

Less SDI, more Governance: implications for evaluation research



y. georgiadou & k. lance

Wayne Gretzky

“I just skate where I think the puck will be”

Assumptions:

Assumption 1:

SDIs are complex. Hence their evaluation is complex.


Assumption 2:

We can take the pulse of SDI at a national, regional and global level.


Evaluation practices

		Uncertainty wrt cause and effect	
		LOW	HIGH
Uncertainty wrt objectives	LOW	Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Answer machine - Goal monitoring - Evaluator as auditor Q: How are we doing?	Social Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning machine - Experiment - Evaluator as knowledge creator Q: Which benefits?
	HIGH	Sense making <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dialogue machine - Consensus - Evaluator as facilitator Q: Which objectives?	Exploratory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Idea machine - Exploration - Evaluator as catalyst Q: What is going on here?


G O V E R N A N C E




GOVERNANCE




+ Geo-ICT




+ Geo-ICT



+ Geo-ICT




+ Geo-ICT



+ Geo-ICT

Example 1: Conflict in India




+ Geo-ICT

Conflicts of values


	Politico-administrative spheres	Society sphere
Stakeholders' values	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• battle corruption• effectiveness• efficiency• transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• battle corruption• completeness• social justice• privacy

Example 2: Conflict in the UK


Who is afraid of the private sector?




Public Administration and society



Public Administration and society



Multi-disciplinarity



Political
Sphere

Public Admin.
Sphere

Society Sphere

Assumption 1: SDIs are complex

Proposition 1:

SDIs are complicated, not inherently complex.

SDIs appear to us complex when we try to generalise from situated local practices

SDI as the geo-realm of governance: multi-disciplinarity, multiple world views


Assumptions:

Assumption 2:


We can take the pulse of SDI at a national, regional and global level.

Look at the history of infrastructures ...


Evolution of infrastructures - USA




Users of infrastructures in USA




Infrastructure evolution

A large, bold, black letter 'S' with a subtle drop shadow, positioned on the left side of the slide.


1. Sprouting of infrastructure islands




2. New system as feeder




3. Encouragement by old system




4. New system formation




5. Competition with old system



6. Subordination of old system



7. Reverse feeder relation



Assumption 2: We can take the national, regional, global SDI pulse

Proposition 2: We can take the SDI pulse without artificially splitting the social from the technical:

1. Sprouting of infrastructure islands
2. New system as feeder
3. Encouragement by old system
4. New system formation
5. Competition with old system
6. Subordination of old system
7. Reverse feeder relation

Implications for research

- Less SDI
- More governance
- More history of infrastructure

Key literature:

Report of a Workshop on History & Theory of Infrastructure (Sept. 2006): Understanding Infrastructure: Dynamics, Tensions, and Design

<http://hdl.handle.net/2027.42/49353>

Questions?

