

Outcomes from Toulouse

Sebastien Paris

University of Toulouse

July 2013

Executive Summary

Previous BRAINPOoL's activities offered an overview of the pattern of actors, initiatives and approaches carried out inside the European debate about going "Beyond-GDP" at various scales. One interesting outcome showed that sub-national scales in France engage relevant actions toward the experimentation, the promotion and/or the implementation of Beyond GDP indicators. As BRAINPOoL engaged an analysis of the barriers encountered by several actors at the national and international scales, we chose to focus on regional and sub-regional actors to comprehend the specific barriers at work at these scales.

Stakeholders involved come from four different territorial scales – region, *département*, urban community/community of towns, city/town – and act as territorial authority, NGO, regional statistical office or elected representative.

Two methodologies have been used to lead this case study. Firstly, actors were interviewed separately to gather information about the content, the approach and the methods used by every actor to tackle the Beyond GDP issue inside its institution. Secondly, actors were invited to a meeting to favour exchanges and communication, and to take part to a workshop dedicated to create a collective reflexion. Both methods were structured according to the entries that the previous studies showed as the more relevant to tackle beyond GDP processes: actors, scales, concepts and methodology.

A large array of specific drivers and barriers at work at sub-national scales are revealed here in the context of the *Région Midi-Pyrénées*. As the main objective of this peculiar stage of

research is to sort out barriers and propose ways to overcome them, we identify four main categories of limits whom major issues are presented here:

Communication and knowledge – There is general lack of communication between actors and the absence of coordination is the major factor of the non-use of alternative indicators in public decision. Above all, the whole context about Beyond GDP is poorly known and implemented - alternatives are generally ignored.

Conceptual bounds – The absence of a clear model linked to Beyond GDP curbs its acceptance and its implementation. Sustainable Development keeps being mentioned but its objectives are directed toward well-being and social cohesion as ideals. Moreover, GDP still is predominant and must be completed instead of replaced.

Methodological barriers – Beside the general lack of material and economic facilities, the main barrier is the absence of (harmonized) data at sub-regional scales, and the will to develop data sharing or common database is unequal and limited by technical issues.

Actors and participation – Participation from civil society is subject to various problems as feasibility, individualism, which people are involved, what is the ideal degree of participation in institutional processes, etc. Decision makers are also sources of limits, from political calendars constraints to societal pressures.

Considering these barriers, and according to the drivers observed in this case, we make some propositions to overcome some of them through three types of activities to be carried-out by BRAINPOoL: communication (mainly by spreading the knowledge gained during the project), consulting (provide tools and methods produced during the project; propose existing AIs according to the need of the actor, etc.), and action (mainly by holding meetings at specific scales and by favouring the constitution and the efficiency of a network of actors).

The pool of Midi-Pyrenean actors ready to involve in a Beyond GDP initiative is rich, but needs to be structured to overcome the barriers it is facing. In general, the willingness for change seems to be relatively strong at sub-national scales, but the facilities they can rely on are limited to achieve it.

1. Introduction

The case study we carried out in Toulouse was deliberately dedicated to observe the barriers encountered by various actors inside the situation determined by the regional and sub-regional scales. The previous work packages showed that these scales were hosting several forms of Beyond GDP initiatives that bring relevant material into the whole Beyond GDP debate. So we made the choice to understand the practical limits they have to face, according to specificities pertaining to these scales.

Based on the observation (in WP2) of a general lack of communication among the various actors of the debate, we decided to invite different stakeholders constituting the system of actors (potentially) involved in a Beyond GDP approach inside the Midi-Pyrénées Region. This decision has two main reasons:

- There is no clear Beyond GDP initiative at work yet (inside which we can intervene)
- The limited means in these actors' possession – because of their limited size and their very localized influence – can be balanced by an efficient network able to tackle a Beyond GDP initiative together

So we decided to do not focus on a single actor/institution implementing an indicator inside its “area of influence”, but to observe the opportunity of a multi-actor approach inside a specific territory.

1.1 Objectives:

- Observation of the initiatives inside the Midi-Pyrénées Region, and analysis of the pool of actors involved,
- Bringing together these actors to spread the knowledge about this context,
- Discussing together the barriers to the uptake of alternative indicators inside these scales,
- Bringing ideas to overcome these barriers,
- Determining the specific drivers at work at these scales,
- Determining if there is a demand,
- Favouring the emergence of a network of actors, to improve the communication.

1.2 Actors constituting the case:

- Regional authorities (Midi-Pyrénées Regional Council; Regional Directorate for environment, land management and housing),
- *Département*¹ authorities (Haute-Garonne; Gironde),
- Community of municipalities (Sicoval),
- Municipality (Toulouse; Saint-Orens de Gameville),

¹ In France the first sub-section of the *région* is the *département*.

- NGO, (Social and solidary economy; Regional Agency for Sustainable Development),
- Elected representatives,
- Regional statistical office (INSEE Midi-Pyrénées).

1.3 Initiatives presented/actors interviewed:

Actor	Scale	Initiative
Midi-Pyrénées Regional Council	Region	Dashboard of SD Indicators Agenda 21
DREAL	Region	SPIRAL Agenda 21
Gironde	<i>Département</i>	SD aggregated indicators
ARPE	Region	Observatory for SD SD Barometer
Sicoval	Community of municipalities	Agenda 21
Saint Orens de Gameville	Municipality/town	Social Need Analysis Agenda 21

1.4 Methodological approach

The WP3 case study is structured according to two approaches. The first one consists in semi-structured interviews of the participants individually. The second one is the meeting itself, where actors are gathered and encouraged to discuss and perform a collective reflexion.

Individual interviews

The interview guide were structured according to the following entries to have a precise description of each initiative. The whole guide tend to more precisely address the issues linked to the scales and the societal participation:

- Conceptual aspects
 - Link between concepts and indicators

- Can SD and Well-Being be measured?
- What are indicators' roles and what is an alternative indicator?
- Knowledge and influence of AIs
- What influence can be expected from AIs?
- Implementation
 - Drivers of the actor's initiative
 - Barriers
- Methodology
 - How are linked concept and indicator?
 - Conveniences and inconveniences of dashboard, composites and single indicators? Which one did you select?
 - Legitimacy, salience
 - Communication
- Scale
 - Relevant scale for your initiative
 - Which scale for participation?
- Political aspects
 - Political and institutional context (crisis, Stiglitz report, Agenda 21,...)
 - What influenced you initiative? Who it influenced?
 - Top-down influence
 - Bottom-up influence
- Place given to civil society
 - Role of citizens inside the initiative
 - Methods and objectives of this participation
 - Results and uses

Meeting: collective workshop

To reach the objectives of the meeting, we organised it in two parts. The first one offers an overview of the context inside the regional scale by the presentation of five main initiatives. It allows attendees to have a better knowledge of the situation and build their argumentation upon real situations. This part begins with the presentation of BRAINPOoL's objectives and results (Léa Sébastien) to ease the comprehension of the role and the objectives of this meeting. Then, five initiatives linked to the Beyond GPD debate inside the Midi-Pyrénées Region are presented:

Sébastien KEIFF, in charge of Agenda 21, council of the *département* of Gironde:

Sustainable Development composite indicators of Gironde

Sendrine PICARD, Directorate for the Environment and SD, Regional Council of Midi-Pyrénées:

Sustainable Development in Midi-Pyrénées: Dashboard of regional indicators

Renée FARAUT, in charge of SD, Regional Directorate for the environment, land management and housing of Midi-Pyrénées:

Social cohesion and Agenda 21 in Midi-Pyrénées

Cécile RODRIGUEZ, Head of Agenda 21 and Governance, Sicoval, & Cédric VANDAELE, head of Social Cohesion, Sicoval:

The Agenda 21 of the 36 municipalities of the Sicoval

Bénédicte RIEY, Regional observatory for SD, Regional agency for Sustainable Development Midi-Pyrénées:

The Barometer of Sustainable Development

The second part of the meeting is a workshop for which the participants are randomly spread among 3 groups of 4 persons². Before the working in groups, each participant fills in a questionnaire addressing the four themes on which the following discussions will be structured:

- *Actors: Name the actors to be associated to Als' conception/implementation process.*
- *Scale(s): Which scale appears to you as the more relevant to implement alternative indicator(s)?*
- *Concept(s): According to you, could a concept unify the various beyond GDP initiatives? Why?*
- *Indicators: What shape(s) should have the ideal indicator?*

These questions have to be answered individually (on paper) to allow participants to gather their arguments and built a first reflexion on the themes that will be discussed later. They will keep their questionnaire all along the workshop to have their basis for reflexion at hand. At the end we get them back to enrich our individual analysis.

When the questionnaire is filled in, participants are asked to introduce themselves inside their respective group to favour exchanges, ease communication and chose a representative that will present the group's results to others.

² There were 17 participants, 5 of them left during the coffee break. We were 3 members of BRAINPOoL to lead the meeting.

The discussions in groups are structured on three questions per theme, knowing that the first one is the most general and is the same as in the individual questionnaires, while the two others are broadening the reflection to specific issues we wanted to have answers for.

The first discussion time lasts 25 minutes and is intended to tackle two themes – “actors” and “scales”. Questions for both themes are presented (as follows) on the same slide in the presentation to help participants manage the time available:

Theme “actors”: *Name the actors to be associated to AIs’ conception/implementation process.*

- Which role(s) could civil society play inside the debate and the AIs conception/implementation process?
- Who are the potential users of alternative indicators?

Theme “scales”: *Which scale appears to you as the more relevant to implement alternative indicator(s)?*

- Does comparability between territories appears relevant to you?
- Should we favour interactions between scales and between territories?

When discussions inside groups are over, each group’s representative proposes its results and arguments. BRAINPOoL members encourage participants to deepen their argumentation and further general discussions help broadening the debate on specific points.

The second discussion time should be carried out according to the same proceedings. However, some more participants have to leave, so is decided to run a collective reflection (eight participants). The following themes are driving the discussion:

Theme “concept(s)”: *According to you, could a concept unify the various beyond GDP initiatives? Why?*

- Is a coherent theoretical frame for the implementation of AIs necessary?
- What constitutes a territories’ wealth?

Theme “methodology”: *What shape(s) should have the ideal indicator?*

- Is the systematic standardization desirable?
- Is the systematic participation desirable?

Long discussions take place freely and the themes are extensively covered. The debates slowly shift toward more general views about the Beyond GDP issues to be finally concluded on opportunities to conduct future meetings.

2. Results

2.1 Individual stakes

Here are the results of individual interviews. They are the main drivers and barriers met by actors inside the regional context at the regional, departemental and local scales. Results are displayed according to the same themes used during the workshop (Actors, Scale(s), Concept(s), Methodology). Actors interviewed are those who presented their initiative during the meeting of May 27th.

Actors

Drivers	Barriers
<p>All initiatives led at the regional scale (Midi-Pyrénées) have a participatory approach involving the highest number of regional actors available (regional authorities and directorates, State, NGOs, citizens, employees, companies, etc.).</p>	<p>Participants from the civil society are people already involved in this type of initiative. There are no inexperienced people, and they are not randomly selected.</p>
<p>This participation generally consists in collecting ideas, discussing about concepts, priorities</p>	<p>Some ideas clearly come from citizens and will be taken into account by the institutions, but the rest of the process is clearly top-down.</p>
<p>In Midi-Pyrénées exists a platform for SD where major institutions bring funds and working time to tackle several topics whose results are destined to help territorial authorities.</p>	<p>Involving in an alternative indicators' initiative needs time and money. Such institutions have to make choices between several issues because they have limited economic and human resources.</p>
<p>Some institutions are powered by individuals strongly involved in both the development of a project inside their territory/institution and inside the national debate</p>	
<p>By providing information, indicators can alert about certain issues and legitimate the implementation of some political decision.</p>	<p>Regarding the influence upon citizens, it seems like indicators are not educational enough, and cannot be presented alone and need to be explained</p>

The measure of well-being implies so much subjectivity that if we do not involve citizens it cannot be widely accepted.

Some innovative and prospective techniques are used at local and *départementale* scales. They gather a relative high number of participants and offer real inputs in specific processes.

With SPIRAL, the Region expects to reach people that are not used to involve in such issues (households, unemployed people, young people under 25, etc.).

The use of the SPIRAL program by every territorial authority can offer a wider participation of citizens by an involvement of inhabitants at the scale of their commune.

The Stiglitz report is clearly a driver for Beyond GDP. Its assets are linked to its media coverage, to its educational, political and institutional impact.

The lack of coordination is a major factor of the non-use of indicators inside public decisions. So the coordination is one of the main challenges and the work is done in this way.

There is a clear lack of communication.

Indicators reporting on well-being are still based upon national data.

Young people and households are very difficult to reach regarding such issues.

Propositions from workshops and other participative methods are interesting but need deep adaptations to the functioning of the administration to potentially reach the implementation.

Political choices and methodological feasibility will decide to what extent this program will be accepted and implemented.

Several barriers:

1. This report is still unknown by many actors
2. Actors being aware of this report almost know nothing else about Beyond GDP (except HDI and EF)
3. Citizens do not address the issue by talking about "going beyond GDP", but by considering the opportunity to assess progress differently.
4. Addressing Beyond GDP is anxiety-provoking. To involve citizens and

decision-makers it is important to focus on specific themes and debate according to these themes, not directly about the questioning of GDP.

Decision-makers are facing several problems:

Sometimes decision-makers are motivated to tackle specific programs or to try to reach national objectives (as an example the ministry announced in 2009 that every territorial institution (more than 50 000 inhabitants) should have to an annual report about the situation of SD.

Decision-makers moreover pay attention to what citizens propose because they need to understand their electorate.

- They cannot tackle environmental issues because the social situation is too critical
- Citizens may be aggressive during participative meetings because they ask decision-makers to act quickly and efficiently to reduce the social/economic crisis (there is an idea to create a training to help DM managing conflicts to use such interactions instead of avoiding them).
- Some of them are simply not interested in the issue: they do not want to involve, the process cannot exist or is very much slowed, and no decision is done.
- Such process take years (often more than one mandate) so decision makers do not want to involve in projects whose results are not immediate, and projects appearing at the end of the mandate might be too dangerous and participate to the defeat at an election.
- Public meetings during the last 4/5 five months before the election are accounted as part of candidates' campaign. That's why they hesitate to take part to public workshop, roundtables, etc.
- Some are strongly committed to GDP and to the economic performance of their territory.
- The political sensitivity of political representatives is very important in the ranking of politics to be undertaken in priority.
- Lack of economical resources.

One problem with the top-down and bottom-

One major asset of the Midi-Pyrénées region is the high amount of NGOs that constitute a strong basis for potential alternative projects.

up methods is that pure bottom-up initiatives do not take into account the political agenda, so they can hardly be effective.

And sometimes, political agendas invite to address specific topics for which people have no interest at that time.

2.2 Scales

Drivers

Agenda 21 are carried out at every scale:

- Region
- *Département*
- Urban communities
- Communities of municipalities
 - Cities
 - Towns

The SPIRAL program was spawned by the European Council, has been promoted inside regions by the ministry of ecology, there is a national driving committee and territorial workshops are led everywhere in France.

SPIRAL is still in an experimental phase so every territory/institution implementing it participates to the building of its method by providing proper outcomes to other territories and scales.

A national seminar about SPIRAL gathered 46 territories (Regions, urban communities, National Parks, departmental councils, communities of municipalities, etc.)

The initiative from Gironde is transparent and oriented to be shared with other departments and in relation with the national scale (Senate, National Assembly, Fabrique Spinoza).

Barriers

Data and standards are incompatible.

This methodology is sometimes blindly copied by other departments that do not adapt the tools to their specificities.

That is an extensive initiative that asked for a large economical and human involvement from the departmental institution (cannot be easily reproduced in other *départements*).

For all initiatives, there is a major lack of data at the scale of municipalities. This avoids the development of local

The measure allows knowing where we are compared to other territories and use them as examples.

Some initiatives are based upon a large observation of the national context and of the various regional initiatives

The initiative has been broadly diffused and is now used inside some other departments.

The Regional Council organized a workshop at Rio+20 to present its approach of Agenda 21 and compare with and feed from other initiatives.

Interaction between territories is very interesting and pooling experiences and data has a strong potential.

implementation of AIs (If we want to collect data of the few main cities in Midi-Pyrénées, the budget of the regional directorate of the INSEE needs to be multiplied 800 times).

Some initiatives are built without any communication/knowledge about what has been done elsewhere.

No decision-maker took into account the numerous results produced.

Incompatibility of data, of processes in compiling them, of tools used to process them.

2.3 Concepts

For all actors, well-being is a constitutive part of SD. Some of them also consider that it is its main goal by developing in a way that allows future generations to have good living conditions. *“If we consider that well-being and SD are not linked, it is a sign that the original purpose of SD has been forgotten”*. Furthermore, social cohesion is a major focus and a transversal finality in almost each initiative.

Drivers	Barriers
<p>The governmental activities mainly addressed the environment during the last years with the Grenelle Environment process, and the Pact of Ecological Solidarity tackled the social dimension by inviting local authorities to act in that way inside Agenda 21. Now the social dimension and the social cohesion are leading concepts inside the regional institutions. At the scale of the government, the environment is now tackled through the concept of ecological transition where past initiatives (from the last government) are taken into account without being named.</p> <p>The Social Cohesion is the main approach currently used in Midi-Pyrénées inside every institution questioned.</p> <p>It is the main entry because of the general context that puts aside climate change and incites to focus on social sustainability. The related actions are led while considering an environmental sustainability but the environment is clearly not the main objective. Social cohesion is the most transversal finality.</p> <p>All the new agenda 21 are structured on</p>	<p>SD is considered from a very anthropocentric position as a reasonable consumption of resources to allow current and future well-being. Constituents of well-being are: equal good living conditions, have a job, ability to decently raise children, and decently taking care of aged and/or disabled people.</p> <p>People are at the centre of the whole approach, and their thriving and the social cohesion are the first entries of the process. There also is some kind of opportunism to tackle well-being while it becomes a major concept at the international scale. The whole system has to contribute to human well-being on territories and globally, and SD is</p>

social cohesion that is placed at the heart of the process as a knot.

The SPIRAL program focused on social cohesion is carried out as part of Agenda 21.

Participative meetings were carried out to adapt the definition of social cohesion (produced by the European Council inside SPIRAL) to the vision of regional actors and to regional priorities.

Using well-being is clearly a communicational asset for politicians because they can make decisions that have a immediate positive impact on the electorate.

Actors are all convinced that GDP should be completed by measures of environmental and social aspects. It is a necessity.

mean to achieve it.

The current individualism is a barrier to the development of alternatives that ask for an involvement by and for the community.

SD and A21 finally appear as approaches that are difficult to appropriate by citizens and decision-makers while well-being is easier to link to quotidian issues.

When we ask some actors what they consider as alternative indicators, some of them show a perception reduced to composite indicators, as if they were all AIs and as if all AIs were composite indicators.

GDP must be kept untouched for its international role, its clarity and robustness. Nothing can be a better representation of a national economy.

AIs cannot replace GDP because territories also need to be economically strong (AIs are not considered as opportunities to measure

Offering a tool as an alternative to GDP consists in offering the practical tools able to support new world visions. It just needs to be educational, accessible, and robust.

SD and well-being need to be measured. Some aspects cannot be measured, but it is essential to measure the consequences of what is/could be lost. So, well-being can be measured in a retro-active way through the measure of several factors of malaise.

differently a complex system, but as new indicators focused on specific concepts as well-being = they are considered as reductive as GDP is)

Indicators cannot change world visions. Individuals do not need them to feel if they are happy or not. Implementing a new indicator reveals a change in mentalities, but the implementation of a new indicator cannot change mentalities.

Many actors interviewed declare that well-being can't be measured. We can only use data about aspects influencing well-being.

2.4 Methodology

Drivers	Barriers
<p>Regional institutions are at the origin of several interesting productions linked to the collection and the diffusion of data/information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- List of regional observatories producing data.- Collection of all available data linked to SD in Midi-Pyrénées-	
<p>There are exchanges of data between regional institutions.</p>	<p>Data are not always usable by every institution.</p> <p>Furthermore, some institutions prefer using their data to be certain of its relevance, or of its coherence with their discourses.</p>
<p>Some alternative indicators are experimented at all scales.</p>	<p>Only the Ecological Footprint, the HDI and the Social Health Indicator are calculated for every regions.</p>
	<p>There is distrust for composite indicators because they are seen as black boxes that hide what composes it (can be dangerous). Simple indicators are clearer compared to aggregated ones. A composite can be useful to have an overview, but it is necessary to clearly see the various dimensions behind to understand trends. Citizens too want to know what is behind a single number.</p>
<p>At the regional scale, there is a clear preference for dashboards of indicators in Midi-Pyrénées.</p>	<p>The ideal number of indicators for the dashboard is between 10 and 20, but it does not help transparency. And it takes a lot of time to do such a work on indicators. It is a choice done by the institution to allow spending time and money on such issue.</p>
<p>The measure of well-being is done with various indicators inside the SD dashboard inside categories as social cohesion, human</p>	<p>Great difficulty to access regional and sub-</p>

thriving, ...

One of the main challenges is the balance between statistical salience and appropriability by citizens.

Inside A21, they noticed that it is better to have a low amount of indicators to be able to take the information into account without leaving it inside a massive unreadable stock of data. Advisories are to select something like 3 indicators by finality.

The data need to be talkative, easily spreadable in society. Official institutions have the duty to inform and find ideal ways to inform at best; that is why synthetic indicators might be too complex.

The Region has two types of indicators:

- strategic indicators to assess the evolution regarding the main objectives,
- action indicators for the follow-up of specific activities.

Data come from the INSEE, from internal activities/directorates, and from partnerships with other regions.

A global indicator could be useful to allow the region to know how it is ranked among others and to act on a larger scale.

All the dimensions constituting the assessment of the social cohesion, well-being etc. are still problematic to be synthesized into indicators. That is why institutions are expecting many practical

regional data.

Regional specificities need to be accounted to address the issues that peculiarly threatens the balance of the Region (example: need to have information about the influence of the major pole that Toulouse constitutes at the expense of rest of the whole region).

solutions from the program SPIRAL.

The approach of the *département* of Gironde:

The annual SD report is structured upon the five finalities of the Grenelle Law, so they decided to create a synthetic indicator for each of them. Each indicator is totally transparent, all the information about the method and the data are freely available on the Internet

Communication is not done widely, but wisely: creating and feeding the debate among field workers, inside families, municipalities, companies, NGOs, instead of a wide and blind diffusion in large media (that is expensive and inefficient).

Decision makers and territorial authorities are gathered inside a technical advisory council to train them and to involve them.

Synthetic indicators can grasp people attention. Each synthetic indicator hides a dashboard that constitutes it. These information only have to be freely available to people who want to deepen the understanding of the synthetic indicator.

They have a data-visualization on the Internet

(<http://www.datalocale.fr/drupal7/dataviz/ig-presentation>)

In the Sicoval, data are structured in a common database that gathers information from every directorate and that is automatized and available to every agent and decision maker (internal system).

Having only a dashboard is highly operational but is not educational at all.

Highly technical, non adapted to a diffusion to the public.

Midi-Pyrénées has a lot of observatories at various scales and about various themes (SD, landscapes, social cohesion, etc.) that create data available for sharing and can be a basis for networking.

A common methodology needs to be built to allow efficient exchanges of data between institutions.

2.5. Collective stakes

Here below are the results from the workshop and discussions carried out during the meeting of May 27th. They are synthetized in few main barriers encompassing the various problems raised by participants during discussions, and mentioned during individual interviews.

Lack of interactions between actors

We observe that in a relatively small territory (one French Region) are several initiatives which are totally carried out without any interaction between one another. Knowledge and experience are enclosed inside tiny spheres of actors without gaining from external exchanges. This leads to an interesting variety of initiatives and methods, but the general lack of economic and human resources to achieve high standard projects shows that interactions could be useful. We observe actors facing technical problems that others already overcame. Some are referring to out-dated initiatives while others could share their state of the art, etc.

No data sharing between institutions

The idea of a database shared and fed by every territorial institution and upon which could be based new indicators is mentioned several times. As an interesting solution, it has been discussed quite deeply and multiple barriers emerged. Institutions creating data and/or institutions having processed data do not share their productions and methods with others because of several factors:

- Some institutions ignore the usefulness to share data
- Sharing data can be a risk for an institution that does not want to have its performances compared (or judged)
- In some institutions, data are often spread all over its internal departments without being organised inside a common and convenient database
- Some institutions avoid sharing data that needed a hard work to collect. They do not want to freely share the enjoyment of such work, and want to assure their primacy

- regarding the interpretation of data.
- The harmonisation of data between institutions and between territories needs a tedious work

However, some administrative drivers are inciting official institutions to share their data:

- Ministerial obligation to diffuse a certain amount of data
- The public access to administrative documents
- Since 1995 towns and cities have to carry out a analysis of social needs
- Each territorial authority over 50 000 inhabitants has to produce an SD diagnosis

Lack of available/usable data at local scales

Collecting, creating and processing data at scale lower than the *département* is highly expensive and cannot be undertaken by national nor regional statistical institutes. However, at every scale, institutions are producing data about various aspects linked to their activities. As seen before, these data are not processed, not even organized so they cannot be used to produce regular indicators nor to allow comparison between entities.

No clear national frame for alternative indicators

Actors are feeling that the alternative indicators issue, the Beyond GDP debate, the questioning of the measure of progress, of wealth, etc. are not framed enough by national authorities. This situation limits official regional and local authorities to carry out initiatives because they are used to respond to national objectives structured upon a clear approach and a dedicated budget. They are lost in the various concepts, finalities and means to address this issue.

No common conceptual frame

What we call “Beyond GDP” is not so obvious for Midi-Pyrénéan actors. They need to refer a clear concept on which actions can be built. Without it, objectives appear unclear and individual interpretations avoid pooling means and actions. A better theoretical frame could offer a better basis and point out the reasons why new indicators are needed, what is expected from their implementation, etc.

Several limits regarding citizens participation

What do we consider as a “participative approach”? Are citizens involved to bring ideas without being involved in the technical and decisional process? Citizens can be easily involved punctually but it is really difficult to involve them regularly. We need to respect their right to be not involved. Participation appears easier to be carried out at local scales, what limits the possibility to generalize this approach at higher scales.

Lack of material and economic facilities

Alternative indicators initiatives need long and deep processes that require important economic and human resources. Their tenure needs to make political choices that some decision-makers are not ready to engage.

Unclear objectives behind the implementation of alternative indicators

As mentioned above, regional actors are feeling that alternative indicators are still not paired with clear goals. We need to refer to a common ideal to consider what changes are to be expected from the implementation of indicators.

No clear model linked to alternative indicators

As GDP is linked to a specific and well known model, alternative indicators still are only linked to what we don't want to be part of anymore. A clear model needs to support their implementation to strengthen processes, to settle objectives and to communicate more easily about their finalities.

Need to settle if we need comparison between territories or if we need to favour local uniqueness

According to the objective expected from the implementation of alternative indicators, it is important to decide if the challenging of GDP is to be undertaken to have a better basis for the comparison of territories or if it is done with the goal to better manage a specific territory. A general observation shows that comparison between territories is useful to help territorial authorities to assess their performances according to current national/global stakes. However, it is necessary to adapt the measure to territorial specificities. Both orientations are necessary, the challenge seems to find how managing a measurement tool able to take both of them into account.

Lack of diffusion of alternative indicators -> lack of knowledge

There is an important lack of communication about alternative indicators. Existing initiatives, contextual innovations, AIs experimentations still are not known by the large public, even among actors of debate. Comments during the workshop and during the interviews clearly reveal that when people are informed about the stakes of alternative indicators, they show a strong interest for the issue. Moreover, only the main international outstanding initiatives are known by the public (HDI and EF).

3. Conclusion and propositions

Several barriers being identified, we now propose ideas to overcome them. The following tab organises our propositions according to the method to implement them ('communication',

‘consulting’ and ‘actions’) and to the feasibility for BRAINPOoL (‘suitable for BRAINPOoL’s competence’ and ‘first ideas to develop’).

	METHOD			
	COMMUNICATION	CONSULTING	ACTIONS	
Barriers				
Lack of interactions between actors			Organise workshops and meetings to improve exchanges between actors, favour the creation of an effective network and improve the understanding between the various actors.	<i>Suitable For BRAINPOoL</i> <i>First idea</i>
No data sharing between institutions		Inform institutions about the interest and the usefulness of sharing data, and the role that a common database could play in building alternative measures of progress, SD, well-being, etc.		<i>Suitable</i> <i>First idea</i>
Lack of available/usable data at local scales			Provide tools and methods for the building of an effective and standardized	<i>Suitable</i> <i>First idea</i>

No clear national frame for alternative indicators	database inside small institutions.	
	No proposition	<i>Suitable</i> <i>First idea</i>
No common conceptual frame		<i>Suitable</i>
	Develop and undertake brokerage activities between these actors and scientists to exchange knowledge about previous analyses, results, and experimentations.	<i>First idea</i>
Several limits regarding citizens participation	Consider the results from the whole BRAINPOoL project and propose a description of successful initiatives (as WP1 fact-sheets) where are explained the methods and degree of citizens' participation inside these successful initiatives.	<i>Suitable</i> <i>First idea</i> <i>Suitable</i>
		<i>First idea</i>
		<i>Suitable</i>
Lack of material and economic facilities	Develop and use the interactions between the members of the network to fasten knowledge exchanges, sharing investments into local experts' training and specific equipment.	<i>First idea</i>
Unclear objectives		<i>Suitable</i>

behind the implementation of alternative indicators

Organise workshops dedicated to the definition of common goals inside the network, to find the ultimate users and adapt the measure to them, and to consider the political use of AIs (what changes are expected, how new indicators are expected to be used and taken into account).

First idea

No clear model linked to alternative indicators

Diffuse knowledge about alternative indicators, their goals, paradigms, authors, etc. Broaden the audience of BRAINPOoL's results.
(To be linked with the development of brokerage activities with scientists)

Suitable

Need to settle if comparison between territories is needed or if local uniqueness should be favoured

Use BRAINPOoL's experience to propose existing indicators linking local specificities and

First idea

Suitable

First idea

Lack of diffusion of alternative indicators (lack of knowledge)

There is a general need for an improvement of communication about indicators. No clear solution proposed except developing the diffusion by any mean.

comparability
(indicators with a common body shared by every territorial entity
(comparability)
a part dedicated to local/regional specificities).

Suitable

First idea

