

***Design* de políticas públicas: experiência de um município brasileiro, com foco no uso e ocupação da orla marítima**

Public policy design: experience from a Brazilian municipality, focusing on the use and occupation of the seafront

Eduarda Montibeller Schuch^{1i*}, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6075-6107>; **Micheline Gaia Hoffmann²ⁱⁱ**, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8516-2137>.

1. Universidade do Vale do Itajaí - UNIVALI, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração, Itajaí, Santa Catarina, Brasil.

2. Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina - Udesc, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina, Brasil.

***Autor correspondente:** dumontibeller@gmail.com; R. 2900, 66 - Centro, Balneário Camboriú - SC/Brasil, 88330-355

Resumo

Em um contexto que requer a participação da sociedade no planejamento e na tomada de decisão, somado às demandas para ordenar o uso e a ocupação da zona costeira, o governo federal brasileiro criou o Projeto Orla, com o intuito de aplicar diretrizes para disciplinar o uso e ocupação da orla marítima. Ele se caracteriza como uma política que combina práticas patrimoniais e ambientais com o planejamento de uso e ocupação desse ambiente. Este artigo teve como objetivo analisar a experiência do município de Balneário Camboriú com o Projeto Orla, à luz do *design* colaborativo de políticas públicas. A pesquisa consistiu num estudo de caso que fez uso de levantamento documental, entrevistas e análise temática. Os resultados mostraram que a heterogeneidade e o envolvimento de diferentes atores na elaboração do plano permitiram integrar o conhecimento técnico, científico, e o conhecimento da comunidade.

Palavras-chave: políticas públicas; *design*; Projeto Orla.

Abstract

In a context that requires society's participation in planning and decision-making, in addition to demands to organize the use and occupation of the coastal zone, the Brazilian federal government created the Orla Project, designed to apply guidelines for regulating the use and occupation of the seafront. It is characterized as a policy that combines property and environmental practices with planning the use and occupation of this environment. This article aimed to analyze the experience of the municipality of Balneário Camboriú with the Orla Project, in light of the collaborative design of public policies. The research consisted of a case study that used documentary survey, interviews and thematic analysis. The results showed that the heterogeneity and involvement of different actors in the preparation of the plan enabled the integration of technical and scientific knowledge, together with community knowledge.

Keywords: public policies; design; Orla Project.

Citação: Schuch, E. M. & Hoffmann, M. G. (2026). Design de políticas públicas: experiência de um município brasileiro com foco no uso e ocupação da orla marítima. *Gestão & Regionalidade*, v. 42, e20269422. <https://doi.org/10.13037/gr.vol42.e20269422>

1 Introduction

Public administration faces the challenge of achieving efficiency in its policies and services and the public interest, simultaneously. The demands for a more inclusive democracy and the complexity of the problems require changes that involve greater participation of society in the planning and decision-making processes (Ansell et al., 2017). Therefore, there is a potential to be explored in the convergence of collaborative design literature and public policies (Blokamp, 2018; Hermus et al., 2020; Pluchinotta et al., 2019; Van Buuren et al., 2020).

The current literature on policy design shows a debate between supporters of traditional approaches and those who bring insights from design practices and handling, characterizing it as an open, participatory, collaborative, flexible, and iterative process (Peters, 2020). For Pluchinotta et al. (2019), public policy design is a way of developing a collective definition of the problem, leading to innovation and valuing participants' prior involvement.

In addition to several other demands, Brazilian society is claiming to organize the use and occupation of the coastal strip throughout the country. Hence, the Federal Government created the Waterfront Integrated Management Plan (PGI), commonly known as the Waterfront Project, in 2002. It proposed general guidelines to municipalities for drawing up a collaborative public policy, involving social, governmental, and non-governmental groups. The goal was to build a network of social groups to encourage the involvement of civil society, both in the production cycles of services and public policies, and in the balanced and sustainable use of the coastal environment.

Balneário Camboriú, a coastal city in Southern Brazil, with a prominent tourism sector, followed the federal government's guidelines and carried out a collaborative planning experiment in 2019, for the occupation and use of its seafront. This article analyzes the experience of Balneário Camboriú City Hall (PMBC) with the Orla Project, in the light of the literature on collaborative design of public policies.

The research contributes by generating theoretical and empirical evidence on the design of a plan at municipal level, which is related to heritage, environmental, and coastal planning public policies. It also shows that public administration has the challenge of keeping up with the changes taking place in society; therefore, there is a growing demand for innovative policies, services, and forms of organization (Ansell & Torfing, 2014). To this end, it is essential to adopt more inclusive approaches in public policy formulation (Pluchinotta et al., 2019; Van Buuren et al., 2020), in order to meet citizens' demands and needs.

After this introduction, the article has the following sections: theoretical framework, methodological procedures, result analysis and discussion, final remarks and references.

2 Theoretical background

In the mid-1980s and early 1990s, a branch of policy design emerged with an interdisciplinary vision, which has evolved to this day. Van Buuren et al. (2020) observe that the central question of policy design is how policies can be created to effectively address the issues under discussion in society. It suggests involving experiences and actors from outside the public sector, such as think tanks, universities, and consultants, private sector stakeholders, and citizens. This definition is similar to the arguments of Pluchinotta et al. (2019), for whom



policy design began to adopt a bottom-up policy formulation process, from 2010 onwards. As a result, policy design practices have become increasingly participatory and advisory in nature.

In order to design and implement public policies and subsequent plans, participation and collaboration between multiple actors foster public innovation (Ansell & Torfing, 2014). It is therefore critical to establish collaborative arenas that enable the joint definition of problems, in order to generate collective learning and solutions that actually meet citizens' needs. Bason (2010) argues that the field of design helps dealing with the practical issue of how to bring together various actors in a collaborative, open, and interdisciplinary arena to seek solutions to the so-called wicked problems (Rittel & Webber, 1973). For Van Buuren et al. (2020), design can be understood as an approach that fosters collaborative processes for drawing up public policies and municipal plans, using co-creation and dialogue with users and stakeholders.

A collaborative process is adopted for achieving an established goal. Some authors mention that the aim of a participatory process can be fulfilling legal requirements that demand participation or public hearings; informing citizens about the intentions and reasons of rulers regarding a certain action/plan/policy; or conveying citizens' preferences to governors (Van de Kerkhof, 2006; Margles et al., 2010; Gil et al., 2011; Sisto et al., 2017, 2018; Suopajarvi & Kantola, 2020; Fuldauer et al., 2019; Longato et al., 2019; Rasheed & Abdulla, 2020).

According to Rubio et al. (2021), a collaborative process can aim to consult citizens on planning an action/plan/policy, in order to advise rulers on decision-making; involve citizens in planning an action/plan/policy and in decision-making; or make citizens take the final political decisions. In addition, there may be one or more goals to be met.

A collaborative process must involve different players, in addition to the government itself. Many authors argue that it is necessary to have a collaborative arena with the participation of the government, private sector, organized civil society, community, and citizens (Koontz & Johnson, 2004; Van de Kerkhof, 2006; Davis, 2008; Hampton, 2009; Margles et al., 2010; Gil et al., 2011; Gutberlet, 2015; Campos et al., 2016; Sisto et al., 2017, 2018; Fuldauer et al., 2019; Longato et al., 2019; Pinheiro de Andrade et al., 2020; Suopajarvi & Kantola, 2020; Rasheed & Abdulla, 2020; Rubio et al., 2021). For some of them, in addition to these players, universities have a lot to add to the debates on a policy/plan being built collaboratively (Van de Kerkhof, 2006; Hampton, 2009; Gil et al., 2011; Campos et al., 2016; Sisto et al., 2017, 2018; Fuldauer et al., 2019; Longato et al., 2019; Pinheiro de Andrade et al., 2020; Rubio et al., 2021).

For this cooperative arena to work, made up of heterogeneous actors, it is necessary to carry out a deliberate process of collaboration, with several stages and favorable characteristics. Gil et al. (2011), Gutberlet (2015), Campos et al. (2016), Sisto et al. (2017, 2018), Fuldauer et al. (2019), Stave et al. (2019), Longato et al. (2019), and Rubio et al. (2021) suggest the following stages for this process:

1. Diagnosis: building quantitative and qualitative knowledge on the object of the plan; characterization of the general aspects (socio-economic aspects, status of the operational and management structure, general situation of the municipality, legislation, and current regulations); status of the plan's theme (general data and characterization, structure and functioning, costs, competencies and responsibilities);

2. Action planning: definition of the city's priorities and related goals, based on quantitative and qualitative knowledge (perspectives for managing the object under discussion); definition of responsibilities; definition of guidelines, strategies, programs, actions, goals, and deadlines (specific measurable goals, according to a time horizon, as well as indicators for measuring them);

3. Final formulation of the plan: process evaluation; communication and promotion; supervision and monitoring.

To help guide the process, from a public policy design perspective, various tools and methods can be used to foster collaboration between the actors. These include participatory backcasting, scenario building, strategy building, SWOT analysis, brainstorming, and the analytical hierarchy process. Sisto et al. (2017, 2018), Fuldauer et al. (2019), and Van de Kerkhof (2006) show that participatory backcasting uses normative views to predict desirable futures, and is a sustainability forecasting tool due to its emphasis in considering long-term futures in an exploratory way.

Scenario building is used to anticipate exogenous factors and deal with uncertainty (Fuldauer et al., 2019; Campos et al., 2016). Strategy building is used for planning endogenous factors and represent visions of the future with fixed investment plans (Fuldauer et al., 2019). SWOT analysis is an approach that helps to create scenarios, aiming to identify the endogenous and exogenous elements of an organization, among them strengths and weaknesses (internal), and the opportunities and threats of the external environment, which influence the phenomenon under analysis (Longato et al., 2019; Stave et al., 2019; Margles et al., 2010) Brainstorming is a technique used to generate different solutions and opportunities quickly (Stave et al., 2019), helping to identify the most relevant ideas to be taken forward, seeking to create a shared understanding.

The analytical hierarchy process requires that decision-makers carry out a series of comparisons between pairs of factors and assign a numerical rating for each decision (Margles et al., 2010). These decisions reflect the decision-maker's perception of the relative importance of the factors. In addition, Stave et al. (2019) show that establishing basic rules for members' behavior during meetings, even if it is not considered a method or tool, is crucial in collaborative processes with the presence of heterogeneous actors.

Considering the categories presented so far, we observe that a collaborative process is built through interactive, flexible, and iterative sessions. When discussing potential outcomes of the process, Medero and Albaladejo (2018) show that these can be managerial, political, and social. Managerial results refer to the impact of the processes on the administrative model and public decisions and policies. Political results refer to the impact of the processes on the development of values of the democratic political system. Finally, social outcomes are the impacts of the processes on inclusion and social cohesion.

However, the prevailing bureaucratic nature of public organizations and their procedures make it a challenge to develop public policies in the light of design, so that the goals and results described above do not happen without facing barriers. For this reason, several authors have discussed which elements facilitate or hinder the implementation of experiences and processes with those features.

Among the facilitating aspects, they mention: the participatory dialogue approach and an informal, open, and trusting environment (Hampton, 2009; Margles et al., 2010; Gutberlet, 2015); the adopted method and heterogeneity of stakeholders (Sisto et al., 2017, 2018; Fuldauer et al., 2019); encouraging participation and independent facilitation (Davis, 2008; Gil et al., 2011); involvement of all relevant stakeholders and a more decentralized approach (Gil et al., 2011); clear “rules of the game” and process leadership (Medema et al., 2017); support from local government (Medero & Albaladejo, 2018); stakeholders’ tacit knowledge about the local context of the territory/community (Rubio et al., 2021; Sisto et al., 2017; Longato et al., 2019); and integration of scientific knowledge (Longato et al., 2019).



On the other hand, factors that can hamper a collaborative process are: the lack of a participatory culture among stakeholders and the lack of interest and commitment by citizens (Sisto et al., 2017; Medero & Albaladejo, 2018); unavailability of high-quality local data and time needed to draw up a participatory plan (Longato et al., 2019); the lack of user participation in the process (Davis, 2008); insufficient support from local government and lack of government representation (Medema et al., 2017; Rasheed & Abdullah, 2020); distrust among stakeholders (Sisto et al., 2017, 2018); difficulty for involving and retaining all relevant groups in the process, conflicts of interest between stakeholders (Sisto et al., 2017, 2018), 2017; Rasheed & Abdulla, 2020); conflicts of values and interests between participants (Suopajärvi & Kantola, 2020); power inequality within interest groups (Rasheed & Abdulla, 2020); lack of feedback and iteration (Rubio et al., 2021).

Based on this brief theoretical background, next section describes the methodological procedures used to carry out the research.

3 Methodology

We used a mostly qualitative approach, collecting data through documentary research and interviews. The documentary research was carried out at Balneário Camboriú City Hall, by accessing the following documents: attendance lists, meeting reports, and other records drawn up during the process, in addition to Orla Project manuals, made available by the Federal Government (MMA & MPOG, 2005).

In addition, we carried out semi-structured interviews with the following people: two representatives of the municipal government - one political (E1) and one technical (E4) - and representatives of a civil society organization (E2) and a university (E3). The interviewees were selected by analyzing the attendance lists of the meetings, which showed the most active. Therefore, we sought to collect data in order to enable triangulation in data analysis, comparing different documents and research subjects.

The interview script was built from the theoretical background. To find out the state of the art on the topic, we searched Scopus, Web of Science, and Ebsco databases, focusing on the convergence between collaborative design and public policies. The following categories were included in the model: goals associated to participatory practices in drawing up municipal plans and public policies; actors involved in the process; structure of the collaborative process; tools used in the process; factors that facilitated or hindered the process; and results achieved.

Thematic analysis was used as the method of analysis. The content of the interviews was transcribed in full and then ranked according to the analysis model. The following section presents and discusses the research results based on the analytical categories.

4 Results

In this section, with a focus on the proposed goals, we analyze the process of drawing up the Integrated Waterfront Management Plan - Project Orla in the municipality of Balneário Camboriú.

To answer the various demands for planning the use and occupation of the coastal area throughout the national territory, the Orla Project was created by the Federal Government and led by the Ministry of the Environment, in partnership with the Federal Heritage Secretariat

(SPU). The project began in 2002, with the aim of applying general guidelines for regulating the use and occupation of the seafront, and is a national policy that combines and articulates heritage and environmental practices with the planning of use and occupation of this environment, for the natural and economic sustainability of the Coastal Zone (MMA & MPOG, 2005).

The federation pact in Brazil adopts the decentralized model for waterfront management, which involves principles and procedures for shared action between the three government spheres and civil society. The Orla Project aims to set up a network to carry out interventions necessary for the common use of this space, with environmental and territorial planning, and a clear division of tasks among all parties (MMA & MPOG, 2005). Coastal cities have several responsibilities and tasks, such as drawing up the Integrated Waterfront Management Plan and creating the Waterfront Management Committee.

The Orla Project was drawn up through workshops, meetings, and seminars, which followed five manuals with instructions for managers, together with civil society, to design the plan, guided by an instructor trained by the federal government. Hence, the project provides municipalities with a channel for dialog between various social groups, governmental and non-governmental, and the creation of this network of social groups enables identifying local problems and priorities in a participatory way (PMBC, 2019).

The city of Balneário Camboriú developed its first Waterfront Project in 2003, but the document was not approved by state and federal authorities (PMBC, 2019). Hence, in 2019, the city revised the previous plan, creating the preliminary Integrated Waterfront Management Plan for the city. To do that, PMBC adopted a bidding process for hiring an instructor qualified by SPU to conduct the review of the Orla Project for the city.

To analyze the collaborative process of building the Orla Project in Balneário Camboriú, we listed the analytical categories mentioned in section 3 – Methodology, based on the literature review.

The collaborative process aimed to fulfill what was agreed by signing the Beach Management Adhesion Term (TAGP), which had the purpose of transferring to the municipality the management of the sea beaches in its territory, including the areas of common use goods with economic exploitation (PMBC, 2019), and was signed with SPU.

According to item V of SCGPU Ordinance no. 44/2019, TAGP commits the municipality to “make available and keep updated on its institutional website, already existing or to be created, the following information regarding the areas covered by this document”. More specifically, when applicable, it should draw up “a.4) a local management plan for waterfront protection, or the Orla Project's Integrated Management Plan” and “c) within 3 (three) years of signing the Adhesion Term, a plan for waterfront protection, according with art. 32 of Decree no. 5.300/2004, or a review of the existing plan”. In addition, according to the manuals, it should be drawn up through workshops, meetings, and seminars, together with civil society.

Hence, one of the goals of the collaborative process was to comply with legal requirements, which demand participation or public hearings (Van de Kerckhof, 2006; Margles et al., 2010; Gil et al., 2011; Sisto et al., 2017, 2018; Fuldauer et al., 2019; Longato et al., 2019; Suopajärvi & Kantola, 2020; Rasheed & Abdulla, 2020). In addition, regarding the involvement of citizens in planning and decision-making of the plan, E1 mentions that “[...] entities were invited to join a participatory process, bringing the community’s opinion”. In this sense, it includes another objective of the collaborative process: to involve citizens in planning and decision-making (Rubio et al., 2021).



The Orla Project workshops received around 320 participants over 14 meetings (PMBC, 2019). Before the first meeting, the Secretariat of the Environment listed all entities of organized civil society to be invited by letter, email, or telephone. There were 19 residents' associations in the municipality and 22 bodies, including sports, civil construction, traders, restaurants, hotels, and environmental associations. Also invited were all municipality departments, the Fire Department, the Environmental Military Police, the Port Authority, the Association of Municipalities in the Mouth of Itajaí Region (AMFRI), and the Superintendence of the Union Heritage of Santa Catarina - SPU/SC. Before each meeting, City Hall drew up an invitation for the whole society and publicized it on social media. In addition, several newspapers in the region helped to spread the meetings and reinforced the invitation, through 10 published articles (PMBC, 2019).

These participants, the actors involved, were part of the following social groups: government, organized civil society, community, citizens, and universities, as suggested by different authors (Van de Kerkhof, 2006; Davis, 2008; Hampton, 2009; Margles et al, 2010; Gil et al., 2011; Gutberlet, 2015; Campos et al., 2016; Sisto et al., 2017, 2018; Fuldauer et al., 2019; Longato et al., 2019; Pinheiro de Andrade et al., 2020; Suopajarvi & Kantola, 2020; Rasheed & Abdulla, 2020; Rubio et al., 2021).

The government group included organizations from the federal, state, and local spheres. From the former, there were representatives from SPU/SC, Ministry of Tourism, and Port Authority. From the state government, there were representatives from the Military Fire Department. From the local government, there were representatives from the Secretariat of the Environment, the Secretariat of Urban Planning and Budget Management, the Secretariat of Tourism and Economic Development, and the Municipal Sports Federation (PMBC, 2019).

Representatives of organized civil society included the Association of Municipalities at the Mouth of the Itajaí River (AMFRI), the Taquaras Residents' Association, the Z07 Fishing Colony, the Central Beach Corn and 'Churros' Workers' Association, Santa Catarina Association of Surf Schools, Santa Catarina Federation of Surfers, NGO Save the Oceans, and Institute Sea Angels/BR, Residents' Association of Estaleiro Beach, Residents' Association of Nações District, and Residents' Association of Estaleirinho (PMBC, 2019). There were also community residents, citizens, and property owners from Praias Agrestes [Rough Beaches] (AMFRI, 2019).

As for universities, representatives from the Integrated Coastal Management Laboratory at the Federal University of Santa Catarina (LEGECI/UFSC) took part in the collaborative process all the time. In addition, there were occasional participations from Avanti University Center (UNIAVAN) and from University of Vale do Itajaí (UNIVALI) (PMBC, 2019).

As for the structure of the process, for the review and building of Balneário Camboriú Orla Project, the methodology provided by the federal government in the manuals (PMBC, 2019) was used, suggesting the creation of two workshops. The meetings were led by a facilitator, a person trained by the federal government for this role, and through interactive, flexible, and iterative workshops and sessions. Workshop I, which took place from June 10 to 27, 2019, developed a simplified landscape, environmental, and socioeconomic diagnosis, classification of the waterfront, delimitation of the space of interest for future interventions, and definition of the current and future scenarios (trend and expectations) (PMBC, 2019; MMA & MPOG, 2005).

Workshop II, for planning the actions, took place between August 20-22, 2019, and developed the suggested activities. After the workshops, a meeting was held to present the plan

to the entities for validation and amendment, if necessary. The preliminary PGI was then completed and submitted to City Hall for assessment.

The structure of the building process of PGI was similar to what Gil et al. (2011), Gutberlet (2015), Campos et al. (2016), Sisto et al. (2017, 2018), Fuldauer et al. (2019), Stave et al. (2019), Longato et al. (2019) and Rubio et al. (2021) suggested: diagnosis, action planning, and final formulation of the plan. However, the city still lacks the communication and promotion of the plan and its supervision and monitoring, since it is still being analyzed by higher authorities, and is not formally in force yet.

As for the tools and methods used during the workshops, we highlight, based on PMBC (2019), that participatory backcasting (Van de Kerkhof, 2006; Sisto et al., 2017, 2018; Fuldauer et al., 2019) was used to build scenarios (Fuldauer et al., 2019; Campos et al., 2016) and strategies (Fuldauer et al., 2019). There were also several rounds of brainstorming (Stave et al., 2019) to identify problems on the seafront, as well as the necessary actions. The analytical hierarchy process (Margles et al., 2010) was used to prioritize the actions identified over a period of time. In addition, basic rules were defined for the behavior of members during the meetings (Stave et al., 2019).

With regard to the results of the process, the Orla Project was drawn up and completed and, according to E1, was already filed for analysis by the State Commission. Drafting the plan is a result achieved by the collaborative process, according to Gil et al. (2011). For Sisto et al. (2018), the plan is the result of a public policy formulation that seeks to meet stakeholders' needs. Its approval and implementation are also a result, but not yet achieved by PMBC, since the plan is under analysis (Suopajärvi & Kantola, 2020). The Orla Project Management Committee was created "through the election of the entities that would form it, considering equality between public authorities and society", according to E1. It is also worth mentioning the managerial, political, and social results of the process (Medero & Albaladejo, 2018).

Managerial results refer to the impact of the process on the administrative model and public decisions, especially building a public policy for coastal management policy at local level. We also identified political results in the development of values of the democratic system.

These results emerge in the words of E1: "[...] now we make decisions [...] based on what was discussed and what is planned in the document. And other people also use the Orla Project for other necessary analyses". The existence of a guiding document for City Hall's actions was also mentioned by E2, E3 and E4.

E1 also gives a practical example of how the decisions made for the Orla Project are being used in municipal government projects:

"We have important projects in the city, such as the Master Plan, which was commissioned by the Jaime Lerner office, and used the Orla Project as a basis; the widening of the sand strip also considers aspects related to the Orla Project, such as the recovery of the 'restinga' [sandbank] vegetation. All future actions use it as a basis, so I think its impact stems from the participatory meetings, which are really being harnessed now, through the document. This also shows a pact for the political system, as the municipality has a guiding document for its actions".

E3 shows that the process had a positive impact on the democratic political system, by "[...] fulfilling some prerogatives and encouraging social participation in management; it became more democratic and had a really positive impact in this sense". In line with E1, E4 confirms the result for the City Hall:

"I even said to the new Secretary that, when decisions should be made on the use of the Orla space, to check the document, because we participated and the demands are already defined there, what can and cannot be done, instead of discussing what has already been defined. Even for some issue that is not in the document, at some point in the meeting we listen to the demand, so we already have an idea of what we can promise or not. Hence, in addition to the document, we have a little more information for developing public policies, which helps our work at the Tourism Secretariat".

In line with the political results presented by Medero and Albaladejo (2018), Sisto et al. (2018) show that one of the results of collaborative processes refers to building actions necessary to achieve a specific political goal, through the involvement of stakeholders. Therefore, the preparation of the Orla Project included timely actions to attain the political goal, leaving the preparation of the plan for the city to the stakeholders.

As for social outcomes, Medero and Albaladejo (2018) suggest that these are the impacts of the process on inclusion and social cohesion. The number of social organizations and citizens involved in preparing the Orla Project, as described above, shows these results. E1 mentions that "since the document was created by society itself, we have supporters of this project". E2, a representative of a residents' association, says that the impact of the process on society was very positive, mainly due to the exchange of knowledge and interaction between participants. E3 brings elements that show the impact of social, managerial and political results:

"We exercise democracy, and I think that, in this sense, for both the public authorities and society, the impact of the decisions made in this document will guide, from now on, what can and cannot be done in the city's waterfront. Hence, besides the impact of participation on democracy, there is the daily impact of the changes on the environment, which may occur as a result of what was decided".

E4 mentions that the process gave society access to information and built new knowledge. We also emphasize the fact that the document was not left in a drawer, since several of the demands discussed are already underway.

Finally, the municipality has achieved results that can be classified as managerial, political, and social: the completion of the coastal protection work, better known as the widening of the sand strip. Carried out in 2021, it aimed to change the sand strip from an average of 25 meters to 70 meters, in order to protect the shore against the advance of tides, thus creating privileged spaces for residents and tourists. In Brazil, only six municipalities have widened the sand strip: Balneário Camboriú, Florianópolis, Balneário Piçarras, Rio de Janeiro, Jaboatão dos Guararapes and Fortaleza.

With regard to the driving factors of the collaborative process, the interviews showed that the participatory dialog approach and the informal and open environment (Hampton, 2009; Margles et al., 2010; Gutberlet, 2015) were considered positive. This is perceived in the words of E4: "it was more of a conversation between the participants, an informal environment"; from E3: "all the places had a structure, providing a comfortable atmosphere, I think these things are very important"; from E1: "everyone was really focused on the discussion goal, there was no partisanship or ideology there, but rather the purpose of building the Orla Project"; and E2: "the atmosphere of the meetings and the dialogue between participants were very positive, I have participated in building other plans, and there were many conflicts, and no progress was made".

Another process driver refers to the method used and the heterogeneity of relevant stakeholders (Sisto et al., 2017, 2018; Fuldauer et al., 2019), as well as everyone's involvement (Gil et al., 2011). Regarding the method, E2 says that "the format of the meetings was excellent,

the methodology used made it easier for people to structure and direct their thoughts”. E3 adds that “the methodology was very good and easy to apply; it brought a lot of trust”. The heterogeneity and involvement of stakeholders was mentioned by all interviewees. For E4, one of the positive elements of the process was “the number of people who agreed to take part, because it's difficult to get so many involved in discussions, and for a quite long time”. E3 highlights:

"It was clear that there were some very defined social groups, some specific actors who grouped together. For example, the people who worked more with sports, fishing, the issue of the corn sellers, and the civil construction people".

Still regarding heterogeneity and stakeholders' involvement, E1 observes:

"We had some participating groups directly related to beach activities, like the people from surf schools, corn and 'churros', and fishermen, who work and survive economically from the beaches. But there were also people who took part and had absolutely nothing to do with the beach, such as the presidents of district associations, where there is no beach, and who participated in the process, in all activities".

Encouraging participation and the facilitation of the Orla Project's independent instructor (Davis, 2008; Gil et al., 2011) emerge in the interviews as issues that helped during the process. With regard to incentive, E2 mentions that "there was a lot of it, both from the facilitator and from the City Hall. We always felt welcome at the meetings". E3 says that "there was always this incentive to participate. Even with everyone tired in the last few days, everybody was aware of this commitment".

As for the instructor's facilitation, E1 highlights:

"I think the success was due to the fact that there was one person to lead the process, that is, the facilitator hired to do so, who knew a lot about the subject and was used to leading participatory workshops for building different Orla projects".

E3 observes that the facilitator "explained some of the more theoretical, more complex things, regarding the environmental area, the legal area. I think he had this concern, and it was very positive".

Having a set of guidelines for the workshops, “rules of the game”, and the role of leadership (Medema et al., 2017) are other aspects that facilitated the process. E2 mentioned that “the rules of the game” were explained “at the beginning of the process, and I don't remember anyone disagreeing, everyone agreed on how it would happen, locations, times, deadlines”. E1 adds:

“The facilitator brought a guiding document, the federal government's manuals for building waterfront projects, in addition to mapping, zoned areas, and focused the discussion on that roadmap, which was presented to the participants at the first two meetings”.

According to E1, the process was based on a guiding document and a pre-established script. For the interviewees, having this direction and a script to follow helped the workshops run smoothly. Hence, the roadmap assisted the participatory workshops to achieve the proposed goal, without detours that could hinder the control of the process.

With regard to the role of leadership, which was responsibility of the Secretariat of the Environment, E3 mentions that this role was evident, due to the fact that the Orla Project is a

prerogative of environmental policy: “The Secretariat of the Environment was the body that led the process, and was responsible for starting it”. Schuch and Hoffmann (2021) analyzed innovation in a public service at Balneário Camboriú City Hall, showing the role of leadership played by that Secretariat as the process driver. These results highlight its initiative to evaluate and start changes for innovating its public services and processes.

Support from the municipal government (Medero & Albaladejo, 2018) was mentioned in all interviews as a positive element in the process. E2 observed that it was always supportive and helped the community, and E3 confirmed it by saying that “there was support from the local government for everyone's participation”.

Another aspect emphasized by interviewees in their collaboration with the Orla Project workshops was stakeholders' tacit knowledge of the local context of the territory/community (Rubio et al., 2021; Sisto et al., 2017; Longato et al., 2019). E1 points out that “[...] it was another strong positive point, people involved there knew about their locality, they had an opinion, and helped build the Orla Project”. E2 and E3 show that these entities' knowledge was very important for building the plan and discussing the topics. E4 says about this knowledge: “As for the fishermen, I think it's important to consider their demands, but they don't have a space to participate and discuss waterfront issues”.

Finally, all interviewees mentioned the integration of scientific knowledge as a process driver (Longato et al., 2019). E1 says that “the university has the knowledge, due to the studies it carries out, the extension activities and other services it provides, thus bringing a lot of information; hence its participation was very useful [...]”. E3 stresses that university's involvement was very important, but comments:

"Other participants also had academic background, and this contribution does not come only from scholars, and other technical knowledge is welcome, it adds a lot to the discussion. I think that our presence as LAGESC was very productive, because most of the time there was no local university present, and that would be very relevant. I even asked the people from UNIVALI if they would not come and take part, but they could not arrange it. [...] although our participation was relevant, there was a gap in the participation of local education, extension, and research institutions, not just UNIVALI, but also IFC, UDESC, and UNIAVAN".

In other words, although there were university representatives who contributed to the collaborative process, there was an absence of local educational institutions, since UNIVALI only joined the process at the end, and UNIAVAN only participated occasionally. E4 highlights the importance of this participation:

"There were issues there that did not end the discussion, and the university's contribution was good. For example, on the question of algae and bryozoans, even considering the City Hall's explanation, the presence of an external person, who had the knowledge to talk about it, helped a lot".

Although we found drivers during the process, there were also some obstacles. In this respect, each interviewee identified a different vision and a barrier. For E1, initially, one of the negative points was the fact that the “meetings were held in the evening, after work and study hours, but there was no other time to do it”. The issue of time and schedule of the meetings can be considered a barrier, as Struecker and Hoffmann (2007) point out. However, the same interviewee added that this initial problem was overcome, since times and days were agreed with all the participants at the second meeting.

E2 mentioned as a difficulty "[...] those things that come half-decided. But that didn't happen throughout the process, it was occasional". E2 was referring to the Orla Project's line of action, which had already been delimited by the City Hall, and some of the Praias Agrestes' bodies did not agree with. This fact, at the beginning of the process, created mistrust among stakeholders (Sisto et al., 2017, 2018). However, that was the only difficulty.

E2 states that "[...] in most meetings, the community people arrived quite 'raw'; it would be nice to have preparatory material to hand out, and a few meetings to train and prepare all participants before the workshops began". This result confirms Sisto et al. (2017), for whom interactive participation seeks to empower stakeholders.

E3 highlights the lack of high-quality technical data:

"I think there was a lack of more technical data. We worked hard on empirical data, on the experience of the participants in building the scenarios, on the sections. But there was a need for more data from public authorities, from where they are and where they want to go, and what their vision is, the problems that management is facing."

Longato et al. (2019) note that the absence of technical quality data during collaborative processes can hinder the final outcome of the plan or policy under discussion. It is important that the public authority, or other institutions that have knowledge and technical data, prepare data that can be presented and understood by all participants. This will allow them to associate these data with their tacit knowledge, contributing to better decisions.

E3 also mentions the absence of some relevant institutions during the process:

"I think that some groups, entities, will not be able to be there in person, but they should participate, and their demands should be collected with care."

As stated above, PMBC invited relevant organizations for building the plan; most of them, directly and indirectly linked to the municipality's waterfront, were invited by various means. Some did not take part in the process, or only attended one meeting, as is the case with the Bocce, Volleyball, Footvolley, and Beach Tennis associations. Sisto et al. (2017) and Medero and Albaladejo (2018) notice that these absences may result from the lack of an internal participatory culture, or even a lack of interest and commitment. According to Suopajarvi and Kantola (2020), another barrier that hinders the collaborative process is the difficulty of involving and retaining all relevant groups in the process.

Finally, E3 shows that it was possible to get feedback at times during the process, but it was not emphasized in the end (Rubio et al., 2021).

5. Final Remarks

The article sought to investigate the collaborative planning process of the Orla Project in the city of Balneário Camboriú. We identified that the process brought about changes in the municipality's coastal zone, by applying general guidelines for regulating the use and occupation of the seafont, combining and articulating heritage and environmental practices with the planning.

With the changes, the city has already achieved a significant result: the coastal protection work, better known as the widening of the sand strip. This work, carried out in 2021, aimed to change the strip of sand from an average of 25 meters to 70 meters, to protect the shore against the advance of tides, thus creating privileged spaces for residents and tourists. The



project was driven by the participation of the municipal government in meetings with organized civil society, the community, citizens, and universities.

Research results showed that the heterogeneity and involvement of different actors in the municipality for drawing up the plan allowed integrating the municipality's technical knowledge, the community's knowledge of the territory, and the scientific knowledge of universities. This led to managerial, political, social, and environmental results for the municipality. In addition, the paper discussed the following categories, based on the proposed model of analysis and in the light of the literature that brought together the topics of collaborative design and public policies: the initial goal of the collaborative process, the actors involved, the structure of the process, the tools used, the factors that facilitated or hindered the process, and the results achieved.

As implications, the article contributes to theory by providing empirical evidence on the collaborative handling of a municipal planning process, given the literature gap. As practical implications, we expect to help managers who face the challenge of involving society in the planning and implementation of public policies. Society's outcry for greater participation has not found a corresponding managerial repertoire yet, which can provide practical measures to open up the decision-making process to society. In addition, the case study can be a reference for managers interested in developing similar projects in other towns.

Finally, we highlight some limitations of this study and suggestions for future research. During the interviews, to understand the collaborative process of building the Orla Project, a representative from SPU/SC was also expected to take part, since it sent persons to all meetings. However, after trying to contact the body by different means, we did not receive a reply for scheduling the interview. In addition, we mention the challenges that the COVID-19 pandemic has imposed on society in general, and managers in particular, which made it difficult or impossible to collect data through face-to-face interviews. This not only hindered physical access to interviewees, but also imposed time constraints on managers, due to the amount of complex and urgent issues that arise every day.

In the systematic literature review, we observed, for the selected portfolio, that the field lacks quantitative studies for analyzing municipal public policy design processes. New studies should explore other collaborative processes, in order to extend the limits of this research, which only examined the experience of the Orla Project in Balneário Camboriú. Future research should also assess the challenges of implementing a collaborative plan according to organizational competencies, in particular political and relational capacities.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank FAPESC for supporting the development of the research.

References

Ansell, C. & Torfing, J. (2014). *Public innovation through collaboration and design*. New York: Routledge.



- Ansell, C., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2017). Improving policy implementation through collaborative policymaking. *Policy & Politics*, 45(3), 467-486.
- Associação dos Municípios da Região da Foz do Rio Itajaí - AMFRI. (2019). *Relatório de consultoria: Oficinas para a II Revisão do Plano de Gestão Integrada (PGI) do Projeto Orla de Balneário Camboriú*.
- Bason, C. (2010). *Leading public sector innovation: co-creating for a better society*. (2nd ed.). Bristol: Policy Press.
- Blokamp, E. (2018). The promise of co-design for public policy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77(4), 729-743.
- Campos, I. et al. (2016). Participation, scenarios and pathways in long-term planning for climate change adaptation. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 537-556.
- Cury, T. C. H. (2001). Elaboração de projetos sociais. In C. M. Avila, *Gestão de projetos sociais*. São Paulo: AAPCS - Associação de Apoio ao Programa Capacitação Solidária, (Coleção Gestores Sociais), 39-61.
- Davis, N. A. (2008). Evaluating collaborative fisheries management planning: A Canadian case study. *Marine Policy*, 32(6), 867-876.
- Fuldauer, L. I., Ives, M. C., Adshead, D., Thacker, S., & Hall, J. W. (2019). Participatory planning of the future of waste management in small island developing states to deliver on the Sustainable Development Goals. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 223, 147-162.
- Gil, A., Calado, H., & Bentz., J. (2011). Public participation in municipal transport planning processes—the case of the sustainable mobility plan of Ponta Delgada, Azores, Portugal. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19(6), 1309-1319.
- Gutberlet, J. (2015). More inclusive and cleaner cities with waste management co-production: Insights from participatory epistemologies and methods. *Habitat International*, 46, 234- 243.
- Hampton, G. (2009). Narrative policy analysis and the integration of public involvement in decision making. *Policy Sciences*, 42(3), 227-242.
- Hermus, M., Van Buuren, A., & Bekkers, V. (2020). Applying design in public administration: A literature review to explore the state of the art. *Policy & Politics*, 1(48), 21-48.
- Longato, D., Lucertini, G., Fontana, M. D., & Musco, F. (2019). Including urban metabolism principles in decision-making: A methodology for planning waste and resource management. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(7).
- Margles, S. W. et al. (2010). Participatory planning: Using SWOT-AHP analysis in buffer zone management planning. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 29(6-8), 613-637.



- Medema, W. et al. (2017). Building a foundation for knowledge co-creation in collaborative water governance: Dimensions of stakeholder networks facilitated through bridging organizations. *Water*, 9(1).
- Medero, G. S., & Albaladejo, G. P. (2018). The quality of participatory processes in the urban redevelopment policy of Madrid city council. *Lex localis-Journal of Local Self Government*, 16(4), 841-872.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente [MMA] & Ministério do Planejamento, Orçamento e Gestão [MPOG] (2005). *Projeto Orla: guia de implementação*. <https://www.sema.ce.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/sites/36/2019/06/Guia-de-Implementa%C3%A7%C3%A3o-Projeto-Orla-1.pdf>.
- Peters, B. G. (2020). Designing institutions for designing policy. *Policy & Politics*, 1(48), 131–147.
- Pinheiro de Andrade, H. C., Albuquerque, A. M. V., Vasconcellos, M., & Nebot, C. P. (2020). Coproducción e incidencia de la sociedad civil en la política de residuos sólidos en Belém, Amazônia. *Administração Pública e Gestão Social*, 12(2).
- Pluchinotta, I. et al. (2019). Design theory for generating alternatives in public decision-making processes. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 28(2), 341-375.
- Prefeitura Municipal de Balneário Camboriú - PMBC (2019). *Plano de Gestão Integrada da Orla (PGI): revisão 2003 – 2019, versão preliminar*. https://www.bc.sc.gov.br/arquivos/conteudo_downloads/CD5MP9HD.pdf.
- Rasheed, A. R., & Abdulla, A. (2020). Evaluating stakeholder participatory processes in policy development for Marine Protected Areas. *Marine Policy*, 112.
- Rittel, H., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy sciences*, 4(2), 155-169.
- Rubio, M. C. et al. (2021). Land use planning in drylands: Participatory processes in diagnosing the physical-biological subsystem. *Applied Spatial Analysis and Policy*, 14(1), 197- 220.
- Schuch, E. M., & Hoffmann, M. G. (2021). Cocriação e design thinking: Uma experiência de inovação no serviço público em um município brasileiro. *Teoria e Prática em Administração*, 12(1), 2021.
- Secchi, L., Coelho, F. S., & Pires, V. (2019). *Políticas públicas: conceitos, casos práticos, questões de concursos* (3a ed.) São Paulo: Cengage.
- Sisto, R., Lopolito, A., & Van Vliet, M. (2018). Stakeholder participation in planning rural development strategies: Using backcasting to support Local Action Groups in complying with CLLD requirements. *Land Use Policy*, 70, 442-450.

- Sisto, R., Sica, E., Lombardi, M., & Prosperi, M. (2017). Organic fraction of municipal solid waste valorisation in southern Italy: The stakeholders' contribution to a long-term strategy definition. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 168, 302-310.
- Stave, K., Dwyer, M., & Turner, M. (2019). Exploring the value of participatory system dynamics in two paired field studies of stakeholder engagement in sustainability discussions. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 36(2), 156-179.
- Struecker, D. R., & Hoffmann, M. G. (2017). Participação social nos serviços públicos: caracterização do estado da arte por meio da bibliometria e da revisão sistemática. *REGE Revista de Gestão*, 24(4), 371-380.
- Suopajarvi, L., & Kantola, A. (2020). The social impact management plan as a tool for local planning. Case study: Mining in Northern Finland. *Land Use Policy*, 93.
- Van Buuren A., Lewis, J., Peters, B.G., & Voorberg, W. (2020). Improving public policy and administration: Exploring the potential of design. *Policy & Politics*, 1(48), 3–19.
- Van de Kerkhof, M. (2006). Making a difference: On the constraints of consensus building and the relevance of deliberation in stakeholder dialogues. *Policy Sciences*, 39(3), 279-299.

ⁱ Mestrado Profissional em Administração no Centro de Ciências da Administração e Socioeconômicas – Esag - Florianópolis/SC, pela Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (Udesc). Atualmente, faz Doutorado no Programa de Pós Graduação na Universidade do Vale do Itajaí - Univali, no município de Itajaí/SC, e trabalha como Secretária Interina de Meio Ambiente na Prefeitura Municipal de Balneário Camboriú.

ⁱⁱ Mestrado e doutorado em Engenharia de Produção pela Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina - UFSC, Florianópolis/SC. É professora associada na UDESC/ESAG, onde atua no Departamento de Administração Pública e no Programa de Pós Graduação Stricto Sensu em Administração.

