servDES'25
భారతీయ సాంకేతిక విజ్ఞాన సంస్థ హైదరాబాద్
भारतीय प्रौद्योगिकी संस्थान हैदराबाद
Indian Institute of Technology Hyderabad
tcs Research
Department of Design

A new generation of collaborative public services

Daniela Selloni
daniela.selloni@polimi.it
Department of Design - Politecnico di Milano, Italy

Abstract

This paper introduces the concept of collaborative public services, drawing on exemplary Italian prototypes. It begins by addressing the crisis of public services shaped by Dominant Service Design and outlines a first paradigm shift, where citizens move from passive users to active participants in global social innovation. However, this shift revealed limitations, often depending on the exceptional commitment of a few individuals. A second shift is emerging: collaborative public services sustained by a stronger role for the state and a participatory ecosystem that enables different levels of engagement, expanding involvement across society. The concept of a participatory ecosystem is explored through the lenses of infrastructuring and enabling platforms and illustrated by the Porta Moneta case study from Milan's "School of the Neighbourhoods." The paper concludes by highlighting key takeaways: designing different "intensities of participation," prioritising marginalised groups, redefining the public sector as a cultural and social facilitator, and favouring co-production over co-design for more meaningful, satisfying involvement.

Keywords: co-production, collaborative services, public sector innovation, participatory ecosystem

Background knowledge: socio-institutional innovation and collaborative public services

In their recent paper, "Amplifying the Politics in Service Design", Akama et al. (2023) discuss the notion of Dominant Service Design, highlighting how service design basically reinforces the existing power structures of neoliberalism by "scaling up social interactions, routinizing human relationships, prioritizing customer experiences

and business bottom-lines as critical knowledge for making 'good' services" (p.610). Dominant Service Design emphasises service quality based on customer loyalty and satisfaction (Vashishth et al., 2021) and operates within a capitalist market framework where the performative dimension of services is pivotal. Such approach has also highly influenced public services, reducing them to cold, sterile procedures that turn users into mere consumers or clients and dismantling any relationship (Hood & Dixon, 2015). Hence, in a way, the structures of neoliberalism have shaped public services similarly to those of the private sector, making them stray from their original mission.

Extensive scientific literature examines such transformation of public services, moving from "Old Public Administration" to "New Public Management" and later to "New Public Governance" (Dunleavy & Hood, 1994; Mulgan & Albury, 2003; Hartley, 2005; Christensen & Laegreid, 2007; Osborne, 2010). It is not possible here to recount this evolution, but for the purposes of this paper it is sufficient to point out that the "New Public Management" approach born in the late 1960s (Frederickson, 1971) is still shaping public services: conceived originally as a remedy to bureaucracy, it emphasises efficiency, cost control, organisational flexibility and a certain quality of services, treating individuals as clients who have (ideally) the option to choose alternative services within the market. Hence, the "New Public Management" basically introduced forms of economic incentives and quasi-market mechanisms that, later, proponents of the "New Public Governance" attempted to change by redesigning top-down decision-making processes to adopt a bottom-up logic marked by the principles of collaboration and co-production (Nabatchi et al., 2017; Osborne, 2010). The two approaches currently coexist within the public sector across different levels and various nuances. It is within this complex landscape, that Manzini & D'Alena (2024) put a spotlight on the capability of the public sector to generate innovations: they talk about "institutional innovation" (translation by the author), i.e. the creation of new forms of organisation and rules that make it possible to address social challenges and respond to emerging needs. Such idea builds upon the wider notion of "public sector innovation" (Cinar et al. 2024; Bason, 2018). According to the expert group of European Commission in this topic, public sector innovation refers to the development of new approaches, policies, and services that enhance government effectiveness, inclusivity, and responsiveness. It involves co-designing solutions with stakeholders, adopting collaborative service models, leveraging technological disruption, and fostering a culture of experimentation and entrepreneurship (EC, 2013). More recently and in the same line, Mazzucato (2021) highlights how the public sector can act as a catalyst for innovation, shifting from a role of service provider to one of enabler of citizen-led socio-ecological practices.

In this context, Manzini & D'Alena (2024) draw specific attention to the reciprocal relationship between social and institutional innovations, highlighting how they

mutually reinforce and inspire one another while both the public sector and citizens play an active role in shaping them. They observe how, in Italy and beyond, the social innovation that characterised the last two decades (Audretsch et al, 2022; de Bruin & Stangl, 2013) has also sparked institutional innovation initiatives that can be viewed more precisely as "socio-institutional innovations". These initiatives, emerging in contexts such as schools, libraries, and neighbourhood centres, have fostered greater collaboration between public institutions, citizens, and local associations and they can be effectively labelled as "collaborative public services".

> "Collaborative public services are a new generation of services that combine the provision of specific services (usually delivered by expert professionals) with enabling platforms through which citizens themselves can cooperate with each other and with other social actors (public authorities, enterprises, universities, third sector organisations) to produce social value." (Manzini & D'Alena, 2024 p.11, translation by the author).

Such idea expands on the earlier concept of "collaborative services" introduced by Jégou & Manzini in 2008, which emphasised the role of users as key resources, capable of actively contributing to both the co-design and co-production of services. In this first elaboration of the notion, the role of the public sector is not yet identified as crucial; it is rather connected to the concept of social innovation, as many social innovations emerge as services that address social needs while fostering new collaborations (Murray et al., 2010). Numerous scholars have analysed a growing array of services rooted in the social innovations that originated from the bottom-up in urban neighbourhoods worldwide, such as community gardens, time banks, social housing, co-working spaces, cultural hubs etc. (Moualert & Van den Broeck, 2018, Calò et al., 2023; Howaldt et al., 2018). In these services, users play a variety of roles by providing their tangible (material and economic) and/or their intangible (time, energy, skills) resources. In his book "Design, when everybody designs", Manzini (2015) has presented this phenomenon as an actual paradigm shift, where people are no longer passive recipients but active participants, contributing at various stage - from ideation to service delivery.

However, over time, such paradigm shift has revealed significant limitations, as it relied on the exceptional commitment of users who invested substantial resources, often becoming the "heroes" of the service, i.e. leading participants with exceptional skills and commitment (Mejer, 2016; Meroni & Selloni, 2018).Their long-term involvement also revealed critical challenges: many social innovation initiatives have lost momentum as their core groups of innovators ran out of energy, activism, and time resources. The inability to distribute activities and responsibilities more widely has often determined whether these innovations could evolve or fade away. A

growing body of research points to the challenges addressing the effective implementation of social innovation (Van Dijck & Steen, 2024; Barlagne et al., 2021; Chalmers, 2013). This is a widely discussed topic, with various hypotheses being proposed to explain the barriers and difficulties involved that cannot be analysed in the present work; rather, what this paper aims to suggest is that a possible response to the fragility of collaborative services shown over the past twenty years lies in introducing a greater role for the state. In this regard, the collaborative public services notion introduced by Manzini and D'Alena (2024) may potentially lay the groundwork for a second paradigm shift. They have observed some exemplary prototypes emerging in Italy (their area of focus) in which the public sector supports their emergence and long-term sustainability in various ways. What distinguishes them is their alignment with a renewed vision of the public sector, i.e. one that seeks to identify, nurture, and amplify the collective resources present within society.

Infrastructuring collaborative public services: framing a participatory ecosystem

The role of the public sector in fostering collaboration is particularly significant in today's society, where sociologist Sennett (2012) observed over a decade ago a widespread decline in collaborative skills. In this perspective, the public sector should play an active part in supporting collaboration, especially among those who would otherwise be unable to participate (Ciaffi, 2024). To achieve this aim, on the part of the public sector it is necessary to build what Manzini & D'Alena (2024) call a "participatory ecosystem": an ensemble of tangible and intangible elements that precisely allows a variety of "intensities of participation", i.e. different possibilities for individuals and groups to collaborate in the co-design and above all in the co-production of a service, building upon the spread of connectivity, media and digital platforms and their potential in terms of management and operational coordination of activities. Such an idea of "intensities of participation" is at the core of the concept of collaborative public services. The key issue is not simply about getting people to collaborate in service activities but about designing and building diverse forms of participation. This way, both active and engaged individuals (the previously mentioned "heroes") can take part, but above all, so can those who usually do not participate and remain on the margins, precisely because they are offered the opportunity to collaborate also in ways that require a lower intensity in terms of time and effort.

The concept of participatory ecosystem, as articulated by Manzini and D'Alena (2024), draws on diverse established frameworks within the scientific literature, most notably the notions of infrastructure and enabling platforms, and is closely linked to the complementary paradigm of service co-production. Below, a brief exploration of these interconnections is outlined.

Firstly, the idea of a participatory ecosystem closely aligns with the two intertwined notions of "infrastructure" and "infrastructuring". Both concepts are present in the work of Ehn (2008), Karasti (2013) and Björgvinsson et al. (2010), who build upon Star's theorisation of infrastructure (Star and Ruhleder, 1997; Star and Bowker, 2002). From this perspective, a participatory ecosystem emerges as an intermediary infrastructure that enables a variety of connections between different human and non-human elements. Hence, a participatory ecosystem can be understood as inherently relational, a quality it shares with the notion of infrastructure as emphasised by Star and Ruhleder (1997): they argue that an infrastructure materialises through practice within specific contexts, in connection to a set of things such as people, activities, and systems. Here is why, in a later work, Star and Bowker (2002) introduce the concept of "infrastructuring," putting a spotlight on action. They suggest that a set of elements and actors can be "infrastructured," stressing the processual and dynamic nature of building and maintaining infrastructure, an approach that closely parallels the continuous development and nurturing of a participatory ecosystem, characterised by different intensities of participation. Also, Ehn (2008) further elaborates on the dynamic nature of infrastructures, arguing that "Infrastructure, or rather infrastructuring, is a socio-material public thing" (p.96) having a relational character and allowing citizen participation, which, at the same time, may be favourably mediated by design.

To better frame the idea of participatory ecosystem, the notion of "enabling platform" (Seravalli, 2011; Sangiorgi, 2011; Jégou and Manzini 2008; Morelli, 2007) can likewise be useful, especially because it is often related to that of social innovation. According to Seravalli (2011), infrastructures are essential for fostering social innovation, acting as intermediaries within this process. She precisely describes these intermediary entities as "enabling platforms", i.e. context-specific systems composed of both human and non-human actors, designed to support grassroots initiatives and cross-sector collaborations. To achieve this goal, enabling platforms need to be firmly embedded within a specific context, recognising and enhancing the value of local stakeholders and resources.
Seravalli (2011), along with Ehn (2008) and Star and Ruhleder (1997), highlights that infrastructures and enabling platforms should remain open and flexible, allowing stakeholders to initiate new activities once the platform is in place. Similarly, Morelli

(2007) notes a shift from providing fixed solutions to offering modular, semi-finished platforms that empower users and institutions to create value collectively, fostering diverse combinations and new social qualities. Jégou and Manzini (2008) describe enabling platforms as systems of material and immaterial elements designed to support creative communities and social innovation, helping them evolve into more stable forms. Across these perspectives, enabling platforms emerge as flexible, modular infrastructures that provide the conditions for bottom-up initiatives to grow and adapt over time, with a long-term vision. Moreover, in her seven 'Transformational Principles', Sangiorgi (2011) identifies 'Building Infrastructures and Enabling Platforms' as key: focusing on service design platforms, she highlights that participants can have a role in developing services; here is why rather than designing fixed solutions, designers should define flexible frameworks made up of tools, roles, and rules that allow practices to emerge and adapt across different contexts, maintaining a necessary degree of openness and indeterminacy.

Thus, tracing the conceptual thread that connects such various contributions, a participatory ecosystem may be understood as both an infrastructure (together with its related infrastructuring process) and an enabling platform. It constitutes an open and evolving construct, characterised by the potential for diverse formats and configurations. Within Manzini and D'Alena's perspective (2024), however, two different elements emerge as particularly central: the active role of the public sector as a key enabling agent, and the ongoing expansion and diversification of participation opportunities to engage especially individuals who usually have little time and energy to participate, thus putting a spotlight on marginalised people. This participatory ecosystem does not exist in its ideal version; however, a range of examples are provided. One such example is a public library, which offers a range of activities, from borrowing books and engaging in cultural initiatives to taking courses, giving lectures, or even organising specific events. These diverse opportunities highlight the potential for greater community involvement and collaboration. As a result, the librarian transcends their traditional public role, becoming a cultural facilitator who actively manages interactions with the social networks that surround the library. Similarly, a middle school teacher takes on more than just an educational role; they become a social facilitator, keeping the school open in the afternoon (something exceptional in the Italian context) and organising a full schedule of activities. In both cases, the teacher and the librarian do not relinquish their specialist roles; instead, they expand them by engaging with the community and facilitating the distribution of roles and tasks among different individuals, according to their willingness to participate, i.e. according to different intensities of participation in terms of time, energy, skills, and disposition.

Such a participatory ecosystem enables a more democratic and distributed approach to public service co-production: to better trace this evolving scenario, here it is also important to provide some background about the notion of co-production. Boyle & Harris (2009) define co-production as the delivery of public services through an equal and reciprocal partnership between professionals, service users, their families, and their communities. Pestoff (2012) argues that governments can engage citizens in the co-production of goods and services not only to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of public services and policies but also to pursue broader social goals, such as fostering citizen empowerment, participation, and strengthening democracy. In all these perspectives, co-production fundamentally changes the way services are delivered, recognising people as assets, promoting reciprocity and shifting the balance of power: this is also the most important feature of the collaborative public services, in which, the primary contribution of the public sector should be to recognise and stimulate the social energies present in society while promoting a new right, i.e. the right to collaboration, especially for marginalised groups. This includes the right to imagine and develop shared projects that merge personal and general interests (Selloni, 2017), overcoming social isolation, because, as Sennett (2012) argues, the current structure of society, the economy, and technology makes collaboration and working together increasingly difficult, if not impossible.
Moreover, as already stated, the form of co-production that collaborative public services ideally foster is a more distributed and diffused model, i.e. the already mentioned second paradigm shift, in which the public sector creates the conditions for a widespread collaboration among several actors.
In the following paragraph an example of such second paradigm shift is presented, without claiming to be exhaustive, it rather aims to provide some stimuli to envision a more distributed participatory ecosystem for service co-production.

Case study: The School of the Neighbourhoods and its related social venture Porta Moneta

The case study introduced in this paper is part of a broader socio-institutional innovation that emerged through “The School of the Neighbourhoods” (in Italian “La Scuola dei Quartieri”) an initiative lunched by the Municipality of Milan (co-funded by the European Union through the European Social Fund as part of the Metropolitan Cities Operational Programme 2014–2020), aimed to experiment with citizen-driven ideas to improve life in the suburbs, welcoming people of all ages and educational backgrounds who wish to engage in meaningful activities within the city of Milan. Over the programme’s five-year span, “The School of Neighbourhoods” engaged

more than 2,500 individuals and 370 local organisations, institutions, and businesses. It attracted 250 idea submissions, 68 of which were selected for participation. Ultimately, 56 of these evolved into fully operational social ventures now actively embedded in Milan's neighbourhoods. As part of the implementing consortium, the Polimi DESIS Lab (the author's research group) played a key role, contributing by applying design thinking, service design and co-design to enhance the strategic and technical capabilities of the participants.

"The School of Neighbourhoods" operates through three main phases:

1. Scouting: a call for ideas engages informal groups of at least two citizens, not tied to formal organisations. This very low access barrier was conceived precisely to foster participation, particularly from those who usually face challenges in taking part for several reasons. Then, through workshops and meetings, participants explore neighbourhood needs, identify opportunities, and refine their proposals.
2. Training: selected groups join a 100-hour flexible programme to develop their ideas into viable solutions, addressing aspects such as value proposition, user journey, business models, and legal structures.
3. Prototyping: groups submit refined proposals to access coaching and up to €25,000 in project funding. This stage focuses on testing solutions in real contexts, fostering co-production with local communities and contributing to the development of local social innovations.

"Porta Moneta" is one of the 56 social ventures of "The School of the Neighbourhood" and emerged within the context of a co-housing complex. It is a residents' association, officially founded in 2022, but its informal activities began in 2019 with the support of the Social Housing Foundation (in Italian "Fondazione Housing Sociale"). The foundation supported the establishment of various interest groups and activities, such as community gardens, creative workshops, and play areas, within the co-housing development on Moneta Street, which comprises 300 apartments in Milan's Affori district. Through its training courses and funding, "The School of the Neighbourhoods" enabled the most active residents to establish an association and create a real service offering. Today, "Porta Moneta" unites a diverse group of people who engage in a wide range of activities, such as after-school help, co-working, financial education, sports courses, creative workshops, a community garden, and a variety of events (festivals, open days, seminars, cinema, etc). These activities are periodically refreshed (around every 4-6 months) to include new offerings, and they use co-housing spaces like common rooms, courtyards, and gardens that are opened not only to residents but also to the broader neighbourhood.

The “Porta Moneta” association emerged within a well-connected context and as part of the wider participatory ecosystem of “The School of the Neighbourhoods.” On one side, the school itself, with its low access barrier and flexible training programme, has been designed to attract and allow the participation of people who usually are in the margins, on the other, the “Porta Moneta” association conceived its own smaller neighbourhood-scale participatory ecosystem since its prototyping phase, to encourage wider involvement, even for those residents with constrained resources.

The “Porta Moneta” participatory ecosystem can be described as a set of human and non-human elements useful to cover the full spectrum of phases necessary to frame and deliver a wide range of interconnected collaborative services. Following the parallel with the notions of infrastructure and enabling platform already mentioned, the neighbourhood-scale participatory ecosystem of “Porta Moneta” is composed of modules/building blocks that can be combined in diverse ways to co-design and co-produce various services. Below, they are presented organised according to their scope: as stated, they can be human (groups and /or individuals, residents covering different roles, experts, stakeholders, public servants, etc.), and non-human (spaces, digital tools, rules and norms, etc).

- To convey information: a set of digital and physical elements to clearly and systematically inform everyone about the available services and opportunities for participation, both formally and informally. Examples include shared calendars, posters, specific social media, information desks, WhatsApp groups and communities, the official Porta Moneta website, and open days’ events to communicate neighbourhood opportunities. Such information is transmitted in parallel through the municipal website and related social networks, and above all, posted physically on notice boards at the library, in schools, in local stores and selected key points in the Affori neighbourhood.

- To organise service co-design: a variety of resources to make it feasible for individuals to contribute to the creation of new services or the improvement of existing ones, both digitally and physically. The “Porta Moneta” association conceived a broad spectrum of human encounters, ranging from intensive co-design workshops aimed at generating new service ideas, to small-scale, ongoing activities focused on continuous refinement, as well as “listening desks” designed to collect input and suggestions. Some of these initiatives are one-off events, while others occur regularly and welcome spontaneous participation. All these activities can be enhanced by the shared physical spaces within the co-housing complex, with the most significant being “The Living Room”, which serves as a central reference point for all residents.

Digital opportunities were also introduced to ensure that participation in the co-design process could happen at any time: call to actions always open on the website, online forms for proposal submissions and active WhatsApp groups and communities dedicated to informal proposals.

- To identify roles and rules: a set of resources specifically designed for the most active participants, which are essential for establishing the foundation of the participatory ecosystem. They prioritise the formation of working groups and the distribution of flexible responsibilities to foster continuous renewal and a balanced mix of experienced and new members. This happens essentially through a set of codified encounters, such as association board meetings, internal organisational meetings and micro working-groups, together with the support of digital elements such as organisational charts and a variety of accountability forms especially for the three main foundational roles established - president, treasurer and secretariat (while other operational roles are defined - and periodically changed - through service co-production).

- To manage service co-production: a combination of elements to coherently and openly manage service co-production across its key phases of member engagement, activity organisation, and the eventual procurement and evaluation of services. They are intended for individuals willing to temporarily assume specific organisational responsibilities. They include activities such as open days for new member enrolment, booking and management forms, and regularly scheduled update meetings. In addition, a second set of operational mechanisms supports the delivery of specific service activities, typically involving small groups engaged in recurring, task-based collaboration. These mechanisms facilitate the management of variables such as resource inputs, attendance, delegation of duties, and documentation. Tasks are designed to require limited individual effort and can be distributed among multiple participants. This is also achieved through attendance sheets, equipment usage logs, shared reporting templates, and the temporary assignment of operational roles, including, for example, the “service contact person” or the “responsible for opening and closing shared areas” (such as the already mentioned Living Room but also a shared kitchen that hosts several activities).

- To facilitate access to services: a configuration of elements designed to support easy access to and use of services, targeting individuals who may not have the time for active participation but still want to benefit from the services. They include membership cards, newsletter subscriptions, social media

channels, WhatsApp communities, calendars, and payment guides and systems.

Such different combinations of human and non-human elements enabled broad and diverse participation within Porta Moneta association in the last three years. While it is not accurate to argue that everyone participates, it is noteworthy that even an immigrant mother with several children felt motivated and supported in running an activity. The duration of participants' roles is flexible and reversible, and if challenges arise, informal mechanisms are put in place that are gradually formalised. For example, when an activity responsible was unable to fully meet their commitment to open and close the common space and record attendance, participants took turns filling in, ensuring the service continued. While the minimum threshold for engagement is becoming a user, as this enables individuals to benefit from services and recognise the collective organisation behind them, the goal of the association is to continually expand opportunities for involvement and distribution of tasks according to each one possibility.

Conclusion

The participatory ecosystem outlined by building upon the "Porta Moneta" case is an abstraction that requires further experimentation to be improved. To ensure ongoing refinement, all the actors should be involved in a kind of "design after design" (Ehn, 2008; Halse, 2013; Shidende & Mörtberg, 2014) process, relying on the idea that design does not stop at (service) delivery or implementation, but it continues through use and constant modification by the people who live with or interact with it. In this perspective, the "Porta Moneta" participatory ecosystem is already conceived in a way that leaves room for future use, appropriation, and reconfiguration, especially to continuously enable the different "intensities of participation" already mentioned. Moreover, a well-conceived, expanded, and widely distributed participatory ecosystem aimed at supporting service co-design and co-production carries an essential implication: it enables individuals to exercise their right to collaborate while simultaneously fostering and developing their capacity for collaboration. In this way, relationships are promoted: people get to know each other, cooperate, and connect with a network of actors they can rely on, whether in times of need or simply to share social moments. By encouraging cooperation and shared responsibility, these services aim to create spaces for connection, relationship-building, and collective action, challenging the logic of the previously described Dominant Service Design while hopefully overcoming the widespread decline in collaborative skills observed by Sennett (2012).

This participatory ecosystem is not new per se, but, as noted, it can support the emergence of the second paradigm shift: moving from early collaborative services, sustained by the heroic efforts of a few individuals, to more mature public collaborative services in which the state plays an active role in enabling widespread collaboration. What follows highlights the elements that may be regarded as crucial and can also be viewed as a summary of possible takeaways of this paper:

- The idea of "intensities of participation": this refers to the concept of designing multiple levels of participation, ranging from intensive to lighter forms, thereby expanding the spectrum of opportunities to intersect with individuals' life trajectories. The aim is to offer modes of engagement that are compatible with participants' specific life circumstances at any given moment. For instance, it may leverage the greater availability of time among youth and the elderly, while also ensuring that adults, including working professionals and parents, are afforded meaningful opportunities to contribute to and benefit from the broader collaborative system. Distributing participation among a diverse range of people offers another key advantage: it can prevent the burnout of "social heroes" who often carry the weight of initiatives alone, as seen in the first wave of social innovation.

- Intentionally centring on marginalised groups: the varying levels of participation are designed to engage those often excluded due to life pressures and to a lack of tangible and intangible resources. Their inclusion is essential measure of success, services that fail to involve them cannot be considered effective. According to this intention, everyone is enabled to contribute based on their abilities and availability, ensuring a more resilient and equitable model of collaborative services.

- The increased involvement of the state: in the "Porta Moneta" case study, the Municipality of Milan through "The School of the Neighbourhoods" project, played a crucial role in identifying, nurturing, and amplifying the collective resources present within the society. In this vision, policymakers and public servants are integral components of the participatory ecosystem, actively contributing to the continuous improvement of the system itself and enhancing the effectiveness, efficiency, and distributions of services. More specifically, some public servants become key actors within this ecosystem: librarians, school teachers, and social workers, to mention a few, go beyond their traditional roles, taking on the additional function of cultural and social facilitators. They actively engage with the community and help coordinate the distribution of roles and tasks based on individuals' willingness to participate.

- Focus on service co-production (rather than co-design): the various "intensities of participation" and their corresponding participatory ecosystem have been specifically conceived to allow for the division and distribution of service-related tasks among multiple individuals. In carrying out their practical co-production tasks, people experience a sense of satisfaction and are able to see the tangible value of their contribution. This does not imply excluding them from co-design activities, but the Italian experimentations on collaborative public services show that it is often easier to involve marginalised individuals in co-production rather than in co-design. Sometimes, this division of labour is highly fragmented and discontinuous, but even involving a marginalised person in a small, time-limited service ask can be considered a meaningful result in any case.

As initially mentioned, such reflections are based on the observation of some prototypes of collaborative public services presented in the work of Manzini & D'Alena in the latter half of 2024 and on the experience of the author's research group with the "Porta Moneta" case study. There is an ongoing conversation on such topic in Italy, and more research is needed to expand and evolve these studies, especially from a service design perspective, and within a broader international context.

Acknowledgments

La Scuola dei Quartieri "The School of the Neighbourhood" project, co-funded by the European Union through the European Social Fund as part of the Metropolitan Cities Operational Programme 2014–2020)

Porta Moneta association.

Polimi DESIS Lab research group.

References

Akama, Y., Light, A. & Agid, S. (2023). Amplifying the politics in Service Design. Paper presented at ServDes.2023 Entanglements & Flows Conference: *Service Encounters and Meanings Proceedings*, 11-14th July 2023, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 610.

Audretsch, D. B., Eichler, G. M., & Schwarz, E. J. (2022). Emerging needs of social innovators and social innovation ecosystems. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 18, 217–254.

Barlagne, C., Melnykovych, M., Miller, D., Hewitt, R. J., Secco, L., Pisani, E., & Nijnik, M. (2021). What Are the Impacts of Social Innovation? A Synthetic Review and Case Study of Community Forestry in the Scottish Highlands. *Sustainability*, 13(8), 4359.

Bason, C. (2018). *Leading Public Sector Innovation (Second Edition): Co-Creating for a Better Society*. Bristol University Press.

Björgvinsson, E., Ehn, P., & Hillgren, P. A. (2010). Participatory design and democratizing innovation. In *Proceedings of the 11th Biennial Participatory Design Conference.* New York, ACM, 41-50.

Boyle, D. & Harris, M. (2009). *The challenge of co-production.* Discussion paper by Nef, Nesta and The Lab publications.

Calò, F., Scognamiglio, F., Bellazzecca, E., & Ongaro, E. (2023). Social innovation during turbulent times: a systematic literature review and research agenda. *Public Management Review*, *26*(6), 1706–1730.

Chalmers, D. (2013). Social innovation: An exploration of the barriers faced by innovating organizations in the social economy. *Local Economy*, *28*(1), 17-34.

Christensen, T. & Laegreid, P. (Eds) (2007). *Transcending the new public management: the transformation of public sector reforms*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.

Ciaffi, D. (2024). Amministrare in modo condiviso: la prospettiva degli abitanti, a partire dagli invisibili, In: Manzini, E. and D'Alena, M. *Fare Assieme. Una nuova generazione di servizi pubblici collaborativi.* Milano: Egea.

Cinar, E., Simms, C., Trott, P., & Demircioglu, M. A. (2024). Public sector innovation in context: A comparative study of innovation types. *Public Management Review*, *26*(1), 265-292.

de Bruin, A. M., & Stangl, L. M. (2013). The social innovation continuum: Towards addressing definitional ambiguity. *EMES Proceedings*, 1–17.

Dunleavy, P. & Hood, C. (1994). From old public administration to new public management. *Public Money Manage* 14(3):9–16.

Ehn, P. (2008). Participation in design things. In: *Proceedings of the 10th anniversary conference on participatory design*. New York, ACM, 95–97.

EC - European Commission (2013). *Powering European Public Sector Innovation: Towards A New Architecture*. Report of the Expert Group on Public Sector Innovation.

Frederickson, H.G. (1971). "New Public Administration," in F. Marini (eds), *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, Scranton (PA).

Halse, J. (2013). Ethnographies of the Possible, in W. Gunn, T. Otto and R. C. Smith (Eds.), *Design Anthropology: Theory and Practice*, 180–96, London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Hartley, J. (2005). Innovation in governance and public services: past and present. *Public Money Manage* 25(1):27–34.

Hood, C. & Dixon, R. (2015). *A Government that Worked Better and Cost Less? Evaluating Three Decades of Reform and Change in UK Central Government.* Oxoford University Press.

Howaldt, J., Kaletka, C., Schröder, A. & Zirngiebl, M. (2018). *Atlas of Social Innovation. New Practices for a Better Future.* Technische Universität Dortmund, ZWE Sozialforschungsstelle.

Jégou, F. & Manzini, E. (2008) *Collaborative services. Social innovation and design for sustainability.* Milano: Edizioni Polidesign.

Karasti, H. (2014). Infrastructuring in Participatory Design. *Proceedings of the 13th Participatory Design Conference:* Research Papers (PDC '14), Vol. 1. New York, ACM, 141–150.

Manzini, E. (2015). *Design, when everybody designs.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Manzini, E. & D'Alena, M. (2024). *Fare Assieme. Una nuova generazione di servizi pubblici collaborativi.* Milano: Egea, 11.

Mazzucato, M. (2021). *Mission economy: A moonshot guide to changing capitalism*. Penguin UK.

Meijer, A.J. (2016). From hero-innovators to distributed heroism: An in-depth analysis of the role of individuals in public sector innovation. In Osborne, S., Brown, L., Walker, R. (Eds) "*Innovation in Public services*", London: Imprint Routledge.

Meroni, A. & Selloni, D. (2018). Design for social innovators. In: Walker, S., Evans, M., Jung, J., Cassidy, T., Holroyd, A.T. (Eds) *Design roots: local products and practices in a globalised world.* Bloomsbury Academic.

Morelli, N. (2007). Social innovation and new industrial contexts: can designers "industrialize" socially responsible solutions? *Design Issues* 4, 3–21.

Moulaert, F. & Van den Broeck, P. (2018). Social Innovation and Territorial Development. In: Howaldt, J., Kaletka, C., Schröder, A., Zirngiebl, M. (Eds) *Atlas of Social Innovation – New Practices for a Better Future.* Sozialforschungsstelle, TU Dortmund University.

Mulgan, G. & Albury, D. (2003). *Innovations in the public sector.* London: Cabinet Office.

Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J. & Mulgan, G. (2010). *The open book of social innovation.* London: The Young Foundation, Nesta.

Nabatchi, T., Sancino, A. & Sicilia, M. (2017). Varieties of Participation in Public Services: The Who, When, and What of Coproduction. *Public Administration Review*, 77, 5: 766.

Osborne, S.P. (Eds) (2010). *The New Public Governance.* London: Routledge.

Pestoff, V. (2012). Innovations in public services: co-production and new public governance in Europe. In Botero, A., Paterson, A.G. & Saad Sulonen, J. (Eds)*Towards peer production in public services: cases from Finland.* Aalto University publication series Crossover, 15/2012.

Sangiorgi, D. (2011). Transformative services and transformation design. *International Journal of Design* 5(2), 29–40.

Selloni, D. (2017). *CoDesign for Public-Interest Services*. Research for Development series. Springer International Publishing.

Sennett, R. (2012). *Together: The Rituals, Pleasures and Politics of Cooperation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Seravalli, A. (2011). Democratizing production: challenges in co-designing enabling platforms for social innovation. In: *The Tao of sustainability, sustainable design strategies in a global context*, Bejing, China.

Shidende, N.H. & Mörtberg, C. (2014.) Re-visiting design-after-design: reflecting implementation mediators connectedness in distributed participatory design

activities. In *Proceedings of the 13th Participatory Design Conference*. New York, ACM, 61–70.

Star, S.L. & Bowker, X. (2002) How to infrastructure. In: Lievrouw, L.A., Livingstone, S.L. (Eds) *The handbook of new media*. London: SAGE, 151–162.

Star, S.L. & Rudhler, K. (1997). Steps toward an ecology of infrastructure: design and access for large information spaces. Design and access for large information spaces. *Information System Research*, 111–134.

Van Dijck, C., & Steen, T. (2024). Failed cases of collaborative innovation: when a castle turns into a tent. *Public Management Review*, 1–23.

Vashishth, A., Prasad, M., Shenoy, P. & Mohnot, J. (2021). Taking Stock and Moving Forward: A Case for Organizational Theories in Service Quality Research. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 42(3–4), 208–233.