomaževič, N., Murko, E., & Aristovnik, A. (2024). Organisational enablers of artificial intelligence adoption in public institutions: A systematic literature review. *Central European Public Administration Review*, 22(1), 109-138.



Public Administration Education, Professionalisation and Executive Learning for State Capacity, Democratic Resilience and Public Value in an Era of AI and Populism

David Alexandre Correia Ferraz; Associate Professor, ISCTE – University Institute of Lisbon; Integrated Researcher, CIES-ISCTE; Director of the PhD in Public Administration, the Master in Public Administration, and the Professional Master in Digitalisation in Public Administration; Portugal
david.ferraz@iscte-iul.pt

Sharon Grace S. Yabut; Director, Executive Education Center; Ateneo School of Government, Ateneo de Manila University
syabut@ateneo.edu

Rationale

This track proposes to examine how public administration education, professional training, executive and continuing education, lifelong learning, and professionalisation can strengthen state capacity, democratic resilience, and public value in an era marked by artificial intelligence, populist pressures, institutional fragility, accelerating governance complexity, digital transformation, and public trust challenges.

Governments are increasingly expected to steer digital transformation, regulate artificial intelligence, mobilise public and private actors, and respond to complex societal problems while preserving legality, accountability and the common good. At the same time, many public institutions face growing distrust, polarisation, anti-bureaucratic rhetoric and populist simplifications that challenge the legitimacy of expertise, merit, evidence-informed decision-making and professional public service.

The governance of AI, social innovation and collaborative growth depends not only on technology, regulation or partnerships. It also depends on the quality of public administration as a profession. Administrative capacity requires public servants and public leaders equipped with digital, analytical, legal, ethical, managerial and collaborative competencies. It also requires training systems, schools of government, universities and professional programmes — including robust executive and continuing



education offerings — capable of embedding public service values, institutional memory, impartiality, accountability and commitment to public value.

This track treats professionalisation and continuous executive learning not merely as human resources issues, but as core institutional mechanisms. In democratic systems, a professional, merit-based and ethically grounded public administration, supported by ongoing education and leadership development for serving officials, can operate as part of the broader architecture of checks and balances. It does not replace political authority, nor should it act as an unelected veto power. Its role is to safeguard legality, proportionality, technical competence, institutional continuity, evidence-informed advice and administrative impartiality, especially when governments are exposed to populist incentives, short-termism, politicisation or attempts to weaken institutional constraints.

Mid-career and senior public servants are expected to implement policies and navigate uncertainty, collaborative governance, organizational learning, and reform-oriented leadership. Executive and continuing education have become central to state capacity, institutional reform, and leadership development. While public administration studies has substantially examined governance, institutions, and policy systems, comparatively less attention has been devoted to how public servants themselves are continuously educated, professionally formed, and supported throughout their careers through lifelong learning, work-integrated and practice-based approaches, digital and hybrid modalities, and reflective practice that strengthens professional identity and public service values.

The track is anchored in classical and contemporary public administration theory. It welcomes contributions engaging with Weberian bureaucracy and its emphasis on legality, merit, hierarchy and impartiality; the Neo-Weberian State and its concern with combining professional capacity, responsiveness and citizen orientation; historical and sociological institutionalism, particularly regarding institutional resilience, path dependency, norms and administrative traditions; public value theory, with its focus on legitimacy, authorisation and collective outcomes; state capacity and administrative capacity approaches; New Public Management addressing new ways of connection between performance and value; and governance theories addressing networks, collaboration, accountability and the risks of capture.

In this perspective, public administration education, executive learning and professional training become part of the institutional infrastructure of democracy. They shape the knowledge, values and competencies through which public officials interpret political



mandates, advise decision-makers, implement policy, regulate markets, manage data, cooperate with private and civil society actors, and protect citizens' rights. In an era of AI and populism, the professionalisation of public administration — reinforced through continuous executive education and lifelong professional development — is therefore central to the capacity of the State to act with competence, legality and democratic legitimacy.

This track invites theoretical, empirical, comparative, policy-oriented and practice-based contributions on how education, executive training, evidence-based approaches, competency-based reforms, merit systems and lifelong learning can help public administrations govern technological disruption, resist politicisation and capture, rebuild citizens' trust in public institutions, and develop adaptive and ethical leadership.

The track is particularly interested in papers that connect public administration education, professionalisation and executive learning with broader debates on state capacity, industrial policy, democratic legitimacy, collaborative governance, social innovation, institutional robustness and public value. It welcomes contributions from scholars as well as from practitioners and leaders of schools of government and executive education programmes.

Possible topics include, but are not limited to:

- Public administration education and democratic resilience
- Professionalisation, merit and public service values as institutional safeguards
- Public administration as a check and balance in democratic governance
- State capacity and administrative capacity in the AI era
- AI governance, data literacy and ethical competencies in public administration
- Evidence-informed administration and resistance to populist simplification
- Executive education, continuing professional development and leadership formation in governance
- Lifelong learning and professionalisation in the public sector
- Work-integrated and practice-based learning for civil servants
- Digital and hybrid learning modalities for government professionals
- Competency development for adaptive governance
- Schools of government and public sector capacity-building
- Reflective practice, professional identity and public service values



- Training systems and public sector workforce transformation
- Administrative impartiality, legality and institutional continuity
- Collaborative governance without capture
- Public administration curricula and executive programmes for an era of AI, polarisation and populism
- Administrative law, accountability and algorithmic governance
- Universities, training institutes, schools of government and public organisations as capacity-building ecosystems
- Comparative models of public sector training, professionalisation and executive education

Keywords

Public administration education; professionalisation; executive education; continuing professional development; lifelong learning; state capacity; democratic resilience; populism; AI governance; public value; merit; public service values; institutionalism; checks and balances; training systems; evidence-informed policy; collaborative governance; practice-based learning; digital learning; adaptive governance; leadership formation; schools of government; reflective practice; professional identity.

Expected contribution to the conference theme

The proposed track directly contributes to the conference theme by focusing on the administrative, professional, educational and executive learning foundations required to turn growth, innovation and technological transformation into public value. The conference call emphasises collaborative governance, social innovation, industrial policy, public value, AGI, human capital, ethical regulation, bureaucratic capacity and institutional design. This track addresses the professional and institutional infrastructure that makes those ambitions possible: capable public servants, competent public leaders, merit-based systems, robust training institutions, schools of government, and executive education oriented towards democratic responsibility, adaptive leadership and public value creation.

While debates on collaborative governance, AGI, social innovation and renewed strategic statehood often focus on institutional design, technology, industrial policy or public-private partnerships, this track asks a prior and complementary question: what kind of



public administration — and what kind of continuous education and professional formation for its people — is needed to govern these transformations without weakening legality, accountability, merit and democratic legitimacy?

The track is expected to attract contributions from scholars, practitioners and executive education leaders working on public administration education, schools of government, public sector training, AI governance, public sector competencies, administrative reform, merit systems, democratic resilience, institutionalism and comparative public administration. As the anchor track of the education and capacity-building cluster, it provides an international platform for consolidating emerging research, comparative experiences, innovative practices and practitioner insights in this vital field.

We would be pleased to co-chair this track and to collaborate with the conference organisers in refining its scope, identifying possible additional discussants if needed, reviewing submissions and organising the accepted contributions into coherent sessions that reflect both theoretical depth and practical relevance for working public sector professionals.



Plural Knowledge Systems and Collaborative Governance: Reimagining Policy Studies Beyond Western-Centric Frameworks

Prof. Nirmala Dorasamy; Durban University of Technology;
nirmala@dut.ac.za

Prof. Adrino Mazenda; University of Pretoria, School of Public Management and Administration, South Africa;
adrino.mazenda@up.ac.za

Aim

To explore how plural knowledge systems, indigenous governance traditions, and Global South policy experiences can reimagine public administration and policy governance by strengthening collaborative governance, fostering social innovation, and enhancing public value creation in response to contemporary developmental, technological, and geopolitical challenges.

In particular, we will focus on the following:

- Explore epistemic biases that have marginalised non-Western policy experiences and governance perspectives.
- Recognise and advance indigenous governance traditions, customary institutional arrangements, community-based decision-making systems, informal governance practices, and policy innovations emerging from Global South contexts.
- Critically examine how colonial legacies and enduring power asymmetries continue to shape institutions, governance, and policy practice.
- Explore how plural knowledge systems can strengthen collaborative governance, social innovation, and public value creation.



Relevance to the conference theme

The panel directly responds to the conference's focus on collaborative governance, social innovation, and public value by interrogating whether dominant Western policy paradigms adequately explain governance challenges in diverse development contexts. Global South governance systems frequently operate through hybrid institutional arrangements combining formal state structures, indigenous governance logics, civic collaboration, and informal policy adaptation. Engagement with these plural governance forms is essential for designing inclusive public institutions capable of addressing inequality, resilience challenges, digital disruption, and developmental transformation.

Rationale

Western-centric paradigms have long shaped public policy and policy studies, often producing universalised models grounded in Global North assumptions, institutional histories, and governance traditions (Howlett, 2009; Shore & Wright, 1997). While these frameworks have contributed significantly to policy scholarship, their application in Global South contexts has frequently occurred without sufficient engagement with indigenous governance systems, lived realities, contextual institutional arrangements, and the historical conditions that shape policy environments (Mukhtarov, 2014; Zhang, 2023).

As such, this has contributed to an enduring epistemic imbalance in which policy experiences and knowledge systems from the Global South are too often treated as peripheral, rather than recognised as legitimate sources of theoretical insight, governance learning, and policy innovation (Mbembe, 2016; Eiró & Lotta, 2023). The growing conversation around decolonising policy studies reflects an important effort to confront epistemic injustice and to create space for more plural and contextually grounded ways of understanding governance, institutions, and policy action (Escobar, 2020). Within this broader shift, decolonial thinking in policy studies is not simply about critique. The thought is equally about recognising that policy itself shapes access to governance, resources, participation, and public value. In this regard, indigenous, community-based, and experiential knowledge systems remain essential to understanding how policy is imagined, negotiated, and implemented in many contexts (Chilisa, 2012; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018).

These questions have become even more pressing amid widening inequality, complex governance, technological transformation, and shifting geopolitical relations.



Contemporary public administration increasingly requires governance approaches that are collaborative, socially responsive, and grounded in the realities of the societies they seek to serve. In many Global South settings, governance already operates through hybrid institutional arrangements that combine formal administrative systems with local governance traditions, civic participation, and adaptive forms of policy practice. Nonetheless, mainstream policy scholarship continues to underrepresent these governance realities.

The panel, therefore, seeks to create a space for critical but constructive engagement on how plural knowledge systems can broaden contemporary policy studies and public administration scholarship. The panel invites reflection on how indigenous and contextually grounded perspectives can contribute to collaborative governance, social innovation, and more inclusive forms of public value creation.

Proposed panel contributions

- Decolonising policy studies and public administration scholarship: critical contributions examining how dominant Western policy paradigms have shaped governance analysis, administrative practice, and policy design, including efforts to develop theory, concepts, or analytical frameworks grounded in non-Western contexts.
- Indigenous, local, and plural knowledge systems in governance: empirical or theoretical contributions exploring indigenous governance traditions, customary institutional arrangements, informal governance practices, community-based decision-making systems, and locally grounded policy innovations as sources of governance learning and public value creation.
- Governance practice, institutional hybridity, and policy implementation in the Global South: critical contributions examining how hybrid governance arrangements combining formal institutions, civic actors, informal systems, and historical institutional legacies shape policy implementation, reform, and collaborative governance outcomes.
- Methodological and conceptual innovation in plural policy analysis: critical Contributions on appropriate methodological approaches for analysing plural knowledge systems, decolonial governance processes, and contextually grounded policy practice.



Format

Presentation of research papers pertaining to the topic, followed by discussions.

References

Chilisa, B. (2012). Indigenous Research Methodologies. SAGE.

Eiró, F., & Lotta, G. (2023). On the Frontline of Global Inequalities: A Decolonial Approach to the Study of Street-Level Bureaucracies. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 34(1), 67-79. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muad019

Escobar, A. (2020). Pluriversal Politics: The Real and the Possible. Duke University Press.

Howlett, M. (2009). Governance Modes, Policy Regimes and Operational Plans: A Multi-level Nested Model of Policy Instrument Choice and Policy Design. Policy Sciences, 42(1).1-13.

Mbembe, A. (2016). Decolonizing the University: New Directions. Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 15(1).1-16.

Mukhtarov, F. (2014). Rethinking the Travel of Ideas: Policy Translation in the Water Sector. Policy and Politics, 42(1).1-11.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018). Epistemic Freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and Decolonisation. Routledge.

Shore, C., & Wright, S. (1997). Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power. Routledge.

Zhang, J. Y. (2023). Decolonising the temporal and relational assumptions in contemporary science and science policies. Critical Policy Studies, 17(1), 162–174.



IIAS 2026 CONFERENCE
Seoul, South Korea November 17-20

Growth for Society: Collaborative Governance, Social Innovation, and Social Value

Collaborative Governance for Regenerative Silver Economy

IIAS Study Group on "Governance for Sustainable Ageing"

Prof Dr Raymond Saner, Diplomacy Dialogue, Centre for Socio-Economic Development & Basle University,
saner@csend.org

Prof Dr Yang Yifan, National Interdisciplinary Institute on Ageing
yangswjtu@126.com

Prof Dr Lichia Yiu, Centre for Socio-Economic Development
yiu@csend.org

Sustainability urgently needs to be strengthened and refocused in a world facing persistent and overlapping crises — climate change, demographic shifts, digital transformation, and deepening inequality. Of which, demographic shifts coupled with lower fertility in the major economies are posing transversal challenges to the traditional comprehension and structure of welfare societies where older workers retire from work most of the time in good health conditions and longer life expectancy for both men and women. Population ageing is arguably one of the most transformative governance issues of the 21st century, profoundly reshaping labour markets, social protection, urban development, and intergenerational equity. Yet, it is still largely absent from the core agenda of healthy ageing. What is needed is a growth agenda exploring "how societies grow regeneratively" and "how to maintain intergenerational harmony"?

Emerging needs for financial viability and intergenerational fairness call for reconfiguration of administrative structure, redefinition of social contract, greater non-state actors' participation and social innovation. This future is already taking shape. We need to make this change sustainable, regenerative and based on social justice.



Themes

Governments are examining silver economy as a way out of financial trap and of promoting employment and economic growth. Yet a consumption-oriented silver society could further exasperate the crises of resource depletion. Therefore, next generation silver economy can be understood through the following key considerations, which require careful policy formulation for effective implementation and circularity.

- Collaborative governance for ageing: how do cross-sectoral and transnational governance arrangements achieve more than designing institutions—they can systematically regenerate social capital and invigorate public participation, shifting from "managing ageing" to "co-creating and co-governing" ageing dynamics?
- Transformation: How does social innovation that constitutes institutional and grassroots innovations converting ageing into a renewable social asset, and highlighting how can design thinking, co-housing, and smart-city interventions continuously regenerate community vitality and residents' well-being?
- Capacity: how does public adminitration build up internal capacity and external partnerships to effectively engage with the dual challenges of population ageing and declining fertility in a whole of system, circular, and intergenerational manner to ensure sustainability and inclusiveness of policy formulation and implementation?
- Contexts: "Leaving no one behind" in a global context calls of local interpretation of appropriateness and feasibility. Policy performance diverges across countries, sustainable development goals and social groups. In the wake of geopolitical reconfiguration, digitalisation, rights to development, and circularity, how do national and regional path dependencies affect policy outcomes?
- Public values & commons: How to construct a regenerative public value framework that incorporates subjective well-being, social trust, environmental sustainability, and intergenerational equity into governance evaluation, giving "growth" an inclusive and future-oriented meaning?



Debate on co-creating public value

The potential for greater co-creation of public value through regenerative silver economy is a subject for debate and contributions. The Study Group invites public administration scholars, lecturers, and practitioners from around the world to contribute in both papers and presentations regarding, but not limited to, the following:

- Collective actions aimed at sustainability, particularly in ageing societies;
- Social innovation and participation in administrative actions and commons for the reintegration of the third-age adults;
- Legal foundations and implications of social innovations, including regenerative silver economy in different cultures at the international level;
- Definition of the concept of "commons" and its application in regenerative public administration and silver economy ecosystem;
- Collaborative governance fostered by socially innovative practices and cross-sectoral coordination;
- Partnership and cooperation in policy formulation and implementation related to the governance of commons (cities, rural areas and deprived areas) and silver economy start-ups
- Urban regeneration and commons address inclusion, wellbeing and equity.

Call

The IIAS Study Group on "Governance for Sustainable Ageing" invites the IIAS community to come together in addressing this emergency of demographic shift and pending threat to societal growth, wellbeing and sustainable future.

Publication opportunities

Submitted papers can be considered for publication in a Special Issue of the Public Administration and Policy Journal



Leadership Skills and Competencies for Anticipatory Social Innovation and Collaborative Governance

Dr. Foteini (Fani) Komseli; National Centre for Public Administration & Local Government (EKDDA);
fanikomseli@gmail.com

Dr. Angeliki Bourmbouli; National Centre for Public Administration & Local Government (EKDDA);
abourbouli@ekdd.gr

Social innovation is widely recognized as a vital response to complex public challenges such as inequality, aging populations, digital exclusion, and climate adaptation. However, much of the literature and practice focus on reactive innovation, solving problems after they have become visible, urgent, and costly. This track argues that a fundamental shift is needed: from reactive problem-solving to proactive intelligence-led social innovation.

Leadership skills and competencies play a critical role in enabling social innovation across public, private, and civil society sectors. While collaborative governance has become a central feature of contemporary public management, collaboration alone is often insufficient to address increasingly complex and rapidly evolving societal challenges. Effective social innovation requires leaders and professionals who possess a broad range of competencies, including strategic foresight, systems thinking, adaptive leadership, evidence-informed decision-making, stakeholder engagement, resilience-building, and the capacity to act under conditions of uncertainty.

Among these competencies, particular attention is given to anticipatory capabilities that enable individuals and organizations to identify emerging risks, opportunities, and societal needs before they become visible crises. Such capabilities include detecting weak signals, integrating information from diverse sources, fostering collective intelligence, supporting preventive action, and facilitating coordinated responses across organizational and sectoral boundaries. These competencies complement collaborative governance arrangements by helping organizations move beyond reactive problem-solving toward more proactive and future-oriented approaches.



This track addresses an important gap in public administration, governance, and leadership research. Although collaborative governance, co-production, and social innovation have been widely studied, less attention has been devoted to understanding the leadership skills and organizational competencies that enable actors to anticipate change, navigate uncertainty, and create sustainable public value. Similarly, social innovation laboratories, policy labs, and cross-sector partnerships frequently generate innovative solutions but often struggle to institutionalize the competencies, learning processes, and intelligence routines required for long-term anticipation and adaptation.

The track welcomes theoretical, empirical, comparative, and practice-oriented contributions examining leadership skills and competencies for anticipatory governance and social innovation. Contributions may draw from public administration, governance studies, leadership research, strategic foresight, organizational learning, strategic human-resource management, public-sector innovation, and collaborative governance. Papers exploring competency development, leadership education, workforce transformation, foresight capabilities, collective intelligence, and future-ready public institutions are particularly encouraged.

By bringing together scholars and practitioners, this track aims to produce actionable insights for leadership development programs, public sector innovation units, and collaborative governance design. It challenges the assumption that collaboration alone is sufficient, arguing instead that intelligent proactivity is the missing link between social innovation and durable public value.

Research Questions

- What leadership skills and competencies are most critical for fostering anticipatory and collaborative social innovation across public, private, and civil society sectors?
- How do competencies such as strategic foresight, adaptive leadership, systems thinking, collaborative governance, and proactive intelligence contribute to innovation and public value creation?
- What organizational structures, cultures, information routines, and incentive systems support or hinder the development and application of these competencies?



- How can leadership competencies for anticipatory governance and social innovation be assessed and measured, particularly in terms of problem prevention, resilience, stakeholder trust, and long-term public value?
- Which educational approaches, leadership-development practices, strategic human-resource management policies, and learning methods are most effective in cultivating future-ready leaders and professionals?

It challenges the assumption that collaboration alone is sufficient, arguing instead that effective social innovation depends on a broader combination of leadership skills and organizational competencies that enable anticipation, adaptation, collective learning, and informed action under conditions of uncertainty. By strengthening these capabilities, organizations can enhance their capacity to create durable public value and address emerging societal challenges before they escalate.

References

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice.Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18(4), 543–571.

Boin, A., & Lodge, M. (2016). Designing Resilient Institutions for Transboundary Crisis Management.

Bommert, B.(2010). Collaborative innovation in the public sector. International Public Management Journal, 13(1), 15–33.

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Stone, M. M. (2015). Designing and implementing cross-sector collaborations: Needed and challenging. Public Administration Review, 75(5), 647–663.

Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). Integrative leadership and the creation and maintenance of public value. The Leadership Quarterly, 21(2), 211–225.

Day, D. V. (2000). Leadership Development: A Review in Context. Leadership Quarterly, 11(4), 581–613.

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22(1), 1–29.

Kimbell, L., & Bailey, J. (2022). Prototyping and the new spirit of policymaking. CoDesign, 18(1), 34–50.

Komseli F., Bourmbouli A. (2022). Digital Reset: European Universities Transforming for a Changing World, Proceedings International conference of EADTU (European Association of Distance Teaching Universities) & Hellenic Open University. “Resilience-Building Skills in order to face the 21st century challenges in the new-normal workplace and educational environment” p.p. 744-758.

Koppenjan, J., & Klijn, E. H. (2016). Governance networks in the public sector. Routledge.

McGinnis, M. D., & Ostrom, E. (2014). Social-ecological system framework: Initial changes and continuing challenges. Ecology and Society, 19(2), 30.



Miller, R. (2018). Transforming the Future: Anticipation in the 21st Century. Sardar, Z. (2010). The Namesake: Futures Studies and Futures Thinking.

Moore, M. H. (1995). Creating public value: Strategic management in government. Harvard University Press.

Mulgan, G. (2012). The theoretical foundations of social innovation. In A. Nicholls & A. Murdock (Eds.), Social innovation: Blurring boundaries to reconfigure markets (pp. 33–65). Palgrave Macmillan.

Mulgan, G. (2018). Big mind: How collective intelligence can change our world. Princeton University Press.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2011). Enhancing collaborative innovation in the public sector. Administration & Society, 43(8), 842–868.

OECD (2019). Skills for a High Performing Civil Service.

Torfing, J. (2016). Collaborative innovation in the public sector. Georgetown University Press.

Van der Heijden, K. (2005). Scenarios: The Art of Strategic Conversation.

Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J., & Tummers, L. G. (2015). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production with citizens in public innovation. Public Management Review, 17(9), 1333–1357.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2015). Managing the unexpected: Sustained performance in a complex world (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.



Transparency, Citizenship and Digital Government in Latin America

Ricardo Corrêa Gomes; FGV EAESP, Brazil
ricardo.gomes@fgv.br

Claudia N. Avellenada; Indiana University, USA/Colombia

Pablo Sanabria; Universidad Icesi, Colombia

Johabed G. Olvera; Pennsylvania State University, Mexico

Humberto Falcão Martins; Fundação Dom Cabral, Brazil

Rationale

The IIAS 2026 Conference theme, "Growth for Society: Collaborative Governance, Social Innovation and Public Value," invites scholars and practitioners to examine how governments can create sustainable public value through collaboration, innovation, and citizen engagement.

Across Latin America, digital transformation has become a central component of this challenge. Governments have expanded transparency initiatives, open government policies, digital public services, open data platforms, citizen participation mechanisms, and artificial intelligence applications to strengthen public trust, improve service delivery, and enhance democratic accountability.

The region has also emerged as an important source of governance innovation. Experiences such as participatory budgeting, open government reforms, transparency portals, integrated digital service platforms, electronic procurement systems, civic technology initiatives, and open data ecosystems have attracted international attention as promising approaches to increasing accountability, improving service delivery, and fostering citizen engagement. More recently, governments across the region have begun experimenting with artificial intelligence, digital identity systems, predictive analytics, and data-driven policymaking, creating new opportunities for innovation while simultaneously raising important governance challenges.



These experiences provide valuable lessons for governments worldwide seeking to strengthen collaborative governance and generate public value in increasingly complex and digital societies. At the same time, important questions remain regarding the extent to which these innovations effectively promote meaningful citizen participation, reduce inequalities, foster institutional trust, and improve public outcomes. Issues such as digital exclusion, algorithmic bias, privacy protection, misinformation, cybersecurity, and unequal access to digital public services continue to shape the governance agenda across the region.

Latin America therefore offers a particularly rich setting for examining both the opportunities and the limitations of digital-era governance. The region combines ambitious reforms, significant institutional diversity, and persistent social challenges, making it an important laboratory for understanding how transparency, citizenship, and digital government can contribute to collaborative governance, social innovation, and public value creation.

This panel seeks to bring together scholars, public managers, policymakers, civil society actors, and technology specialists to discuss how transparency, citizenship, and digital government can contribute to collaborative governance, social innovation, and public value creation in Latin America and beyond. Contributions that generate comparative insights, identify transferable lessons, and advance theoretical understanding of digital governance are particularly encouraged.

Focusing mainly on Latin America, the panel is particularly interested in addressing questions such as:

- How can digital transformation strengthen collaborative governance and public value creation?
- Under what conditions do transparency and open government initiatives enhance citizen trust and democratic legitimacy?
- How can governments leverage artificial intelligence and data-driven technologies while preserving accountability, privacy, and fundamental rights?
- What institutional capacities are required to ensure that digital innovation generates inclusive and equitable outcomes?
- Which lessons from Latin American experiences can inform governance reforms in other regions of the world?



- Can digital transformation become a vehicle for collaborative governance and public value creation, or does it risk reproducing existing inequalities and accountability deficits in new forms?

Topics of interest

Contributions may address, but are not limited to:

- Transparency and public value creation
- Open government and collaborative governance
- Digital participation and citizen engagement
- Social innovation through digital platforms
- Open data and civic innovation
- Artificial intelligence and public sector innovation
- Algorithmic accountability and transparency
- Digital inclusion and social equity
- Trust, legitimacy, and democratic governance
- Data protection, privacy, and accountability
- Digital transformation and governance capacity
- Public communication and misinformation
- Citizen-centred digital services
- Digital government and sustainable development
- Comparative studies of digital governance reforms

Types of contributions

The panel welcomes:

- Full research papers
- Research-in-progress papers
- Comparative studies
- Conceptual and theoretical contributions
- Quantitative and qualitative research
- Experimental and quasi-experimental studies
- Public sector case studies
- Practitioner and policy perspectives



Expected Outcomes

The panel aims to:

- Advance comparative knowledge on digital governance in Latin America;
- Promote dialogue between scholars and practitioners;
- Identify governance innovations that generate public value;
- Strengthen international research networks on transparency, citizenship, and digital government;
- Explore opportunities for future collaborative research and publication initiatives.



Africa's Digital Future: Governing Artificial Intelligence, emerging technologies and institutional transformation

Prof N Holtzhausen-du Toit, University of Pretoria;
natasja.holtzhausen@up.ac.za

Dr RG Wessels, University of South Africa;
RWessels@unisa.ac.za

Africa is entering a period in which emerging technologies are reshaping not only economies but also the nature of government itself. Artificial Intelligence (AI), digital public infrastructure, blockchain technologies, digital identity systems, fintech, satellite technologies, smart cities and advanced connectivity are creating opportunities for governments to redesign institutions, improve public service delivery and accelerate development (Avgerou, 2019; Dunleavy & Margetts, 2023). Rather than following historical development trajectories established elsewhere, many African countries are adopting innovative technological solutions that bypass traditional stages of industrial and administrative development (Moyo, 2022).

The continent is increasingly demonstrating that resource constraints can stimulate institutional innovation. Mobile financial systems such as M-Pesa that revolutionised financial inclusion by enabling millions of citizens to make payments, transfer funds and access financial services via mobile phones without first requiring widespread bank branch networks is one example of development of the continent. In addition, digital health platforms, remote education, geospatial technologies, drone applications, AI-supported agriculture and digital identity programmes illustrate how governments are experimenting with new models of administration that are responsive to local realities while contributing to global policy innovation (Gillwald, 2021; Ojo, 2020).

At the same time, Africa faces significant governance challenges associated with digital transformation. Unequal infrastructure, cybersecurity threats, algorithmic bias, digital sovereignty, cross-border regulation, data governance, institutional capacity and workforce readiness require new approaches to public administration (UN E-Government



Survey, 2022). These challenges cannot be addressed through technology alone but require governments capable of governing rapidly evolving digital ecosystems while maintaining democratic accountability, regulatory legitimacy and citizen trust (Meijer, 2022).

This track explores how emerging technologies are transforming governance and public administration across Africa. It examines how governments can build institutions capable of governing the Fourth and Fifth Industrial Revolutions while promoting inclusive, ethical and sustainable digital transformation. Rather than viewing Africa as a technology adopter, this track positions the continent as a source of innovative governance solutions that can inform global debates on digital government, Artificial Intelligence governance and institutional transformation.

Link to general conference call

This track is situated within the broader **IIAS conference theme "*Growth for Society: Collaborative Governance, Social Innovation, and Public Value*"**. The general call highlights how sustainability, demographic shifts, digital transformation and inequality demand new forms of collaborative governance and social innovation. Africa's experience with technologies, sovereign digital capabilities and institutional experimentation provides a unique vantage point for addressing these global challenges. By examining African digital future this track contributes to comparative debates on how public administration can mobilise technological disruption for societal resilience, legitimacy and inclusive growth (IIAS Call, 2026).

Indicative thematic areas

- Governing Artificial Intelligence in African public administration
- Digital public infrastructure and government modernisation
- Data governance, cybersecurity and digital sovereignty
- FinTech and digital identity for inclusive public service delivery
- Smart cities and technology-enabled urban governance
- Emerging technologies for agriculture, health, education and environmental management
- Institutional innovation for rapidly changing technological environments
- Public sector leadership for digital transformation on the African continent



- Workforce development and future public service capabilities
- Regulatory innovation focused on disruptive technologies
- Ethical governance of autonomous systems and emerging technologies

Guiding questions

- How should African governments govern Artificial Intelligence while promoting innovation and protecting citizens?
- What institutional reforms are required to prepare governments for rapidly evolving technologies?
- How can digital public infrastructure improve state capability and administrative performance?
- What regulatory approaches are most appropriate for emerging technologies in developing economies?
- How should governments balance digital innovation with cybersecurity, privacy and data protection?
- What role should African governments play in developing sovereign digital capabilities?
- How can digital identity, fintech and interoperable government platforms improve service delivery?
- What knowledge, skills and competencies will future public servants require for an AI-enabled governments?
- How can governments regulate autonomous systems while maintaining transparency and public accountability?
- What lessons from African technological innovation can influence global approaches to digital government?
- How should governments prepare for the governance implications of quantum computing, advanced robotics and next-generation communications?
- What institutional models will define the future digital state in Africa?

Contribution

This track positions Africa at the forefront of global debates on digital government, Artificial Intelligence governance and institutional transformation. Rather than viewing the continent through the lens of developmental challenges, it highlights Africa as an emerging source of innovation in public administration capable of informing future



governance models worldwide. The track invites contributions from scholars, policymakers and practitioners exploring how governments can successfully navigate technological development and disruption while building capable, resilient and future-ready public institutions.

References

Avgerou, C. (2019). Digital innovation in developing countries: A critical perspective. Information Technology for Development, 25(2), 209–218.

Dunleavy, P., & Margetts, H. (2023). Digital-era governance: IT corporations, the state, and e-government. Oxford University Press.

Gillwald, A. (2021). After access: ICT policy and regulation in Africa. Research ICT Africa.

Meijer, A. (2022). The platform society: Public values in a connective world. Oxford University Press.

Moyo, D. (2022). How the West was lost: Fifty years of economic folly. Penguin.

Ojo, A. (2020). Digital government in Africa: Strategies for public sector transformation. African Journal of Public Administration, 12(3), 45–67.

United Nations. (2022). UN E-Government Survey 2022: The future of digital government. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.



Resilient and Adaptive Governance: Policy, Administration, and Recovery in Fragile States

Tamer Qarmout, Doha Institute for Graduate Studies;
tamer.karmout@dohainstitute.edu.qa

Sofiane Sahraoui, International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS);
s.sahraoui@iias-iisa.org

Liza Ceciel van Jaarsveldt, University of South Africa (UNISA);
vjaarlc@unisa.ac.za

This track invites contributions that examine governance, public policy, institutional resilience, and state fragility through comparative and interdisciplinary perspectives, hereby contributing to the social innovation pillar of the conference theme. Rather than viewing fragility as an exceptional condition confined to low-income, fragile, or post-conflict states, this track conceptualises fragility as a persistent and multidimensional feature of statehood. In an era characterised by geopolitical uncertainty, technological transformation, environmental pressures, and recurring systemic shocks, manifestations of fragility are increasingly evident across the development spectrum — affecting not only countries of the Global South but also many states within the Global North.

The track makes four interconnected contributions:

- **Integration of policy and administration**: Repositioning public policy-making capacity (agenda-setting, coordination, strategic planning) alongside public administration as central to understanding fragility, recovery, and resilience.
- **Historicising and globalising fragility**: Presenting fragility not as a post-colonial anomaly, but as a recurrent condition shaped by wars, economic collapse, and systemic pressures across both the Global South and the Global North.
- **Operationalising adaptability**: Moving beyond static resilience to define adaptability through four governance functions: anticipation of risk, strategic coordination, political legitimation, and institutional execution.



- **Empirical and inclusive analysis**: Offering comparative case studies that directly respond[1] to critiques of Western-centric public administration scholarship.

Contributions are invited on the following themes (non-exhaustive):

- **Conceptual foundations**: Rethinking fragility; legitimacy and capacity; resilience versus adaptability in public administration.
- **Core governance functions**: Policymaking under pressure; public administration, service delivery, and trust in fragile contexts.
- **Comparative experiences**: Decentralisation; service delivery reform; security sector governance; fiscal governance in fragile and recovering states.
- **Actors, architecture, and external engagement**: United Nations system engagement; foreign aid and policy space; non-state and hybrid governance arrangements.
- **Cross-cutting pressures**: Technology and AI in fragile states; environmental stress and migration; adaptive governance futures.

We especially welcome theoretically informed, empirically grounded, and comparative contributions that engage with questions of governance, institutional adaptation, policymaking, administrative capacity, legitimacy, crisis management, and recovery in fragile or rapidly changing contexts. The track is designed to be accessible to advanced postgraduate students (master's and doctoral) in public policy, public administration, development studies, and conflict and peace studies, as well as to established scholars and practitioners.

A selection of high-quality papers from this track will be considered for an edited volume, ***Resilient and Adaptive Governance: Policy, Administration, and Recovery in Fragile States***, currently being developed for submission.

[1] More exclusively theoretical contributions should be proposed in the "Plural knowledge systems" track.



Revival of State-Owned Entreprises

Dr. Diana Vicher; Universidad de Guanajuato, Mexico
dianavicher@gmail.com

In the 1980s, within the framework of neoliberalism, the widespread privatization of state-owned enterprises took place. Privatizations were justified under the argument that they were the only measure to improve public finances, which were burdened by the deep deficit of many public companies.

In Latin America specifically, the neoliberal concept of a "minimal" state was the framework for the privatization reform process in Latin America promoted by international organizations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the OECD, mainly as a structural adjustment process of the 1980s to address the problem of economic crisis.

However, on these days a different perspective has emerged regarding the presence of the state-owned enterprises. In recent years, a renewed presence of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) has been observed. This is reflected in the proportion of SOEs among the world's largest companies, which has quadrupled in the last two decades, rising from 34 in 2000 to 102 in 2017 and to 126 in 2023. Among the 500 largest listed and unlisted companies by revenue worldwide, 126 SOEs are included, representing approximately 25% of global wealth (OECD, 2024: 14).

However, new privatization trends are also evident, as SOEs have gained greater prominence in public stock markets over the last two decades. Many states have listed minority stakes in SOEs as a first step toward full privatization or as an alternative.

Thus, the public sector has become a major investor in public equity markets worldwide and, in 2023, accounted for US$11.7 trillion of global market capitalization. OECD, 2024. At the same time, a different perspective has emerged regarding the presence of the State-owned enterprises (SOEs) on these days important international organisms like the OECD have recognizing that play an important role in many economies, and operate across a range of sectors, including infrastructure, natural resources, energy, logistics, transportation, financial services and manufacturing. SOEs can provide public goods and services that cannot be supplied by markets forces alone, generate revenue streams for



governments, make investments to achieve a policy objective, support development, and advance science and technological progress (Secretary-General, OECD, 2024: 3).

In this scenario, this track invites contributions about state owned enterprises regain relevance, and some of the lines of inquiry for their study are the following:

- Are state-owned enterprises nowadays a factor in the re-establishment of national priorities?
- Strategic participation of the State in economy to strengthen industrial and technological capacity
- State-owned enterprises as financial instruments
- The new discourse in politics and public administration as mechanism of gain power in the new multipolar world order
- The Quantitative Global Resurgence of State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs)
- Modern Public Equity Trends and the Strategic Role of Contemporary SOEs



References

Baum, A., Medas, P., Soler, A., & Sy, M. (2020). *Managing fiscal risks from state-owned enterprises* (Working Paper No. WP/20/213). International Monetary Fund. https://www.imf.org/-/media/files/publications/wp/2020/english/wpiea2020213-print-pdf.pdf

Bloomberg Línea. (2025). Deuda global suma US$345 billones: la lista de los gobiernos de América Latina más endeudados.

Del Búfalo, E. (2002). Las reformas económicas en América Latina. Revista Venezolana de Economía y Ciencias Sociales, 8(2).

Expansión. (s.f.). México: Índice de Gini. Datosmacro.com. https://datosmacro.expansion.com/demografia/indice-gini/mexico

Glade, W. (1985). Privatización y desestatización de empresas públicas: Observaciones basadas en el caso peruano. En H. Boneo (Ed.), Privatización del dicho al hecho. Ed. El Cronista Comercial.

Guilardes, G., & Rubio, J. (2025). Empresas públicas y propiedad estatal: Un aporte más allá de la mirada fiscal (1ra ed.). Fundar.

Houtart, F., & Polet, F. (2001). El otro Davos: Globalización de resistencias y de luchas. Plaza y Valdés.

International Monetary Fund [IMF]. (2020). Managing Fiscal Risks from State-Owned Enterprises (Working Paper No. 20/213). https://www.imf.org/-/media/files/publications/wp/2020/english/wpiea2020213-print-pdf.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD]. (2024). Ownership and Governance of State-Owned Enterprises 2024. OECD Publishing.

Sachs, J. D. (Ed.). (1989). *Developing country debt and economic performance* (Vols. 1–3). University of Chicago Press.

Savas, E. S. (1987). Privatización: La clave para un gobierno mejor. Gernika.

World Bank. (2023). The Business of the State. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank



Practicalities

Key Links

- Conference website: https://www.iias-iisa.org/iias-2026-conference/
- Submission system: https://www.conftool.org/iias2026/
- Contact: iias-conference@iias-iisa.org

Important Dates

- Abstract / Panel submission deadline: **30 August 2026**
- Notification of acceptance and opening of registration: **30 August 2026**
- Full paper submission and registration deadline: **4 October 2026**

Submission Guidelines

- Unless otherwise specified in the track call, abstracts are limited to **500 words**. They should clearly outline the research question, theoretical framework, methodology, main findings (or expected findings), and implications.
- Accepted abstracts are expected to be developed into full papers.
- **Panels** are session proposals submitted under the main conference theme. A panel proposal includes a title, abstract, proposed chairperson(s), and a list of expected presentations. Panels are not required to produce full papers.

Evaluation

Proposals (papers and panels) are evaluated by the chair(s) (or co-chairs) of the track to which they are submitted. Evaluation criteria include:

- Academic quality and rigour
- Relevance to the track theme and overall conference theme
- Thematic fit and originality
- Clarity and quality of presentation

Paper Requirements

- Maximum length: **6,000 words** (all inclusive, including references).
- Structure: abstract, introduction, main body (developing the research question, theoretical framework, methodology, findings, and implications), conclusion, and references.

