



Erick Fabricio Santillan Ordoñez

Value Co-creation in Public Services: The Case of Open Data Ecuador

Master Thesis

at the Chair for Information Systems and Information Management
(Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster)

Supervisor: Prof. Veiko Lember

Presented by: Erick Fabricio Santillan Ordoñez

Date of Submission: 2022-05-31

Content

Tables	III
Abbreviations	IV
1 Introduction to value co-creation in public services.....	1
2 Literature review.....	4
2.1 A brief state of the art on public administration reforms	4
2.2 Value creation beyond co-production	8
2.3 Elements of value co-creation	13
3 Research design and methodology	19
3.1 Research design	19
3.2 Data collection and analysis	21
4 Results	25
4.1 The case of Open Data Ecuador	25
4.2 Value creation process and elements applied to the Ecuadorian study case	32
5 Discussion.....	55
5.1 Co-created value.....	55
5.2 Co-creation participants and the process of value creation	67
6 Conclusions	71
References	74
Appendix	83

Tables

Tab. 1	Process of value creation for public services	13
Tab. 2	Value creation/value elements matrix	18
Tab. 3	Value creation elements and exemplary open questions.....	22
Tab. 4	Summary of interviews	23
Tab. 5	Government responsible and official counterparts.....	28
Tab. 6	Co-creation participants and value creation process	52
Tab. 7	Elements of value analysis	56
Tab. 8	Co-creation process and participants' role(s).....	68
Tab. 9	Value co-created summary	72

Abbreviations

DATALAT	Organization dedicated to open data for Latin America and Ecuador
FUNDAPI	Organization dedicated to helping citizens in internet-related matters
ICT	Information and communications technologies
MINTEL	Ministry of Telecommunications and Information Society Ecuador
NAP	Open Government National Action Plan
NPG	New Public Governance
NPM	New Public Management
NGO	Non-government organization
ODG	Open Data Guide
ODP	Open Data Portal
ODP&G	Open Data Policy and Guidelines
OPENLAB	Organization dedicated to promoting dialogs and experiences about digital culture and open knowledge
PA	Public Administration
PAM	Public Administration Management
REDAM	Organization dedicated to promoting open data and metadata in Ecuador
SM&M	Service Management and Marketing

1 Introduction to value co-creation in public services

In public administration, "social innovation and co-creation are 'magic concepts'" (Pollitt and Hupe 2011). The magic side of co-creation could be attributed to the fuzziness around how co-creation works or how policymakers use co-creation as a one-size-fits-all tool to address any problem. Furthermore, co-creation is not a new concept and can be traced in studies about Public Administration (PA) reforms to address societal changes and budget requirements; through the delivery of services while achieving "the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas, and members of the groups served" (Osborne et al. 2016).

One stream of studies on PA reforms is the New Public Management (NPM). Under this paradigm, co-creation is understood as the process of including users in delivering a service (Osborne 2010). The second stream of studies is the New Public Governance (NPG) paradigm, where service co-creation research focuses on the bottom-up relationships between the stakeholders involved in developing services. Researchers agree that in both paradigms of PA reforms, technology has provided public servants with tools to manage co-creation (Dunleavy et al. 2006a; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011; Voorberg et al. 2015),

Studies of co-creation in the context of NPM see the creation of value in the delivery of services (Meynhardt 2009; Osborne 2006). In comparison, recent literature about co-created public services in the context of NPG points to value creation during service production and consumption (Strokosch and Osborne 2021). Additionally, during these two stages, NPG literature highlights the importance of the experience between the public servants, citizens, and other actors such as NGOs, academia, and the private sector to shape and create value. The phenomenon of value creation in the co-creation process, also known as value co-creation, is worth studying to complement the current literature on co-creation (Alford 2015). Research on value co-creation can help further define the roles of public servants, citizens, and other actors. Moreover, research on the co-creation of public services will ultimately help understand the new power relation between PA and societal actors (Farr 2016).

As policymakers and politicians consider co-creation with citizens as a necessary condition to create innovative public services that meet the needs of citizens, given several societal challenges (Voorberg et al. 2015), scholars keep their interest in understanding how value is created. Some interesting points to still be further researched are: the power imbalance between the public servants and citizens involved in the co-creation process (Farr 2016), manipulation of the co-creation process (Bouchard 2016), and problems with the implementation of the services co-created (Palumbo and Manna

2018). Furthermore, the biggest flaw of co-creation seems to be: that “the predominant co-production discourse is not situated within a meta-dialogue that appreciates the links between the processes of public service delivery/production and the value that such delivery seeks to add to citizens/society at the point of service use/consumption” (Alford 2015).

Voorberg et al. (2015) posit that: "There seems to be an implicit assumption that involvement of citizens is a virtue in itself, like democracy and transparency, thereby also stressing that co-creation as a process is a goal in itself." Their claim is backed up after a systemic literature review where 122 papers were revised 52% did not include a specific objective for co-creating the services. Moreover, the cases where goals were identified were primarily related to efficiency and effectiveness, which means that public administrators use co-creation methods looking to save costs (Voorberg et al. 2015).

Literature related to co-creation in the Public Administration Management (PAM) has primarily focused on: "how service user participation can be 'added into' the service planning and production process to improve the quality of these services" (Osborne et al. 2016). To frame the problem of this research, let us suppose the co-creation process happens inside a paradigm where the public servant produces services and citizens are mere consumers. In that case, the co-creation process may not produce services with co-created value (Osborne et al. 2016). Osborne proposes a holistic framework to tackle a gap in the literature on value co-creation for public services (Osborne et al. 2021). The author proposes that researchers must bridge the two main stages of co-creation: production and consumption of services, to understand co-creation. The paper “Beyond co-production: value creation and public services” presents a theoretical framework to study co-creation for public services and invites researchers to empirically apply the framework to test its generalizability (Osborne et al. 2021).

As an answer to the call of empirically applying the Osborne framework, this research proposes studying a co-creation process in Ecuador. This is a pioneer type of research since Ecuador's first official co-creation experiences were reported in 2018 when the country joined the Open Government Partnership to improve public services and transform the government into an open government. The Ecuadorian government started a process of co-creating an Open Government National Action Plan with participants from academia, NGOs, and citizens. The result is ten commitments between participants and the government to implement until 2021 (later reprogramed until 2022 due to the COVID-19 pandemic) (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020). The Ecuadorian study case is interesting since applying the Osborne framework has been done almost exclusively in European countries. The Latin American countries, including Ecuador,

have the potential to create value such as transparency and trust through the co-creation process of services (Tania Zabala-Peñañiel and Open Government Partnership 2021). Especially for Latin American countries, values associated with an Open Government, such as trust and transparency, are paramount for public administration since Latin American governments are constantly involved in corruption scandals that negatively impact the perception of public administration (Janssen et al. 2012; Roseth et al. 2018; Scartascini 2022).

This research offers to study the process of co-creating services in the context of the Ecuadorian case, contributing to explaining questions from co-creation participants, especially the Ecuadorian government, that are looking to understand, evaluate, and learn from the co-creation experience and looking forward to implementing a new National Action Plan (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2022). Moreover, there is an ongoing initiative to evaluate the impact of the actions performed during the co-creation process (DATALAT 2021; Tania Zabala-Peñañiel and Open Government Partnership 2021). This research can provide insights to identify and understand moments of co-creation, participants and roles, and elements that lead to value co-creation as presented in Osborne's framework.

This research proposes four central moments to understand the co-creation of public services and value creation in the Ecuadorian case. First, the components of the Osborne framework are further developed and complemented with additional literature in public administration management and service marketing and management. Second, official documents were collected and analyzed to set the context of the study case. Third, ten interviews were conducted with representatives from academia, government, NGOs, and citizens who participated in the co-creation process. The semi-structured interviews gathered first-hand data analyzed using the *editing and template approach* proposed by Cabtree & Miller (1999) to find common themes from in-depth interviews and correlation with the theoretical framework. Fourth, the discussion of the results will allow finding common elements of value shared across participants, roles performed, and moments of interaction where value was co-created.

In addition to empirically testing the Osborne framework, the main objective of this research is to understand how value is produced in co-created public services in Ecuador, specifically in the case of the collaborative drafting of the Open Data Policy and its Guidelines and the re-designing and updating the Open Data Portal in the context of the First National Action Plan Ecuador 2019-2022 Open Government Partnership. Applying the Osborne framework will answer questions about when and what kind of value was created and the roles and interactions that participants took to co-create value.

2 Literature review

The literature review in this chapter is meant to extend the concepts and provide examples to facilitate the empirical application of the Osborne framework in the Ecuadorian study case. There are two sections in this chapter. First, there is a brief state of the art on value creation, innovation, open data, and open government concepts. The literature on these subjects aims to present a brief state of the art regarding public administration reforms and value creation in public services. The second section explains and expands on the main elements of the Osborne framework on value co-creation, which is the theoretical framework in this research.

2.1 A brief state of the art on public administration reforms

Public administrations embrace reforms to remain relevant for citizens and improve results when delivering public services. Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011) posit that NPM has stalled since 2000 in twelve countries studied. The authors also mentioned that reforms in countries are not clean-cut leaning toward one model, either NPM or NPG, and instead, countries experiment with implementing elements from both or other reform paradigms that may be relevant in their national context (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). For example, Osborne proposes that public administrations embrace NPG practices to create value between the government and non-governmental actors in a collaborative approach, moving away from the paradigm of considering citizens as clients proposed by NPM (Osborne 2010). As public administrations embrace new forms of producing services collaborative, the discussion on value creation is shifting from performance related to economic value. Public administrators are looking to generate value in transparency, participation, and accountability from the reforms they implement. The following subsections present a brief state of the art in NPG, value creation in public services and open data, and open government.

2.1.1 New Public Governance

The New Public Governance paradigm changes the perspective of innovation since public services are no longer considered goods as in NPM, where innovation in the public sector mimicked the industrial production and adopted technical systems to deliver quasi standardized products to passive citizens (Alford 1998). The NPG paradigm shift allows governments to profit from collaborative and citizens' participation in innovation networks (Osborne and Brown 2011; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). Furthermore, public administrations' adoption of NPG elements responds to the promotion of e-government and the increased interest from governments to be more transparent (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011).

Literature on the public sector has a lengthy ongoing discussion regarding the possibility of innovation in public services provided by governments, where citizens have no opportunity of choosing a different provider (Sørensen and Torfing 2012). The arguments to explain the perceived lack of innovation in public services include the monopolized nature of the public service, and another argument is bureaucracy rigidity that does not facilitate changes in civil servants' roles (Voorberg et al. 2015). Additionally, there is a component of risk aversion from politicians who do not want to make significant changes to policies or services, especially when elections are approaching (Bason 2010). In countries like Ecuador, where the President appoints the top management positions in governmental agencies, a layer of political instructions is added when making decisions about public service innovation.

NPG practices foster some types of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship (Grohs et al. 2015), where public servants use their abilities and knowledge to solve problems in different and new ways allowing for innovation to happen in their daily tasks. NPG promotes interactions in a more horizontal structure, and citizens are not a customer or passive clients; instead, they are co-creators and can contribute to the generation of ideas on how to solve problems, ergo contributing to the generation of innovation (Bason 2010; Osborne and Brown 2011). Furthermore, NPG allows interaction between public servants, citizens, and the third sector in producing and consuming public services, creating a collaborative network structure that can sustain innovation and co-creation (Brandsen and Pestoff 2006; Pestoff et al. 2006).

2.1.2 Value creation

A first discussion to understand value creation is to define value. Meynhardt (2009) collects several definitions of value and posits that value is something desirable and important to the person evaluating, emphasizing the importance of the individual, societal or institutional realities from where the person evaluating is located. In this regard, the discussion of value is carried from an individual psychological perspective of defining what is important and the from a societal or collective perspective that explains public interest (Bozeman 2002, 2007; Meynhardt 2009). In the discussion of public interest and public value Jørgensen and Bozeman (2007) mention that the legal or obligations that organizations such as governments must perform are usually the framework under which the judgment of value is concentrated. Nonetheless, the authors propose that if citizens and non-governmental actors are considered co-producers of services with responsibilities beyond complying with the law, the value process shifts from a client-provider relation to a collective creation of value (Jørgensen and Bozeman 2007).

The literature about NPM and NPG mentions different approaches to creating value when producing public services. On the one hand, NPM uses performance evaluation criteria based on monetary, financial, and time-related indicators to evaluate costs, revenue, returns, and added value. Other measures are related to customer loyalty view in the sense of customer retention. The peruse of maximizing these market-driven indicators can sometimes contradict the public context where fairness, justice, or inclusion are the added value that services are being developed (Bozeman 2002). On the other hand, NPG has a similar approach when studying value creation to the literature about Service Management and Marketing (SM&M) that proposes the service provider does not create and deliver value to its customer but simply offers a value proposition (Grönroos 2017; Vargo et al. 2017). The customer themselves will create the potential value by using and experiencing the service.

NPG uses a performance evaluation multicriteria that seeks an equilibrium between market-driven and public value. The criteria are generally designed to visualize the efforts put into delivering the service by the diverse network of participants contributing to service production and delivery. Finally, regarding the time, the NPG performance criterion measures two main results: 1. short-term performance related to actual outputs of the services and 2. long-term performance related to the outcomes of the service in the context of a system (Osborne 2006). NPM performance measures outputs in terms of money, processes, and financial revenue (Bozeman 2002, 2007). However, these concepts are not entirely aligned with public services. Social innovation for public services is not always valued as the monetary profit created by a public servant or any other participant in co-creation processes. Instead, social innovation should be valued using indicators that measure improvement in delivering public service. The improvement can be measured by evaluating the short-term: immediate results and, in the long-term: how sustained in time are the service outcomes (Bozeman 2002; Dunleavy et al. 2006b). Public administrators could create indicators to measure development in human capital, environment friendliness, and customer satisfaction, to name a few, as criteria to assess public innovation.

When reviewing the concept of value creation, the financial concept of added value is usually transposed and overwhelms the discussion in value co-creation. This means that discussions about value could end up being a calculation between the cost of production and the revenue from consumption. Co-creation literature proposes to shift the focus of research from the financial calculation of added value to a holistic study of the production and consumption of the service to understand how value is co-created. Co-creation scholars mention that moving away from the financial and performance-based calculation of value linked to efficiency reforms of services allows concentrating on measuring public

innovation in terms of co-created social value related to sustainability, transparency, and democratic-participation reforms of public services (Bozeman 2002; Osborne et al. 2021). Furthermore, Osborne proposes that co-creation participants can create value for themselves -value creation- or participants can share the benefits of the value created -value co-creation- (Osborne et al. 2021).

2.1.3 Open data and open government

Open government initiatives are associated with certain types of values worldwide, such as transparency, participation, and accountability. Harrison and Sayogo (2014) propose that citizens accessing information about governmental activities represent the substance of democracy (Harrison and Sayogo 2014). The most recurrent reasons to implement open government projects are transparency, releasing social and commercial value, and participatory governance (Janssen et al. 2012).

Janssen et al. (2012) posit that there are myths about open data and open government to be considered when governments develop projects in these matters. The myths more closely related to value creation are related to the proposition that open data has "little intrinsic value; the value is created by its use" (Janssen et al. 2012). Value co-creation can be impacted due to a missing feedback channel, lack of instructions and guidelines on how to use the data, and missing meta-data, reducing usability and hampering value creation (Dawes and Helbig 2010). Governments should make open data portals user-friendly, keep data updated and offer training.

In addition to limited use of the available open data, value is decreased from the public administration side due to the metrics developed to evaluate the effectiveness of the open data portals. Metrics are focused "on the input, for example, on how many data sets are opened" (Bertot et al. 2012). Downloading a data set is just the start of the process of using the data. Open data users want to answer questions using data; value is created from solving their doubts and the benefits they can get from processing the data. Furthermore, metrics tracking the mere access and download of datasets cannot measure the impact of the wide range of uses those citizens can co-created value. Since raw open data has little added value, actors with knowledge in interpreting and processing data could potentially have a role that creates added value (Janssen et al. 2012). Governments can help reduce the complexity barrier by providing processed data in formats like dashboards. However, the government must invest significant resources to produce quality products. The number of resources needed to create and maintain visualizations can be a barrier; likewise, this can create a dependency in the long term (Dawes and Helbig 2010).

An abundance of data does not necessarily create a positive value. In most cases, access to information can create values such as better accountability, transparency, and trust. However, confusion, misinformation, and reduced trust can result from opening data without context (Schnell 2022; Strathern 2000). Little understanding of the legal frameworks or social context can lead to misunderstandings in interpreting specific data. For example, some public investments cannot be measured purely economically, e.g., applying a return of investment indicator. Social investment analysis requires social and political context to be understood entirely. If the context of social projects is not clearly explained and purely economic analysis is published using open data, the analysis can create distrust in citizens that will judge some investments as poorly executed (Schnell 2022; Strathern 2000).

2.2 Value creation beyond co-production

The theoretical framework proposed for this research is explored and described in detail in this section. The Osborne framework on value creation results from the studies on New Public Governance reforms in public administration (Osborne et al. 2021). Osborne proposes that as public administrations keep introducing collaborative methodologies to produce and deliver public services, value co-creation for public administrations and citizens is expected. To explain how value can be co-created in public services, Osborne proposes to study the co-creation of public services in two interlinked moments 1. Production and 2. Consume/use. Furthermore, Osborne proposes five elements of value creation to understand how value is co-created.

Production of public services

The novelty of the Osborne framework is that it approaches the co-creation process from the perspective of production and use/consumption of the public services to study value creation. Osborne mentions that the co-production of public services is the stage most studied by scholars of the Public Administration and Management since this stage is when explicit participation of citizens is incorporated into the public service co-design (Ehn 2008; Osborne et al. 2021; Voorberg et al. 2015).

Literature about co-creation has as a start point the general concept of end-users participation in the design and production (von Hippel 1987). The Scandinavian countries refer to the idea “that those affected by a design should have a say in the design process” as participatory design (Ehn 2008). Voorber et al. (2015) posit that participation is a broader concept than co-creation, defining the scope of research for co-creation/co-production as the more specific process of participation where citizens are involved in various stages of the production and delivery of services. Furthermore, Osborne (2021)

proposes that the production stage of co-creation has two sub-moments, co-design and co-production, explored in the following sections.

2.2.1 Co-design

Co-design is the explicit inclusion of user participation, opinions and feedback when designing public services. Co-design is considered the leading interest for the Public Administration Management research since this process takes explicit, conscious, and voluntary participation of stakeholders to create the capacity to improve the design and delivery of public services (Bason 2010; Osborne et al. 2016; Sanders and Stappers 2008). Furthermore, Sanders and Stappers (2008) mention that including users in the designing process allows participants to take on new roles, where the “level of expertise, passion, and creativity” allows passive users to become co-designer/co-creators.

Several scholars identify this co-design as "improving the performance of existing public services by actively involving the service user in their design, evaluation, and improvement" (Osborne et al. 2016). The design stage happens very early in the process of producing a service; however, due to the cyclical way of delivering services, there are some blurred lines in placing the stage of co-designing exclusively for production or consumption. Another characteristic to identify the co-design stage is the type of involvement of the citizens, whether they participate actively or passively (Lengnick-Hall et al. 2000; Steen et al. 2011). If their involvement in evaluating and improving the service is explicit, these activities can be considered co-design. In general, co-design can be identified in two moments during co-creation; in the early stages of production or when the service is already being consumed and requires the involvement of users to improve services incrementally.

A final differentiator between co-design and the later to be explored co-experience and co-construction stages is that the design, evaluation, and improvements considered in co-design are almost exclusively related to the service that is being developed (Osborne et al. 2016). An example of differentiating co-design, co-experience, and co-construction is that services designed to be provided to older adults can include their opinions from the very start of the project is considered co-design. On the other hand, if the project is already running and the elders' experiences using the services are applied to improve the general quality of the health system is considered co-experience. If elders are consulted about the quality of the service, and there is a process of continuous improvement to implement the provided feedback, that can be considered co-construction.

2.2.2 Co-production

Co-production is the explicit inclusion of service users in roles related to managing and delivering a service. Public services that are co-produced require the participation of public servants and citizens or any other actors from society (Steen et al. 2018). Furthermore, co-production allows for the inclusion of other stakeholders as non-user that can be exclusively part of service management and delivery (Etgar 2008). This can be useful, especially in services where an external actor can provide additional inputs such as human capital or knowledge to improve the service.

Co-production is often done intuitively and is considered an intrinsic part of service co-creation. Users are an intrinsic part of the service, as every service is designed from the beginning to serve a group of people. Co-production is the technical and structured production of service, including users in the service design and aiming to maximize their satisfaction based on their constant feedback. Even in cases where users seem to be unwilling to consume or collaborate to produce the service, this can be considered a type of implicit feedback to improve service delivery (Brandsen and Honingh 2016).

Users that collaborate to produce a service are expected to consume it. However, this expectation creates pre-set roles between service providers and users, leading to the assumption that service provider and user participation in the service consumption is always "unconscious, coerced and/or unavoidable" (Osborne 2010). However, this idea can be misleading since some stakeholders who participate in co-producing could have no interest or need to consume the final service but still co-create value. The level of participation or not to participate is a voluntary decision. Moreover, highly motivated stakeholders who take an active role in service delivery are expected to improve service outcomes (Ehn 2008; Osborne et al. 2021).

A practical example of different motivation levels can be seen in education services. Some students will be motivated and willing to take extra steps to learn besides attending classes, providing improved outcomes of the service they voluntarily opt to consume. In contrast, other students will not be willing to take any additional steps besides attending classes; nonetheless, by attending classes, they will benefit from the same minimum outcome of the education system a diploma. In some countries, teachers are not an active part of the formulation of education curricula. However, they can decide voluntarily to take additional steps to service delivery even when they are not the final beneficiaries. Teachers' motivation to improve service delivery can be understood by looking at the perspective of generating value for society. Furthermore, as proposed in previous paragraphs, teachers' motivation improves service outcomes (Bozeman 2007).

Use or consumption of public services

The second stage of co-creation is the use or consumption of public services, which is arguably less studied by public administration and management scholars (Osborne et al. 2021). From the perspective of service management and marketing, value is created when users start using the service, and their experiences and feedback can be captured and integrated into the service to improve its delivery of value. The Osborne framework argues that co-creation participants can co-create value from their co-experience when using or consuming the service. Furthermore, users' experiences are also crucial for co-constructing changes in the environment or organization where services are being provided.

2.2.3 Co-experience

Co-experience is when users start utilizing services and develop an experience that allows them to attribute a value, also known as value-in-use (Grönroos 2017; Sandström et al. 2008). This stage requires users' conscious and voluntary participation, and their inputs and experiences with the services are used to innovate in delivering value within the system or organization where the service is provided (Brandsen et al. 2018; Lee et al. 2012). Researchers focus on analyzing the context where the service is being delivered, paying particular attention to the organization or system where the service is provided.

An example of co-experience in rural communities in Ecuador is a common practice that started in the Incan empire to deliver a service involving a self-organized community known as minga (Faas 2017). During mingas, the community gets together to actively collaborate to improve a communal good such as a park, a street, or even private property. Frequently local governments profit from this community predisposition to deliver service faster (Faas 2017; Oikonomakis, Leonidas 2020). E.g., if a local government wants to build a school, the inhabitants of the community where the school is going to be built get together and offer free labor to help finish the construction of the building. Additionally, the local government will sometimes offer a rebate in taxes to the community in the following years as a form of reimbursement for the labor provided in the construction of the school. Service Management and Marketing theory recognizes that users are a source of innovation in service delivery. Alam (2006) posits that at least two-thirds of innovative models are directly derived from user experience and participants' feedback. Currently, crowdsourcing, hackathons, and other events where citizens try to solve problems using data can find parallels to traditional collaborative practices such as mingas to profit from self-organized communities.

2.2.4 Co-construction

Co-construction considers all the steps taken by the PA to incorporate users' expectations and experiences when the service is consumed (Hjortskov 2019; Osborne et al. 2021). This process can enhance the performance of the service. Particular attention should be paid to the methods used to decide what users' experiences and expectations are included. Deciding on what user contributions will be considered is highly dependent on social and economic factors (Go Jefferies et al. 2021).

This stage considers incorporating users' contributions for changes in the whole system or organization, in contrast to co-design, which considers contributions exclusively related to the service. Users who participate in the construction and consume the service will develop a "lived experience" (Manen 2016; Schembri and Sandberg 2002). This concept can be explained as the interconnection of users' personal experiences and how they participate in a service's co-creation. During the service co-construction, additional value can be created by profiting from the previous users' experiences with homologous services or other services provided by the same organization. This means that the user's emotions and personal lives will affect their experience and interact with the service creating a different and personal experience for each user. The interchange between the experience gained from receiving a service and the users' personal lives can create or destroy value when delivering service, impacting the quality of the service and the users' lives.

As an example of co-construction in health services, the users identified as patients will always bring their emotions and expectations from their lives to interact and obtain value from a medical service. As patients interact and have good or bad experiences with the hospital services, these experiences positively or negatively affect their health. Whenever a patient needs medical attention again, they will evoke their previous experiences when evaluating a new interaction with medical professionals. Furthermore, patients can share their previous experiences when receiving health treatments with new physicians. In some cases, a particular detail can provide clues to physicians to deliver or avoid treatment for similar patients. In this example, thanks to the previous patient experience, the quality of the health services is improved for others (Dehghan et al. 2018; Palumbo and Manna 2018).

Tab. 1 from the Osborne framework summarizes the co-creation process and allows for identifying stakeholders and their participation during the co-creation process.

Stakeholders' role(s)	Co-creation process			
	Production		Consumption	
	Co-design	Co-production	Co-experience	Co-construction
The role of key public service stakeholders in designing public services	... managing and delivering public services	... creating the positive/negative experience of a public service	... creating the effect/impact of a public service upon their life (and vice versa)

Adapted from (Osborne et al. 2021)

Tab. 1 Process of value creation for public services

2.3 Elements of value co-creation

Bringing together concepts from public administration management and service marketing and management literature, Osborne proposes five elements of value for public services (Osborne et al. 2021). These elements are identifiers that help understand how value is created for individuals and across participants, defined as value co-creation (Osborne et al. 2021).

2.3.1 Short term satisfaction and user wellbeing

User satisfaction and well-being are frequent concepts in SM&M (Sandström et al. 2008). Osborne argues that first experiences will impact the overall benefits of the public service, and their satisfaction with the public service can shape its legitimacy (Song et al. 2021). Identifying users' first impressions and how it develops in their perception and future interactions with the service providers is crucial to understanding the expectation of users and how this can influence the service outcomes (James 2011).

For example, in health services, patients consulting a specialist for the first time can be under anxiety and pressure. In addition, external factors such as the waiting room can influence the first encounter with the doctor. As a result, the patient could unintentionally omit details of their condition that could impact the delivery of the medical diagnosis. The repercussions can affect a patient's treatment and set precedents in clinical outcomes for future patients (Dehghan et al. 2018; Palumbo and Manna 2018).

After experimental work in the public sector, Andersen and Hjortskov (2016) posit that service users, especially those consuming abstract services, are influenced by factors other than service quality when judging service performance. Moreover, other authors conclude that satisfaction is not always consistent with performance (Orr and West 2007; Van Ryzin 2004). In general, service users judge their experience with the service based on two criteria: their experience during the process and the outcome of the service. Previous findings show that service users have different satisfaction ratings depending on

how they value and balance experience vs. outcomes. This means that users will have different baselines of satisfaction, creating sympathy for certain services (Van de Walle 2018).

Expectations can predict future performance. In the case of citizens, they can have "certain predispositions towards the public sector" (Kampen et al. 2006), even "stereotypical attitudes" (Van de Walle 2004). This predisposition can influence positive or negative the satisfaction of different public services provided by the same governmental agency. Also, citizens that have previous experiences interacting with a specific government agency can transpose their positive or negative experiences to the whole public administration (McGill and Iacobucci 1992). Jin and Guy (2009) observed that vocal citizens could get their demands met if they put the right stress level into public servants. In this regard, policymakers should be aware of the possibility of users intentionally bringing attention to previous negative experiences to get improved results for themselves.

2.3.2 Medium/long term service outcomes

This element concerns the relation between the proposed value of the public service and the long-term effects of the service on the user's lives and society. Literature about the medium and long-term public service outcomes considers this element one of the main determinants of performance evaluation. Osborne (2021) mentions that understanding this element of value creation is essential to identify stakeholders and their relations in the context where the service is provided (see also Bouchard 2016).

The improvement of service outcomes is usually linked to service personalization. The changes adopted in service delivery due to personalization can improve the service outcomes without necessarily increasing costs (Cook 2017). In a study performed by the World Bank, twelve governments reported that the main reason for concentrating on outcome-based service delivery is to increase transparency (Perrin 2006). The research also showed that various bottom-up and top-down organizational changes are required to accommodate the outcome approach. The shift is fundamental regarding responsibility and commitment to adopting and tracking the outcome approach for service delivery. The evidence shows that the challenges associated with the outcomes approach are related to tracking and accountability (Cook 2017).

Changing services to be outcome-focused adds an additional layer of complexity to service delivery. This means that processes aiming to improve services can be problematic and negatively impact the outcome due to the complexity of the improvement project (Jo and Nabatchi 2016; Wimbush 2011). Furthermore, researchers mention that

processes looking to improve outcomes can only be meaningful if the stakeholders are consulted, which means that some of the factors that will influence the outcome will be directly linked to the feelings and experiences of the stakeholders and how they perceive improvement and the value of a better service outcome (Lowe 2013; Strokosch and Osborne 2021). On the one hand, NPM concentrates on management performance, and NPG focuses on outcomes, co-production, and collaboration (Osborne 2006). Even though there are new approaches to measure and track the improvements in service delivery based on outcomes, there is a tendency to try to evaluate outcome-focused services using pre-existing performance-driven indicators. This lack of coordination between service delivery methodology and evaluation indicators points to the ongoing tension in the models for PAM reforms (Bozeman 2002).

2.3.3 Whole life experience of service users

This element captures the life-changing effects public services can have on their users. When governments plan for a service, they intend to tackle a specific societal need. How the service is designed and provided can result in life-changing experiences for users (Osborne et al. 2021). Moreover, public servants' interactions with users can be beneficial or detrimental to the creation or destruction of service value (Meakin et al. 2017). For example, education is one of the public services that can have whole-life effects on the users called students. Decisions on how education is structured, for example, budget allocation for specific schools, can have life-changing effects on students. More importantly, public teacher attitudes and interactions with students as service providers have life-lasting effects on the students (Hersh and Walker 1983).

Meynhardt posits that value goes beyond an economic transaction and can only be understood in the environment where the service is provided (Meynhardt 2009, 2015). Literature suggests that a co-creation stakeholder can influence the service and influence service users' perceptions. This phenomenon results in making the value of the services subjective to the emotions and individual psychology of the participants (Eagly and Chaiken 1993). As co-creation stakeholders participate integrally in the service, they potentially develop an emotional involvement that makes them consciously participate in the service delivery (Chandler and Lusch 2015). This participation mechanism often results in stakeholders contributing to service delivery, and as well as they are involved in other services or processes related to the primary services, they initially started their participation. This participation of co-creation stakeholders in more than only the service where they are the beneficiaries creates a collaborative ecosystem (Brodie et al. 2011).

Vargo and Lusch posit that "co-creation of value is not an option" (Lusch and Vargo 2009, p. 9), meaning that there is always a valuing process from each stakeholder when

participating in a co-creation service process. Value appears as a product of the relationship between users and service (Grönroos 2017). Because value is created as the product of the before mentioned relationship, and the relationship is only created because a service exists in the first place, these two entities: value and service, cannot be separated (Meynhardt et al. 2016). This relation between value and service has a transitive property; if the value is determined by personal experience and service is co-created by several actors, personal experience from the actors participating in the co-creation process affects the value and the service alike. During the co-creation process, some actors do not directly benefit from services, such as lobbyists, NGOs, or academia, and their participation can potentially influence the service positively or negatively and, ergo, the value.

2.3.4 Capacity creation for future change

This element captures if the value created by the service generates dependency or capacity for the users (Osborne et al. 2021). A mass of literature concentrates on studying possible dependencies generated by public services; the common conclusion from this research focus is that services that do not create capacity are economically and socially unsustainable (Sirianni and Friedland 2001). For example, a sense of community can enhance and maintain the association's work in neighborhood associations. Studies on building capacity in neighborhood associations found that a sense of community promotes their ability to support themselves and develop their objectives over time. Moreover, neighborhood associations that create a sense of community have members more engaged in meetings and actively participating in activities (Chavis and Wandersman 1990).

Researchers on the marketing and delivery of services Kumar, Scheer, & Kotler, (2000) have identified that companies sometimes adapt their products or services merely following the voice of a single customer or customer group, without necessarily looking at collateral impact to other customer groups. This can originate a phenomenon called in the private sector "tyranny of the served market" (Zhou et al. 2005). In a process where value is co-created with users, this phenomenon can be detrimental to some users since the decisions made to favor a group can be damaging to others. In services where co-creation is used to deliver services, a situation where something similar to "tyranny of the served market" is spotted can also have repercussions on the public servants that deliver the service. If citizens' demands are taken into consideration in isolation, public servants may not be able to adapt and keep up with the new proposed service. The study from Zhou, Yim, and Tse (2005) shows that a cultural change is needed to accomplish the changes in services required by users and keep service providers up to date and motivated to keep and keep service provision delivering outcomes. The required cultural change to

keep services relevant requires users, service providers, and all other co-creation stakeholders to learn about each other's roles and the service delivery process. Learning during the co-creation process plays a crucial role in keeping value co-creation over time (Komulainen 2014).

2.3.5 Societal value

Public value can be ambiguous to define and generalize due to the subjectivity of a particular society's values (Bozeman 2002, 2007; Jørgensen and Bozeman 2007). Nonetheless, this element aims to identify value created from a service provided to an individual that at the same time contributes value to the society where the user received the service (Osborne et al. 2021). For example, public healthcare for transexual people is approached differently depending on the society where the person lives. In some cases, sexual reassignment operations and prescriptions are considered part of the public services, and societal value is created when the service is delivered (Ellis et al. 2014). In contrast, there are countries where transgender people are considered illegal; no societal value is produced regarding sexual reassignment operations (Sood 2010).

To better understand how societal value is produced, Shirky (2010) proposes understanding value creation in communities that share information online. Shirky mentions that sharing content can produce personal, group, and public value on virtual platforms. Users can get personal value for sharing videos or images, such as influencers on social media. More organized communities like those that share final products like reports or datasets are expected to generate value from group interchange of assignments. Finally, organized communities follow community agreed-on rules to achieve public value, e.g., communities cooperating to report georeferenced information in maps. Shirks mentions that communication technologies provide tools to make personal contributions available for little cost and extended periods, significantly reducing barriers for individuals to share their contributions and participate in communities. This phenomenon opens the opportunity to create additional value from individual contributions for group value. Public value is created when a community of active members generates value from an agreed process that provides a service, and the service is openly available to any user, even to non-contributors and newcomers (Shirky 2010). Even though the generation of personal, group or public values relies upon individual contributions, the difference between public value and personal and group values is that participants must follow governance agreed upon within the community. The governance allows for consistent service delivery, allowing external users and newcomers to profit from the service quickly. Additionally, the set of rules stated in the governance ensures that there are no malicious modifications or appropriations from users (Shirky 2010).

Elinor Ostrom describes that the governance mechanism in this public value service requires a significant level of communication, constant and orderly interactions between members, and a mutually binding agreement (Ostrom 1990). Examples of these communities can be observed in open-source software like Apache or open knowledge communities like Wikipedia. Ostrom also posits that these self-governed communities can self-manage the resources that they produce and ultimately generate value. In the open market or services typically provided by governments, a private or public authority would typically manage these resources. As the participants of the communities that manage these resources profit from the value created, self-imposed rules make sense and stick more in the community. These rules create a sense of right or wrong behaviors and create a system that can produce sustainable value for society (Shirky 2010).

Tab. 2 summarizes the Osborne framework putting together the elements of value and the value creation process.

Value-creation process		Elements of value created				
		Short-term satisfaction and user well-being	Medium/long-term service outcomes	Whole-life experiences of services users	Capacity creation for future change	Societal value
Production of public services	Co-production Co-design					
Use or consumption of public services	Co-experience Co-construction					

(Osborne et al., 2021)

Tab. 2 Value creation/value elements matrix

3 Research design and methodology

This chapter describes the steps to collect, structure, and analyze primary and secondary data. The first part of this chapter describes the use of the theoretical framework and the steps taken to apply it to the Ecuadorian study case empirically. The second part of this chapter offers a detailed list of steps taken to collect data through interviews and the techniques applied for its analysis.

3.1 Research design

In 2021 Osborne published “Beyond co-production: value creation and public services” as the result of the project “Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (CoVal)” part of the European Commission H22020 (Osborne et al. 2021). The author proposes an empirical framework to contribute to closing the literature gap on value co-production in public services and calls for researchers to apply the framework empirically to improve its generalizability.

To empirically apply the Osborne framework, the chosen research methodology is a holistic case study with a single unit of analysis. The unit of analysis is the Ecuadorian Open Data Portal and its Policy and Guidelines developed in the context of the First National Action Plan Ecuador 2019-2022 Open Government Partnership co-created in collaboration with academia, government agencies, citizens, and NGOs. The study case is complemented with semi-structured interviews to collect primary data from participants in the co-creation process. The following steps describe the steps taken to perform the research.

- The first step is to collect official documents published by the participants in the process of co-creation of the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal. The information gathered will set the context of the case study.
- The second step is to perform semi-structured interviews with participants in the production and consumption of the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal. The identified participants to be interviewed are the Ecuadorian Government, NGOs, citizens, and academia representatives (See Tab. 4).
- The third step is to process the information gathered from official documents and the interviews using the matrixes proposed by Osborne et al. (2021) (see Tab. 1 and Tab. 2). The discussion will be a qualitative analysis of the findings after

applying the theoretical framework proposed by Osborne (2021). The theoretical framework allows for identifying co-creation stages taken while producing consuming public services, elements of value co-creation, and relations between participants that produced positive or negative value to the public service.

- The fourth step is synthesizing the empirical findings using the conceptual framework to provide answers to the following research questions:

1. How is value created in the context of the co-creation process of the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal?

- 1.1. When is value co-created during the process of co-creation of the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal?
- 1.2. How do the interactions between co-creation participants create value in the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal?
- 1.3. What kind of value was created through the co-creation process of the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal?

The following paragraphs justify the selection of a case study as the methodology to gather data and answer the proposed questions. A study case is fitted to answer questions looking for qualitative analysis of how or why a current event occurred in the way it happened (Yin 2009). The questions proposed for this research concentrate on how co-creation was carried out in the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal.

Study cases are an excellent fit for events where the research has little to no control over the variables. Additionally, to understand the phenomenon in-depth, study cases allow researching the contextual conditions where the phenomenon occurs. In the process of co-creation between the citizens and the public administration, the researcher is not recommended to intervene in the interactions that may create value. The contextual conditions such as cultural and societal factor that shapes the interaction between public servants and citizens can help understand why specific values can be co-created (Yin 2009).

A case study allows for various sources to enrich the understanding of the phenomenon. Furthermore, this methodology enables applying previously proposed theoretical

frameworks to structure and guide the collection and data analysis. Moreover, it also allows for various data collection tools such as interviews.

3.2 Data collection and analysis

Data collection

Yin (2014) identifies six sources of evidence for study cases: “documents, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and physical artifacts.” Yin also recognizes that interviews, observations, and documents are the most common sources for study cases.

For this research, semi-structured in-depth interviews are the tool chosen to collect data about the experiences and perceptions of co-creation participants in the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal

The questions are designed to get as many opinions as possible on the elements from value-cocreation listed in the Osborne framework. The interviews were recorded after asking for the consent of the interviewees. The researcher's role was to listen, take notes, and ask follow-up questions. Special attention was put into asking the question How and Why to let participants express their experiences using their own words (Campbell 2015).

Interviews are an appropriate tool to collect qualitative data from stakeholders' experiences during co-creation (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree 2006; Whiting 2008). The open-ended questions with the follow-up questions allow for hearing opinions about the events. As follow-up questions, respondents were asked to share their insights into how the process of co-creation was carried out. The interviews were in-depth to allow the discovery of shared commonalities in the group that participated and help answer the research question

The following steps and considerations were taken to conduct the interviews:

- A broad structure for the interviews was set to explore in-depth the participants' experiences that could co-create value (see Tab. 3).

Value creation elements as proposed by Osborne	Exemplary open questions
Short term satisfaction and user wellbeing	How would you describe your experience participating in the co-creation process of the Open Government National Action Plan, Open Data Policy and Guidelines, or Open Data Portal?
Medium/long term service outcomes	How do you think citizens will use open data?
Whole life experience of service users	Could you explain what the role of open data in Ecuadorian society is?

Capacity creation for future change	Could you explain the government's role in the future regarding open data / open government?
Societal (public) value	Could you explain the benefits of open data / open government for citizens who did not participate in the co-creation workshop? Or citizens that cannot use the Open Data Portal?

Created by the researcher using elements from (Osborne et al. 2021)

Tab. 3 Value creation elements and exemplary open questions

- The first interviewees were identified based on the official list of government agencies and official counterparts for the Open Data Policy and Guidelines and the Open Data Portal (See Tab. 5).
- The second set of interviewees was identified by recommendation of previous interviewees and after participating in an event for Open Government Week organized by the Ecuadorian government.
- Citizens were identified using the two online portals where citizens contributed to the co-creation of the Open Government National Action Plan and the Open Data Guidelines.
- Invitations explaining the research and the motivation for having an interview were sent via email to each interviewee.
- The interviews were conducted online for approximately one hour for each participant, as mentioned in Tab. 4, and transcripts were produced see Appendix A.
- Participants were informed about the objectives of the research and the motives for the interviews. Additionally, they were asked for their permission to record the interview.
- Reference IDs are created for each interviewee, as shown in Tab. 4, to protect their privacy and later reference during the chapter where results are presented.

Reference ID	Interviewee description	Interview format	Date	Duration
I.1. Vice-presidency representative	A mid-range authority at the Vice-president's Office that coordinate the Open Government Plan	Online interview	13-03-2022	00:43:40
I.2. Secretariat of planning representative	A mid-range authority at the Technical Secretariat of Planning 'Planifica Ecuador – the government agency responsible for maintaining the Open Data Portal	Online interview	05-04-2022	00:44:22
I.3. Ministry representative	A senior civil servant at the Ministry of Telecommunications and Information Society MINTEL government agency responsible for the Open Data Policy and Guidelines	Online interview	26-04-2022	00:48:04
I.4. Academia representative	A professor of Digital Language at Universidad de las Americas UDLA, a current user of the Open Data Portal	Online interview	11-03-2022	00:50:16
I.5. DATALAT representative	A senior member of DATALAT organization dedicated to open data for Latin America and Ecuador	Online interview	14-03-2022	00:58:58
I.6. FUNDAPI representative	A senior member of FUNDAPI (Fundación de Ayuda por Internet) organization dedicated to helping citizens in internet-related matters	Online interview	10-02-2022	01:10:43
I.7. REDAM representative	A senior member of REDAM (Red Ecuatoriana de Datos Abiertos y Metadatos) organization dedicated to promoting open data and metadata in Ecuador	Online interview	16-02-2022	00:50:48
I.8. OPENLAB representative	A senior member of OPENLAB organization dedicated to promoting dialogs and experiences about digital culture and open knowledge	Online interview	16-03-2022	01:07:39
I.9. Citizen NAP	A citizen that contributed to the co-creation of the Open Government National Action Plan	Online interview	02-04-2022	00:45:32
I.10. Citizen ODG	A citizen that contributed to the co-creation of the Open Data Guide	Online interview	30-03-2022	00:37:36

Tab. 4 Summary of interviews

Data analysis

The interviewee transcripts were examined using the *editing and template approaches* proposed by Crabtree & Miller (1999) and presented by DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree (2006) to analyze the data collected during the interviews. The authors mentioned that as many disciplines of scientific studies use interviews as a tool to collect data, there are several strategies to analyze the data gathered. One common strategy of analyzing in-depth interviews is the *editing approach* that allows researchers to “review and identify text segments much as an editor does while making interpretative statements during the process of identifying patterns for organizing text” (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree 2006).

A second stage includes coding the segments of the interviews that were identified as experiences from interviews that showed a statement of value regarding their experience participating in the co-creation process. The *template approach* as proposed by DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree (2006) was followed for the coding process. The *template approach* can be utilized to apply “categories (codes) based on prior research and theoretical perspective” (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree 2006).

For processing the interviews in this research, the following steps are taken:

- Review interview transcripts and identify segments with statements linked to experiences that create value (see Appendix A).
- The identified segments are then transposed into a table to find common categories across the interviewee’s statements (see Appendix A).
- Several rounds of coding were performed to define major themes in the interviewee’s statements finishing with twelve themes (see appendix A). Additionally, participants mentioned eight recurrent roles that are a product of the co-creation process (see appendix A).
- Then the five elements of value co-creation mentioned by Osborne are used as a template to tag the statements (see appendix A and Tab. 7).

Tab. 1 and Tab. 2 summarize the Osborne framework to be applied in this research. The five elements of value creation will help identify if there was value co-creation during the process of producing and consuming the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal. Also, it allows for defining the value created and how the relations between participants contributed to its production. In the literature review, definitions and examples of identifying the elements of value co-creation are provided and will be applied empirically in the study case. Moreover, applying the framework to the co-creation of the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data Portal will facilitate the qualitative analysis of the interactions and experiences of co-creation participants.

4 Results

As proposed in the research design, the first section of this chapter describes the Ecuadorian study case from the documentation published by participants of the co-creation process. This section explains the interrelations between the ODP, ODP&G, and the NAP, setting the context of the study case. The first section allows for understanding the motivations of the Ecuadorian government to implement an open government agenda and use co-creation as the methodology to produce and deliver services.

The second section presents the result of the interviews performed with ten participants in the co-creation process of the NAP, ODP&G, and ODP. The twelve common topics that were identified as value-creating elements are explained. Additionally, the eight roles that co-creation participants mentioned as the product of the process are analyzed.

4.1 The case of Open Data Ecuador

4.1.1 First Open Government National Action Plan

In Ecuador, projects that include the state and the citizens interacting to produce a public good are not new. For example, the process of *minga* is a recurrent practice to cover a deficit of resources and capitalize on labor available, especially in rural communities. However, the first formal approach to engaging in co-creation came when Ecuador joined the Open Government Partnership in 2018. As a member of this partnership, the Ecuadorian government started developing the First National Action Plan 2019 – 2021 Open Government Partnership (NAP), using co-creation as the primary tool to propose, articulate, and decide what initiatives to include in the NAP (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020).

The process consisted of first articulating a *Grupo Nucleo*, which translates to English as a *Core Group* formed by public institutions, the academia, and civil organizations that will articulate the plan (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Core Group revised timelines for all commitments in the NAP, extending deadlines for implementation until 2022.

Second, the government collected initiatives from citizens, public servants, and civil organizations online on the website www.gobiernoabierto.ec, and organized in-person workshops in conjunction with universities in 20 provinces to capture citizen perspectives that would otherwise not have access to the online option to process initiatives (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020). 297 were collected online, and 38 were collected at in-person workshops.

Third, the core group analyzed the 335 citizens' proposals and determined that 181 were related to Open Government. The next step was to bundle together citizen proposals into themed groups getting 43 integrated proposals. The criteria taken in this process are:

1. Precision and clarity.
2. Willingness for active collaboration between citizens and the public sector.
3. Relation with the pillars of Open Government.
4. Possibility of becoming or contributing to public policy (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020).

Fourth, the Core Group evaluated the 43 integrated proposals and categorized them as follows:

- **10 in category 1:** Proposals to be included in the plan as commitments
- **6 in category 2:** Possible proposals to be included in the Plan
- **8 in category 3:** Proposals to be promoted outside of the Plan
- **19 in category 4:** Proposals to be included in the next plan or conditioned by circumstances

Each of 335 initial proposals was assessed by the Core Group. At every step of the process, a formal answer about the decision was made available on the Open Government website. The 10 consolidated proposals were further categorized and transformed into commitments reflected in the NAP as follows:

Three proposals are categorized as Open Data commitments:

1. Collaborative drafting of the open data policy and its guidelines
2. Re-design and update the open data portal
3. Open Information Platform for Public Procurement

Two proposals are categorized as Capacity strengthening for transparency commitments:

4. Implementation of participation rights and access to environmental information (Escazú)

5. Co-design of a roadmap for the implementation of the EITI Standard to improve financial transparency in extractive industries in Ecuador (oil, gas, and mining)

Two proposals are categorized as Citizen Empowerment commitments:

6. Capacity development to ensure transparency and Access to public information
7. Co-creation of the National Plan on Prevention and Eradication of Gender Violence and Against Women and creation of citizen observatory of violence against genders and sex-generic diversities

Three proposals are categorized as public innovation commitments:

8. First citizen innovation laboratory of Ecuador
9. Improvement of public processes (simplification)
10. Co-creation of a strategy to improve the Quality of Public Services of the Executive Branch

Fifth, all ten compromises were assigned a governmental agency and a civil society or academia counterpart, as shown in Tab. 5.

Commitment Number	Government Agency Responsible	Counterpart
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Telecommunications and Information Society (MINTEL) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Red Ecuatoriana de Datos Abiertos y Metadatos (REDAM)
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical Secretariat of Planning 'Planifica Ecuador 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundación de Ayuda por Internet (FUNDAPI)
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Procurement Service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundación Ciudadanía y Desarrollo
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Environment and Water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Universidad de Los Hemisferios, through the Centro Internacional de Investigaciones sobre Ambiente y Territorio
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Energy and non-renewable resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundación Ciudadanía y Desarrollo Grupo FARO Corporación Participación Ciudadana Universidad de Los Hemisferios, through the Centro Internacional de Investigaciones sobre Ambiente y Territorio
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ombudsman Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporación Participación Ciudadana
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secretariat of Human Rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundación Diálogo Diverso Fundación Esquel
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of the President 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundación San Francisco Global
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office of the President Ministry of Telecommunications and Information Society (MINTEL) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instituto de Altos Estudios Nacionales
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Labor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colegio de Administradores Públicos de Loja

Adaptation from (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020)

Tab. 5 Government responsible and official counterparts

Sixth, as part of the monitoring and reporting process, a virtual search engine was deployed on the website www.gobiernoabierto.ec in addition to the official documents published, these instruments help citizens track and understand the status of their contributions. In addition, the Open Government Partnership has an Independent Review Mechanism that evaluates the implementation of the NAP (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020). In their main conclusions, the Independent Review Mechanism Design Report 2019-2021 proposes that the process of co-producing the NAP was well carried out. However, it mentions that the role of the government is still a strong coordinator rather than a facilitator, a recurrent situation when it is the first incursion of governments co-creating services (Tania Zabala-Peñañiel and Open Government Partnership 2021).

4.1.2 Open Data Policy, Guidelines, and Open Data Portal

The study case in this research concentrates on the two first commitments established in the NAP:

1. Collaborative drafting of the open data policy and its guidelines (ODP&G)
2. Re-design and update the Open Data Portal (ODP)

Collaborative drafting of the open data policy and its guidelines

The first commitment established in the NAP is the collaborative drafting of the Open Data Policy and its Guidelines (OPD&G). In order for this commitment to be developed, the Ministry of Telecommunications (MINTEL) and the Red Ecuatoriana de Datos *Abiertos y Metadatos* (REDAM) are established as responsible for the drafting of the OPD&G (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020).

The Open Data Policy has as its primary objective to establish the general legal framework for implementing open data in the executive branch. The main goals for its implementation are to strengthen citizen participation and transparency, improve public administration efficiencies, and promote academic research, citizen entrepreneurship, and social innovation. The Open Data Guidelines is the instrument that provides the technical criteria and methodologies to plan, open, publish and promote the use of open data (López et al. 2021).

As established in the NAP, the drafting and the process of creating the OPD&G should follow a similar format to the process of co-creation used to create the NAP. In this regard, REDAM and MINTEL coordinate a four steps process of co-creation:

1. **Mapping stakeholders**, open call for national and international experts that wanted to participate in the drafting of the OPD&G
2. **OPD&G drafting**, thematic workshops to draft the document in consultation with the participants
3. **Citizen feedback**, publish online the draft of the OPD&G for comments from citizens
4. **Feedback integration**, analysis of citizens' contributions to update and improve the OPD&G (López et al. 2021)

In mapping stakeholders, 136 experts were identified using an online open call. The experts are representatives from NGOs, academia, international organizations, and public servants. The participants worked in workshops regarding the following themes:

1. **Technical matters**: this workshop's discussions were related to meta data, data dictionaries, interoperability, standards, and data quality.

2. **Legal aspects:** this workshop's discussion was related to open licenses and methodologies and techniques to protect personal data.
3. **Value creation:** the discussion in this workshop was related to promoting innovation using open data, data for academic research, diffusion, and promotion of open data.
4. **Participation:** the discussion in this workshop was related to data demand and offer and methodologies for engaging citizens in open data (López et al. 2021).

After the four workshops, the draft document of the OPD&G was published on the platform *Dialogo 2.0*¹. Citizens participated and provided 155 contributions to the OPD&G. The contributions gathered online were analyzed and incorporated where possible by the legal department of MINTEL. In 2021 the Ministry of Telecommunications officially published the Open Data Guide (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones 2021).

Consumption: Re-design and update the Open Data Portal

The second commitment established in the NAP is to re-design and update the Open Data Portal ODP. The responsables established for this commitment are the Technical Secretariat of Planning *Planifica Ecuador* and the *Fundación de Ayuda por Internet* (FUNDAPI). The ODP is meant to address the several problems related to official government data not being user-friendly, scattered, not interoperable, and not compliant with personal data protection legal standards (Bejar 2020).

The Open Data Portal commitment has five milestones to be accomplished by 2022.

1. Assessment of the current situation of the existing open data platforms.
2. Redesign update of exiting open data.
3. Hold public events such as hackathons to allow feedback on the updated Open Data Portal redesign.
4. Systematization and adjustment to the open data portal.
5. Evaluation. After these five milestones are completed, the ownership of the Portal will be the responsibility of the Technical Secretariat of Planning (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020).

¹ www.aportecivico.gobiernoelectronico.gob.ec/legislation/processes/14/draft_versions/33

REDAM and the Technical Secretariat of Planning, following the mandate established in the NAP, used co-creation methodologies to propose and implement the redesign and update of the ODP. The process was conducted in several co-creation workshops with 67 representatives from academia, local governments, transparency function government branches, the private sector, citizens, and public servants (Bejar 2020).

During the co-creation workshops, a canvas methodology was applied to gather participants' needs and requests about how the new ODP should look and its desired functionalities. To gather the information, the following questions were asked to develop the functionalities and future actions regarding the ODP:

- **Datasets:** What dataset are you interested in having as open data?
- **Data management:** Do you know what government agency is responsible for open data?
- **Open data demand:** Who do you think are the potential users for open data?
- **Potential partners:** Who are the main stakeholders that could help improve the promotion of open data?
- **Priority:** What dataset do you think is the most important to have available?
- **Legality:** What legal framework do you think is the most suited to promote open data publication?
- **Responsible:** Who do you think in the government agencies should be in charge of publishing open data?
- **Portal hosting:** Do you think there should be an independent webpage for the ODP?
- **Promote open data:** What activities do you think are helpful to connect open data and its possible users?
- **Impact:** How do you think the impact of the dataset published and the importance of the ODP can be measured? (Bejar 2020)

The contribution from the participants in the co-creation workshop was processed using the canvas methodology. The contributions collected point that citizens are looking for socio-economic reports, demographic information, poverty, and education datasets. Participants in the workshop expressed that they see the most potential for data usage in

students, academia, NGOs, and public administration. Another common perception expressed during the workshops is that communication campaigns are needed to promote better and balance demand and offer of open data. Participants mentioned a need to create abilities and capacity that enable potential users to profit from the open data published in the ODP. Finally, the participants expressed that to measure the impact of open data, the quantity of the dataset was not the most relevant indicator. Instead, they think that impact can be measured from the quality and usefulness of the dataset available in the ODP (Bejar 2020).

In 2021 the revamped Open Data Portal was launched on the website www.datosabiertos.gob.ec. The ODP includes features requested by participants during the workshops, such as a search box, map of institutions and categories, metric usage, contact form, use cases, and tutorials.

4.2 Value creation process and elements applied to the Ecuadorian study case

The following two sections will present the results of the interviews with ten participants in the co-creation of the NAP, ODP&G, and ODP. The first section presents the twelve common elements arising from the analysis and coding of the interviews. The second section presents the eight roles that the interviewees mention as important when co-creating the NAP, ODP&G, and ODP.

4.2.1 Value creation elements

As proposed in the methodology for this research, interviews were carried out with ten participants involved in the co-creation process in the NAP and commitments 1 and 2 as described in Tab. 5. The open questions proposed to the interviewees aimed to collect their experiences that can be identified as elements of value creation. To structure the interviews, five main conductive open questions guided the conversation based on the five elements of value creation proposed by Osborne (2021) (See Tab. 3). When processing the interviews, 12 codes/themes emerged as recurrent experiences that added or subtracted value during the co-creation process. In the following sections, the 12 themes are explained.

1. Community

The feeling of being part of a community is one factor that motivates the participation of citizens in the co-creation process. Citizens want to feel an integral part of the process. NGOs identify local leaders to bring communities' needs to workshops for discussions with the governments (I.10.). All interviewees mentioned that open data opens the

opportunity to develop a community around the exploration and share ideas about using the data sets available in the ODP. Some interviewees recognize that working with data in a dedicated community has benefits such as easing communication between the members that help identify and tackle problems (I.1., I.2., I.3., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8., I.10.). Moreover, other interviewees mentioned that the diversity of citizens and experts in collaborative communities might add value to co-creating services (I.4. and I.8.). Furthermore, diverse communities can be crucial to developing out-of-the-box ideas or bringing citizens ideas from already implemented solutions that could be replicated and available in other communities and contexts (I.4.).

The formation of communities around the open data ecosystem allows the creation of a whole life experience of associated services produced thanks to data availability. Communities can easily share the tasks of understanding how to use data to solve a problem and implement solutions. The government may profit from this voluntary work self-promoted by these communities.

The interviewee I.2. mentioned that tools of the Open Government allow for individuals to get in touch directly with the government; however, the role of the government is still to provide services not to individuals but rather to conglomerates, big or small. For the governments, the role of citizen communities to conglomerate needs and present them in co-creation workshops is vital to advance the improvement of tools such as the ODP (I.2.). A citizen mentioned that citizens look up to NGOs and the government to provide opportunities to form specialized communities where they can collaborate to propose solutions to social problems (I.10.).

As all NGOs are already working with communities, they found that empowering the citizens looking for open data and willing to participate in events like hackathons is one of the ways Open Data can create societal value. Also, some NGO representatives mentioned that well-organized communities or empowered citizens could take full advantage of the open data and open government and produce services that generate value for their communities with little to no intervention from the central government (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.).

2. Communications

During the co-creation process, communication between participants allowed for the establishment of compromises, making decisions, transferring knowledge, and inviting citizens and other actors to participate (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020; Tania Zabala-Peñañiel and Open Government Partnership 2021). Nonetheless, especially

for some interviewees, there is still potential to create additional value when communicating with the government (I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8., I.9., I.10.).

From their first impression of interacting with the government in the process of co-creation of the NAP, some interviewees mentioned that they had a perception that communications were not sufficient in transmitting the final decision made regarding their contributions (I.8. and I.9.). Distrust in the process can be associated with the traditional communications in previous experiences with the government when authorities use media and public events to communicate final products and expect recognition from the citizens (I.6. and I.8.). In contrast, a citizen mentioned that they would rather see the use of new communications channels like social media for the government to recognize their contributions (I.10.). Additionally, the citizen mentions that having public recognition on Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, or any other official social media platform from their government can boost their motivations to participate in these projects (I.10.).

The academia representative expressed that they feel invited to participate in the process of co-creation (I.4.). Nonetheless, they pointed out that the invitation needs to be more broadly extended (I.4.). The academia representative mentioned that the invitations were focalized on experts related to computer and data sciences (I.4.). Moreover, the academia representative mentioned that the process could benefit from a more diverse scientific background (I.4.). Similarly, all NGO representatives observed that citizens felt relegated from participating due to the technicality of open data.

Some interviewees mentioned that the use of social media has medium- and long-term effects on communications (I.1, I.6., I.9., I.10.). The interviewed citizens identified the opportunity to participate in the co-creation of the NAP and ODG through social media publications (I.9. and I.10.). Some interviewees consider the use of social media a sign of openness and a more horizontal government (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8., I.9., I.10.). The government can increase the periodicity of publications and directness using social media, making it possible to share detailed information in every step of the co-creation process. This translates into setting the right expectations with citizens and diminishing misinformation (I.7.).

The government representatives acknowledge the potential of using social media platforms to facilitate the participation and diffusion of co-creation processes and promote new services such as the ODP (I.1., I.2., I.3.). In addition to social media, participation platforms such as www.gobiernoabierto.ec or www.aportecivico.gobiernoelectronico.gob.ec have allowed the government to improve the traceability of comments, requests, and general inquiries from the citizens. In addition,

the Ministry representative mentioned that traditional communications tools such as the publication of reports and participation diplomas had been the way to communicate and recognize citizen participation (I.3.).

3. Continuity

Regarding the continuity of the projects, the government representatives mention that the public administration has taken legal steps to ensure that the ODP keeps providing high-quality open data to the citizens. Regarding the co-creation process for the NAP, some citizen propositions were not included in the first version of the NAP (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020). However, there is a written compromise to consider some of the ideas in the future. In this regard, citizens mentioned their expectation to hear from the government if they revisit their propositions and the final decision (I.9.).

A citizen mentioned that they prefer that the government take small steps at the time and communicate the result as they progress, in contrast to trying to “build a castle in one day” (I.10.). This will also require that the NGOs provide constant support to the process of co-creation, which could be challenging to achieve; an NGO representative mentioned that organizations right now work per project and, when it is finished, they move to the next (I.8.). This means that a process with a continuous improvement cycle may represent a challenge to the proper participation of the NGOs.

The Ministry representative mentioned that the expectations generated by the co-creation process had created an additional awareness in public servants to think about including citizens' participation when creating policies (I.3.). Another government official mentioned that co-creation is not the only tool they use to collaborate in the public administration, mentioning that intra-agency and cross-agency collaboration is also considered necessary (I.2.).

4. Digitalization

Using technology to conduct the process of cocreation is associated positively by the citizens and NGOs. A citizen mentioned that they perceive the government embracing technology as a way of modernization (I.10.). Some NGO representatives recognize that citizen participation has increased since the transportation barrier has disappeared with the wide use of technologies, primarily virtual participation (I.5. and I.7.). Also, the perception of the NGOs representatives is that citizens during the COVID-19 pandemic have started using more digital ways to interact with the government (I.5. and I.8.).

Nonetheless, there is a positive first impression regarding the digitalization of services in the government. Some citizens wonder if virtual participation will be kept after the

COVID-19 pandemic (I.9. and I.10.) In addition, some interviewees mentioned that if all participation is carried out using online methods, there is a high chance for senior citizens to be left out of the process. Also, considering the socio-economic situation of Ecuador, some interviewees expressed their concerns about the access to the internet in remote areas (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8., I.9., I.10.).

5. Education

Non-government representatives interviewed shared the expectation that learning and education about the process of co-creation, open government, and open data as one of their main motivations to participate (I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8., I.9., I.10.). Some interviewees share an intrinsic interest in learning and sharing knowledge as one of their motivations; the openness of the co-creation process allows for this motivation to be fulfilled (I.4., I.9., I.10.). Significantly for some citizens interviewed, their participation was motivated by a necessity to express their complaints and expertise to improve public services and the government (I.9. and I.10.). It is essential to mention that citizens who answer the request for the interview of this study are academically or professionally related to the open government or open data world (I.9. and I.10.). Some citizens mentioned their inspiration was to impact the development of the NAP and ODG and, by extension, improve the government (I.9. and I.10.).

The government representatives pointed out that creating capacity is one of their goals (I.1, I.2, I.3). The representative from the ministry mentioned the option in the ODP that allows citizens and public servants to take courses on how to use the ODP (I.3.). On top of that, the representative from the ministry mentioned that there are events where public servants discuss the data their organizations produce and upload it to the ODP so that other government agencies can reuse data (I.3).

The academia representative mentioned that they pay close attention to the co-creation process as an opportunity to do research and contribute with theoretical frameworks that can facilitate these processes (I.4.). The ODP has a significant role in creating capacity through education since the academia could use the ODP to identify and complement research in Ecuador (I.4).

All NGOs showed significant interest in generating capacity from education. On the one hand, they identify that the open government and open data will only be relevant as long as the citizens are educated on using these tools. They want to encourage curiosity in the citizens to get them involved in using open data to solve societal problems and promote government oversight. NGOs are interested in getting citizens educated on visual tools that will allow citizens to deep dive into the pool of data available in the ODP (I.8.). Some

NGO representatives mentioned that boosting citizens' expectations of open data will ensure that future projects with local governments and other government branches will deliver value (I.5 and I.6).

All the interviewees concur that even though the ODP is fully working, there is no value for these tools if citizens cannot use them. Following this reflection, the interviewees mention that there is an opportunity to start educating and boosting a cultural change to make sure that everyone can benefit from an open government.

All NGOs regard education as one of the elements that can produce societal value. An NGO representative said that “Even though from a 100% of citizens that could be taught about open government and open data, roughly speaking only 10% will master the knowledge to create visualizations, apps, a product, or a service using the ODP datasets. Nonetheless, the other 90% of participants will most probably transform into a consumer and allies to promote the use of open data in Ecuador” (I.8.).

6. Efficiency

Regarding the allocation and use of resources, some interviewees see that technology has the potential to find efficiencies (I.1.). Some NGO representatives mentioned that there is still the need to allocate additional economic and human resources to open government initiatives (I.5 and I.7). Also, some interviewees agree that efficiency in the context of open government needs to move beyond the discussion of lack of resources and instead concentrate on discussing the improvement of public services by putting citizens in the center (I.1., I.5, I.6., I.7., I.8.). In this discussion, there seems to be a disagreement on if the resources should be secured before starting new projects or if exploring new ways of delivering services could potentially make a project viable with little to non-impact on the budget. A government representative mentioned that thanks to the partnerships with NGOs, projects expected to be delivered in six months took fewer thanks to the joint efforts (I.3.). There is a positive experience from the government side of using co-creation to have additional human effort to produce public policy (I.3.).

7. Horizontality

The process of co-creation allows for a horizontal structure for actors to interact. For some NGO and academia representatives, this encounter with the government had a positive connotation because it showed the government as an open institution (I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). Working with multidisciplinary specialists from NGOs and academia allowed bringing highly specialized knowledge to the co-creation process. As NGOs and academia saw their contributions integrated across the co-creation process, they felt that

their contributions were taken seriously and positively impacted the NAP, ODP&G, and the ODP (I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). In addition, participants perceived transparency from the government in announcing that they do not have a predefined solution, and willingness to learn created a sense of opportunity to contribute from academia and NGOs (I.6.).

The new proposition from the government to resort to citizens, NGOs, and academia to propose solutions is well seen by all the interviewees. A government official mentioned that the government is mainly looking to empower other actors to collaborate in solving societal problems (I.1). The government's position is that services will be more customer-centric by bringing collaboration across the co-creation process (I.1.). Furthermore, the government representative mentioned the potential to find efficiencies in saving resources that would otherwise be invested in outsourcing services to collect feedback, testing, and development (I.1.).

The ministry representative mentioned several new synergies between the co-creation participants (I.3.). For example, DATALAT and REDAM are providing training to the public servants (I.3., I.5, I.7.). A new role that has been identified for NGOs, academia, and skilled citizens can be data mediators (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones 2021). This role entitles understanding the needs around data use and providing solutions for less-skilled citizens to understand and produce value from open data. The government representatives mentioned that the role of data mediator should be exercised in society to create capacity (I.1, I.2., I.3.).

From the government side, they were required to assemble different collaborative structures to coordinate governmental agencies' responsibilities to make the coproduction process possible (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020; Tania Zabala-Peñafiel and Open Government Partnership 2021). A practical example is the ODP; the responsibilities are shared between the Ministry of Telecommunications in charge of the governance and the Secretariat of Planning in charge of maintenance (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones 2021). Additionally, NGOs, academia, and citizens as participants in the development and users of the ODP could request changes and improvements.

A government official mentioned that public servants have preconceived positions on how policymaking should be carried out, which translates into resistance to collaborating in more horizontal policymaking processes (I.1.). Moreover, public servants are apprehensive regarding personal data law, which can create additional resistance to open datasets. Some government officials expressed that public servants are reluctant to open institutional datasets proactively because they believe that the institutions have data ownership (I.1 and I.2). To legally make it possible to publish data, the Open Data Policy

and Guidelines were created (López et al. 2021). In addition, the Ministry of Telecommunications is carrying out events in which public servants from different agencies present in-house datasets to create cross-agency collaboration and awareness.

All NGO representatives interviewed expressed that the legalistic approach to how public servants perform their tasks creates a negative perception in society. Some NGO representatives and citizens mentioned a widespread feeling that the “process is just being carried to check a box” (I.8., I.9., I.10.). This perception is harmful to establishing a more horizontal interaction between the participants. In addition, another NGO representative expressed their feeling of “just being heard during the workshops” and mentioned that this perception discourages engagement for future projects (I.8.). This perception can be traced to a habit mentioned by a government official: “public servants treat policymaking as war rooms or behind closed doors” (I.1.).

As part of the creation of the NAP, the Core Group was established (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020). This group formed by representatives from academia, government, NGOs, and citizens has shared responsibility in the decision-making process to define priorities. All members from the Core Group are legal counterparts with a designated government agency to implement and report the NAP commitments (see Tab. 5). The interactions product of the shared responsibilities has enabled the NGOs and the government to find new ways to work together, such as NGOs training public servants, developing collaborative working methodologies, and new evaluation methodologies (I.5. and I.7.). The NGO and government representatives are motivated to keep exploring and profiting from each other expertise and the possibility of improving the policymaking process and public services (I.1., I.2., I.3., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.).

Some interviewees said that co-creation could quickly turn into a whole life process thanks to establishing collaborative networks and ecosystems where collaboration happens organically (I.1, I.2, I.3, I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). Some NGO and government representatives agree that for citizens to be participants in these collaborative ecosystems, they need to be empowered into a co-creators role, meaning that they will be part of all the policymaking and service delivery processes (I.1., I.2, I.3., I.6., I.7., I.8.). A government representative mentioned that bringing knowledge and firsthand input from the citizens is a primary resource to improve services from the government (I.1.). All NGO representatives mentioned that their monitoring role of government initiatives is improved when there is a more horizontal structure and open data. An NGO representative mentioned that the government might consider the future NGOs’ reports and datasets as official information (I.5.). All interviewees agreed that the critical aspect

of promoting a horizontal co-creation process is trust in the work and contributions from the other participants.

There are conflicting opinions regarding the participants' roles in a completely horizontal co-creation paradigm. Some government officials showed a more conservative approach in the near future about moving forward to a hypothetical completely decentralized administration of services where non-government participants can take the role of administrators and the government as a supportive role (I.2. and I.3.). From the NGO representatives' perspective, they mention that if the horizontal collaboration ecosystems remain a common practice, the Government needs to have a down-to-earth attitude that shows that they genuinely do not know how to fix a problem and are willing to take recommendations from citizens (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.).

Some citizens interviewed mentioned that their horizontality experience is increased when they can see their contributions seriously taken, and they mention that making their contributions' status available is a sign of credibility (I.9. and I.10.). In this regard, a government representative pointed out that there is still a governmental responsibility to prioritize citizens' needs corresponding to a logic to provide public services equitably (I.2.). Furthermore, from the government official's perspective, some citizens' contributions could not be taken into action because they might represent an individual need (I.2.). Some interviewees still see the national government's role as an administrator of funds and priorities of society (I.4., I.9., I.10.).

A government representative mentioned that the objective of having a more horizontal policy-making process is to cover blind spots that public servants working away from communities could not foresee (I.1.). The NGOs pointed out that even when participating in workshops, there is still a need to identify better the participants that will attend these meetings. There is a negative connotation from the NGOs regarding the organization of working groups; they would like to see a broader range of participants (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). In addition, politics can impact the stability of previously established collaboration environments if the government in power decides to stop inviting NGOs or citizens if they show a particular political affinity.

In order to keep the process of co-creation for future services and the ODP delivering value, all interviewees recognize the importance of creating capacity to enable them to take on different roles and responsibilities as equals between public servants, NGOs, citizens, and academia. An NGO representative mentioned that they see potential in creating news skills in the public sector by bringing best practices related to agile methodologies, as the rigid government structure could take a long time to implement (I.5.). In this regard, the role of NGOs can be to experiment and develop agile

methodologies that could contribute to customer-centric public services. The ministry representative sees potential from creating the capacity and skills in the public servants that will allow them to produce and deliver services considering collaborations with society (I.3.). A government representative mentioned that public services with a customer-centric approach would bring better results when delivering services to citizens (I.1.). In addition, a more horizontal and agile approach will allow the government to address citizens' needs more efficiently (I.1.).

From a citizen's perspective, their role in the future could evolve into an oversight agent using open data (I.10.). Additionally, another citizen mentioned that there is a high possibility that citizens who have experienced a problem for an extended period have already identified quasi-solutions for their problems (I.9.). Furthermore, in a more horizontal government, these citizens' practical solutions could be adopted by the government and reproduced in other communities.

All NGO and academia representatives proposed that they could keep bringing technical and specialized contributions to the discussion. They mentioned that in a horizontal collaboration structure, their roles should be considered at the same level as the experts in the government and discuss together methodologies and plans to produce and deliver public services (I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). In addition, some interviewees mentioned that product of the collaborative work between the government and NGOs, new observatories will be established to contribute to gathering citizens' data for improving public services (I.1., I.3., I.5., I.7.). All interviewees mentioned that the establishment of new roles still needs work in the upcoming years to achieve a more horizontal participation structure. A citizen mentioned that from the citizen's perception, they still see the government's role as an institution that “holds people's hands to cross the street,” which needs to be changed (I.10.).

Some government representatives see the potential to create additional societal value by establishing citizen observatories, especially for citizens who are not directly involved in the co-creation process (I.1., I.3.). These observatories could significantly add value to the open data available in the ODP while collecting citizens' input and producing additional data. In addition, an interviewee mentioned that minority groups could greatly benefit from observatories that can bring data that the government is not currently capturing (I.1.).

Additional societal value could be achieved by making the interaction between participants more horizontal; for example, an NGO representative mentioned that the role of the government in the future is to share responsibilities in a “co-government” with the citizens (I.8.). Some citizens interviewed mentioned that they would like to actively solve

societal problems beyond contributing to a policy document promoted by the government (I.9. and I.10.). The government representatives agree with this perspective, for the most part, especially on the part of sharing responsibilities; nonetheless, some government representatives raised the concern of leaving behind the public services ethos exercised by the government (I.2. and I.3.). The doubts are mainly raised around the hypothetical case where a public service is entirely produced, delivered, or managed by a non-governmental organization. In such a case, the government representatives expressed that services should be provided following the estate ethos of servicing all citizens equally and respecting the national laws (I.2. and I.3.). This could incur costs and human capacity that a non-governmental organization could not afford. In contrast, a citizen mentioned that from their perspective, citizens are already producing, delivering, and managing services to solve community issues that the national government has no capacity to address (I.9.). Some examples mentioned were “cooperatives,” “mingas,” and “community childcare” (I.9.).

8. Innovation

Regarding innovation, NGO and government representatives mentioned the term sporadically to refer to the process of co-creation of the NAP, mentioning that Ecuador is following a best practice model to innovate in the public administration provided by the Open Government Partnership (I.1., I.2., I.3. I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). All NGO and government representatives expect citizens to be empowered to propose innovative solutions under a new horizontal governance paradigm. A government representative recognized that the current government's rigid structure is somewhat a barrier to innovation—furthermore, there is an implicit expectation for innovation to come from the private sector (I.1). An NGO representative mentioned that the government is not necessarily taking co-creation as an opportunity to innovate; because the government is only following what is written in the law (I.8.). Likewise, the NGO representative mentioned that public servants do not necessarily see innovation as a natural opportunity since they prefer to accomplish their jobs following their mandate (I.8.). A remark made by a government representative points out that if citizens do not use open data as an opportunity to innovate, the ODP may soon be useless since the government will still take too long to promote innovation by itself (I.1.).

9. Intrinsic motivations

As a first experience, citizens interviewed felt that they fulfilled their motivation to participate; they learned and contributed to a topic they wanted to learn (I.9. and I.10.). The NGO representatives interviewed had overlapping intrinsic motivations to participate in the co-creation process. For example, they participated in co-creating the NAP, the

ODP&G, and the ODP because they felt that their organizations' missions were aligned with the objectives of the projects (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). The NGO representatives also used these spaces to promote advance in their missions, such as promoting open and free access to knowledge in society. The NGOs see the co-creation process as an opportunity to interact with citizens, government, and academia on their working topics. They also used the co-creation process to identify citizens' motivations and needs and engage with them. An NGO representative described the opportunity as “to help citizens get a deep dive into the open data pool” (I.8.).

The government has three main operative tasks, considered intrinsic motivations: publishing datasets, maintaining the ODP, and overseeing related services and projects that allow the accomplishment of the three pillars of Open Government transparency, participation, and collaboration (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020).

From the interview with the academia representative, their intrinsic motivations were identified in the medium and long term (I.4). The academia wants to use open data for research, establish a baseline, and create metrics to evaluate development in societal issues (I.4). NGOs acknowledge that one of their motivations is in conjunction with the academia and citizens to create the capacity to boost curiosity from citizens about open data. Some NGO representatives consider that curiosity can only be ignited if the citizens can understand how to use the data published in the ODP (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.).

Some citizens interviewed mentioned that one of the reasons they decided to contribute to the co-creation process is recognition in various degrees (I.9. and I.10.). One is to prove themselves that their knowledge is valuable and could be put into practice for a societal value. The second type of recognition that citizens are looking at is to feel proud and part of society. They mentioned that they are not looking for monetary compensation but rather public recognition for their participation (I.9. and I.10.). Finally, a citizen mentioned that patriotism, the feeling of helping their country, motivates them to participate (I.10.). All interviewed citizens mentioned that they are aware of the publication of reports where citizens' participation is kept and available to review, which boosts their motivation (I.9. and I.10.).

By participating in the co-creation process, NGOs have identified opportunities to keep working on their institutional objectives and have connected their previous work and experience to improve the creation of NAP, ODP&G, and the ODP. Some NGO and government representatives pointed out that Open Data can only benefit citizens' lives if at least two conditions are met (I.1., I.2., I.3., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). First, citizens develop a natural connection between their desires to understand the government and the ODP. Second, based on this curiosity, citizens can propose ideas on using data to solve societal

problems. Additionally, even if citizens do not have a set of skills to produce visualizations or solve a problem, their curiosity must drive the willingness to take additional steps to understand data, either raw or already processed in visualizations or applications.

The academia and NGO representatives see potential to create societal value around the co-creation process (I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). The academia representative mentioned that a strong culture of open data strengthens the cycle of research and knowledge production (I.4.). Some NGO representatives mentioned that citizens and public servants developed a profound sense of importance for the work done in the workshops during the co-creation process (I.5.). For example, an NGO representative observed that some public servants participated beyond their working hours to complete the project (I.5.).

From the interviews with the NGO representatives, at least one common objective across all these organizations is to bring citizens' needs to the discussion with the government (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). In this regard, NGO representatives see co-creation as a viable tool to influence public policy creation. Additionally, NGO representatives recognized the importance of having an open data ecosystem. An NGO representative said that a collaborative open data ecosystem could help to promote “public innovation, transformation in the government and transparency” (I.5.).

10. Legal and mandatory activities

All interviewees recognized that the legalistic governmental approach and the mandatory activities performed by public servants have positive and negative connotations in the co-creation of the NAP, ODP&G, and the ODP. A Citizen recognized that having a written document that establishes the steps for the co-creation process allows them to trust the process (I.9.). All citizens interviewed acknowledged as a good experience that all documents of the process and their participation are kept as accessible official documents (I.9. and I.10.). Some NGO representatives acknowledge that having laws that provide tools for the society to demand access to information is essential to make sure that citizens and organizations can legally request information from the government (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). From the government representative's perspective, it is required to have a legal document to make coordination between governmental agencies in the co-creation process possible (I.1.). Additionally, when the commitments were established in the NAP, this was considered a binding document that established accountability and deadlines (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020). Moreover, the NAP opens the door for the NGOs, the academia, and citizens to participate as equal counterparts with the government agencies.

On the contrary, some interviewed citizens mentioned that the rigid, legalistic approach used by the government felt like an imposition, and they felt pressure to finish the process regardless of the opinion of the citizens (I.9. and I.10.). Some NGO representatives expressed that the government's rigorous framework produces dubiousness about whether the government genuinely considers their contributions or if the primary goal were to comply with a mandatory process established by an authority (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.).

Regarding the national laws that apply to the co-creation, open government, and open data, a government representative agrees that these laws could potentially be outdated (I.1.). The Transparency and Information Access Law was mentioned repeatedly by the government representatives either as a tool or a barrier to access information, depending on the context (I.1., I.2., I.3.). On top of the mandate for government officials established by the law, a government representative pointed out a culture of “just following what is written in the law and nothing more performed by the public servants” (I.1.). In the case of publishing data, the public servants perceive that data is an asset that belongs to the governmental agency where they work and sometimes oppose opening its access to citizens. Some of the public servants' reservations about opening data come from the interpretations of the restrictions set in the Ecuadorian law to protect personal data.

In the medium to long term, the interviewees' perception of the application of laws in the context of co-creation is relatively positive. Some interviewees said that the law is a resort they will use to request data or enforce accountability to the government (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8. I.9., I.10.). A government official mentioned that establishing accountability is crucial in keeping databases alive and adequately updated (I.2.). For example, the ODP&G provides a legal reason to audit government agencies to comply with data standards and schedules when updating datasets into the ODP (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones 2021). From the government side, the representatives mentioned that since this project includes the efforts of many government agencies, a mandate is required to articulate future actions regarding the ODP (I.1., I.2., I.3.). Additionally, the ministry representative mentioned a growing consciousness due to the creation of legal requirements inside the public administration about citizens' expectations when creating new public policies (I.3.).

An NGO representative mentioned that the government should find an equilibrium between a rigid structure and a flexible space to allow citizens' participation and experimentation regarding the co-creation of public policy (I.8.). The government representatives stated that in order for them to materialize citizens' demands, it is necessary to write them down in a policy or a law. Some interviewees expressed that distrust is easily created when citizens or NGOs interact with the government and feel

that the only reason the government invited them to participate is to comply with the law (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8. I.9., I.10.).

Regardless of the negative perception mentioned by NGO representatives and citizens regarding how mandatory obligations can impact the co-creation process, they also mentioned some opportunities to transform it into an opportunity. They mentioned that if more citizens were educated about their participation and access to information rights, they would be more willing to participate in the co-creation process (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8. I.9., I.10.).

11. Open Data and Open Government

A government representative mentioned that “open data is a resource to achieve the final goal of an Open Government” (I.1). This affirmation and the process of prioritization in the NAP establishes the government directive on the interaction between open data and open government (Ecuador Open Government Core Group 2020). Furthermore, the government identifies three pillars for open government transparency, participation, and collaboration. The commitment to co-produce the Open Data Policy and its Guidelines (ODP&G) establishes a legal framework that allows public agencies to publish high-quality datasets. The ODP&G commitment also layout the responsibilities and a process to keep the ODP running in the short term. Moreover, the ODP&G also establishes a continuous improvement process for the ODP that allows for long-term continuity of the project. All these actions are identified as drivers of transparency, a pillar to achieving an Open Government.

An NGO representative mentioned that citizens and academia requested open data at the NAP co-creation workshops (I.6.). From the government's perspective, open data is a pillar in their agenda for Open Government, and it is linked to achieving public innovation and fostering transparency. A government official interviewed acknowledges that data must follow standards and be updated periodically to be relevant, and these responsibilities are now shared between the Secretariat of planning and the ministry of Telecommunications (I.2.). Furthermore, the same government official mentioned that the ODP&G established a permanent improvement process for the ODP that allows the inclusion of new features, correcting and adding datasets (I.2.).

In the first stages of opening datasets, an NGO representative mentioned concerns regarding citizens' personal information that some datasets included (I.7.). This concern was addressed with an anonymization process established in the ODP&G (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones 2021). Anonymization techniques are considered a technical barrier to opening datasets since many government agencies do not have the technical skills

(I.7.). A second challenge spotted by NGO representatives is that the raw data published in the ODP needs to be processed to have value for the citizens (I.6., I.7., I.8.). The observations from the NGO and government representatives mention that there is still work to be done to create skills and establish new roles that allow for the creation of value using data in ODP.

In the medium to long term, the Secretariat of Planning is responsible for maintaining the ODP up to date and running. In coordination with the ministry, they manage that the datasets keep their high-quality information as established in the ODP&G (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones 2021). Furthermore, the Secretariat constantly identifies new functionalities and improvements to enhance citizens' use of the ODP (I.2.). The academia representative said that a good data administration that keeps datasets updated and high-quality data standards could create trust in the government (I.4.). Moreover, the NGO representatives mentioned that their mission in the following years is to provide citizens and public servants with more tools to learn to use data, identify additional datasets needed by citizens and keep producing methodologies that allow citizens to create value from open data (I.4.).

A citizen mentioned that the government has the opportunity to use the data collected during co-creation workshops (I.10.). Furthermore, the citizen mentioned that by keeping track of the contributions, the government could revisit some of the ideas left behind in the future (I.10.). Moreover, they could potentially complement the existing repository platform with a dedicated space where contributions to topics the government is not addressing could receive comments from other citizens who may have ideas on how to solve a problem.

A government representative said that all commitments developed under the NAP also follow similar collaborative methodologies when producing, developing, and implementing projects (I.1.). Moreover, the next step to achieving an Open Government is to include other agencies outside the executive branch, such as parliament or justice (I.1.).

Some citizens mentioned that due to the different governmental agencies interacting when delivering a service, citizens are confused about what agency addresses their suggestions or complaints (I.10.). Moreover, they mentioned that “contributing to a services o filing a claim should be as intuitive as calling 911 in case of emergency” (I.10.).

An NGO representative mentioned that there is still work to match the offer and demand of data, a statement shared with some government representatives (I.2., I.6.). Furthermore, the government representative added that Open Government is a long-term

project that requires a change in the mindset, especially among public servants (I.2.). They should feel comfortable publishing data because the data belongs to the citizens. Furthermore, there should be incentives for citizens and public servants to use data (I.2. and I.3.). The ministry representative mentioned that public servants do not know what data is available to support their policy-making process in some cases (I.3.).

The academia representative mentioned that in addition to the previously described government responsibility of data quality assurance, the government should also be able to host a public repository of scientific data (I.4.). Mentioning that Ecuadorian researchers must resort to private repositories such as *Mendeley* if they want to share their research data.

A citizen mentioned that to achieve transparency, an explanation on how to use data should accompany datasets, and if any anomaly is detected, there should also be a government channel ready to respond (I.10.). Additionally, it was mentioned that “If the government manages to take a role where it can open their data and address citizens' questions; that will create trust and endure democracy” (I.10.). In addition to trust and transparency, some citizens said that data should enable the government to make decisions and create policies based on data (I.9. and I.10.). All government and NGOs interviewee agree with these two statements. Additionally, the secretariat representative mentioned that co-creation in the public sector feels like a refreshment wave for government in Ecuador and Latin America (I.2.). An NGO representative mentioned that these government reforms should be accompanied by promoting digital rights for citizens, which is especially important when the government is opening its data (I.7.).

The vice-presidency representative remarked that open data is a tool to achieve the final goal: an Open Government (I.1.). In this regard, the Secretariat of planning representative mentioned that in a meeting with the Ecuadorian President, Guillermo Lasso, he mentioned that transparency will come along with questions from the citizens and that the government should be taking steps to address those potential questions (I.2.). The President remarked that it is imperative to open fiscal and budgeting data (I.2.). The President also communicated to the Secretariat of planning that if citizens ask questions about their management and the government can answer, the objective of open data is fulfilled (I.2.).

A citizen mentioned that the government should follow the principle of a “good administration,” meaning that the government should use its resources to improve itself to benefit the citizen (I.10.). During the COVID-19 pandemic, some citizens mentioned that they felt that the government used the internet as a resource to show proximity and reachability (I.9. and I.10.). Some citizens think that the government could keep using the

internet to show itself as more reachable to citizens and open data as more transparent, collaborative, and generate trust (I.9. and I.10.). For this reason, the government is committed to providing all available tools to keep citizens participating in co-creation processes. An NGO representative mentioned that making digital tools to understand and process data enables public innovation (I.7.).

All NGO representatives mentioned the excellent opportunity to create value by publishing open data from local governments. This information feels nearer to citizens and could be easier to understand and use to solve local problems. In addition to local data, some NGO representatives mentioned that citizens ask about industrial, commercial, and other related data that could make business more competitive (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.)

All NGO representatives mentioned that their role is to promote a culture of open data, open science, open software, and social innovation. In this regard, a government official mentioned that if a culture of open data is not established to create value for citizens, innovation will die inside the government, and tools like the ODP will soon be in disuse (I.1.). A citizen said that there are problems in society that open data may not be enough to solve, such as poverty or violence (I.9.). In addition, an NGO representative mentioned that a recurrent error is that sometimes citizens start analyzing data without having a problem they want to solve (I.6.). The NGO representative mentioned that the proper steps are to identify a problem, and then the data need a possible solution (I.6.).

Furthermore, an NGO representative stated that the rigid and regulatory approach that the government shows could impede data-driven innovation (I.8.). Another NGO representative mentioned that the innovation should not be an outcome perused by the government, and instead, the government should create a legal environment that allows social innovation outside the government (I.6.). Some citizens interviewed agree that in their experiences, they see that the government cannot possibly tackle all citizens' needs, making social innovation critical (I.10.).

Some NGO representatives mentioned that their organizations are working to create capacity within the government, especially with public servants, so they keep opening and publishing datasets (I.5. and I.7.). Some co-creation participants agree that as much as they can educate citizens about using the ODP, the easier it is to get more results (I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.). An NGO representative mentioned that to create capacity for citizens; it is essential to create applications using the open data; these applications can be created in collaborative events such as hackathons (I.6.).

A government representative mentioned that the Ministry of Telecommunications is carrying out events to create capacity with public servants by having presentations and

discussions about the dataset the public agencies produce (I.3.). During these events, public servants learn what data is available and how specialists use that data to produce value-added knowledge and public services (I.3.). The interchange of ideas and experiences of using data between public servants allows the creation of knowledge that can improve future projects. In addition, the Office of the Vice-president is actively checking for projects that follow under the Open Government umbrella but are not included in the Plan (I.1). The idea is to visualize and position Open Government as a quotidian term in the government agencies (I.1).

One of the questions raised by an NGO representative is: “Is it always required to have a data intermediary to add value to the open data for citizens? (I.6.). If the data intermediary is a governmental agency, the NGO representative mentioned that is an indicator that building capacity still needs work (I.6.). Furthermore, another NGO representative mentioned that if the government does not follow the development of technology and updates the ODP accordingly, it could be in disuse in the future (I.7.). A government representative expressed that the Ecuadorian public sector has a high rotation of employees, making it challenging to retain public servants with proper trained capacity and abilities to manage specialized projects (I.3.).

A citizen mentioned that human nature is to organize to survive, and one of the highest levels of human organization is the government (I.9.). However, if the government is not providing the results they are looking for, humans will organize into smaller organizations or communities to solve their needs. This general assumption will apply to the physical and digital worlds. Another citizen mentioned that if the government manages to build a collaborative ecosystem around open data, there are significant chances for innovation and improvement of public policies (I.10). A government mentioned that societal value is achieved when citizens themselves put data into practice to solve problems (I.1.). For an NGO representative, citizens can get the most value when an established process allows raw data to be presented as helpful information and knowledge (I.7.).

There is no clear perspective on measuring the impact of co-creation and open government from the government. A government representative mentioned some initiatives to measure impact, but the methodology is still unclear, and the first measurement was under the average compared to other regional countries (I.3.). The government is actively looking to measure the impact of Open Government in society and understand to what degree the commitments agreed upon in the NAP are responsible for achieving a more transparent, collaborative, and participative government (I.1.).

12. Politics

Politics is a topic mentioned by all the NGO representatives and citizens interviewed as a recurrent factor that influenced their experience with the process of co-creation. All citizens and NGO representatives had a negative predisposition to collaborate with the government due to previous bad experiences related to the political interest of governmental authorities. A second moment where the negative predisposition created doubts was when the NAP was under development as they questioned if a new government with a different political view would honor the commitments achieved through co-creation (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8. I.9., I.10.). The NGO representatives mention their utmost interest in keeping commitments to be implemented and maintained regardless of political affiliations (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8.).

All NGO representatives and citizens recognize that extreme political ideology changes that could happen from one presidency period to another threaten the development of projects that require more than one presidency period to be complete (I.5., I.6., I.7., I.8. I.9., I.10.). An NGO representative recognized that they have to put in additional work to ensure that a new government will support the development of projects such as the NAP, ODP&G, and the ODP (I.6.). In this regard, NGOs play an essential role in reminding any government of the citizens' motivations to have an Open Government.

4.2.2 Process of value creation for public services

The Osborne framework proposes two main moments for value co-creation for public services: production and consumption. For the study case, based on the documents gathered from official Ecuadorian government websites and provided by NGOs representatives, the two stages of co-creation can be defined as follows:

- **Production:** Open Government National Action Plan
- **Use or consumption:** Open data policy and guidelines and Open data portal

The NAP is the official initiative that paved the road for the use of co-creation in Ecuadorian public administration. As presented in Tab. 5, the ten commitments co-created with participants from NGOs, academia, citizens, and governmental agencies established formal compromises to develop specific services and policies based on the needs and contributions gathered and agreed upon in the co-creation process NAP. The participation of each actor is shown in Tab. 6.

Co-creation participants	Production: Co-creation of the Open Government National Action Plan (NAP)		Consumption: Open Data Policy and Guidelines (ODP&G) and Open Data Portal (ODP)	
	Co-design	Co-production	Co-experience	Co-construction
I.1. Vice-presidency representative	X	X	X	X
I.2. Secretariat of planning representative	X	X	X	X
I.3. Ministry representative	X	X	X	X
I.4. Academia representative	X		X	X
I.5. DATALAT representative	X	X	X	X
I.6. FUNDAPI representative	X	X	X	X
I.7. REDAM representative	X	X	X	X
I.8. OPENLAB representative	X		X	X
I.9. Citizen NAP	X			
I.10. Citizen ODG			X	

Produced by the Author using elements from (Osborne et al. 2021)

Tab. 6 Co-creation participants and value creation process

Except for the citizens I.9. and I.10, all participants interviewed participated in both stages of co-creation. In the case of I.4. and I.8., their participation generated value in all co-creation stages except co-production; since they are not considered an official partner in the two commitments Open Data Policy and Guidelines and the Open Data Portal, they did not fully take a role of administrators or providers of services.

In the case of I.9. they generated value while participating in the co-creation of the Nation Action Plan of Open government. The contribution of I.9. was intended to express a necessity to have data and bring attention from the government to provide a public service related to open data. In this case, the value created for them is associated with the co-design stage since they did not experience the service. The I.10. contributed to the co-creation of the Open Data Guidelines. The value generated is related to a co-construction stage since their contributions were meant to improve the guidelines that will apply to the service of the ODP. Furthermore, the guidelines apply to the whole ecosystem of open data in a national context.

All interviewees mentioned new roles that they performed or expected to be performed that currently generate value or could create additional value in the future. Co-creation participants mention eight common roles product of the process of co-creation:

1. NGOs as trainers of public servants:

NGOs are taking the role of trainers for public servants. NGO representatives mentioned that thanks to work done with the government during the co-creation workshops, government agencies saw the opportunity to receive training from NGOs in topics such as agile methodologies and open data. It is easier for NGOs to test and learn concepts associated with high risk and agility than for the government, making knowledge transfer especially important for the public servants (I.3., I.4., I.5., I.6., I.7.).

2. Public servants as co-creators:

Before the process of co-creation, the policymaking and service delivery process was considered the responsibility of public servants exclusively. There was even the belief that policy and services were meant to be created in closed rooms. The benefit of co-creation for public servants in terms of knowledge acquired and time reduction has ignited cultural change in which public servants are open and expect to use collaborative methodologies to produce policies and services (I.1., I.2., I.3., I.7.).

3. Participants in collaborative co-creation ecosystems

The official co-creation workshop allowed NGOs, academia, government, and citizens to sit together and share experiences. Furthermore, because their motivations are similar, they keep communicating even outside official events, creating collaborative ecosystems. Currently, these ecosystems are working closely with local governments to replicate co-creation methodologies and open data for some Ecuadorian municipalities. There are no pre-established roles in these ecosystems but rather a horizontal structure of participants (I.1., I.3., I.4., I.5., I.7., I.8., I.9., I.10.)

4. Data mediator:

The interviewees recurrently mentioned the data mediator role. There is an official definition of the role in the Open Data Guidelines as the “person or organization that collects and presents data to be comprehensible and add value to the users” (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones 2021). Data mediators play a crucial role in creating value for citizens with fewer skills in gathering and processing data; however, they could also create dependency. Currently, NGOs, academia, and government are the data mediators; however, it is expected that citizens will take the role in the future (I.4., I.6, I.7.).

5. Citizen observatories:

As part of a transparency process, the government communicated that there is data that they cannot collect and publish. NGOs are currently taking the lead in creating citizen observatories to capture citizen data that otherwise would not be captured. There is exceptional potential to create value from citizen observatories for minorities whose data are often not reflected in the primary governmental datasets (I.1., I.3., I.5., I.7.).

6. Citizens as co-creators:

Citizens are identified to take on new roles and responsibilities during co-creation. Some government and NGO representatives commented that one of the objectives of a co-creation process is to empower citizens to be part of the production and consumption of services. In this regard, citizens should move from a more passive way of participating, like exercising their voting rights, to more hands-on participation, such as co-creation (I.1., I.2., I.3., I.8., I.9., I.10.).

7. Citizens as overseers:

There is an agreement between participants that open data can only generate value if citizens use it to generate value. One of the motivations to promote an open Government and to open data to citizens is to achieve transparency, and it is expected that citizens will take the role of overseers using open data. Citizens that participate in the co-creation process recognize that their motivation to learn and understand the government better will generate trust if they can use open data. National laws in Ecuador already have provisions to promote the role of citizens as overseers; furthermore, providing open data could facilitate establishing this role (I.1., I.2., I.5., I.7., I.8., I.10.).

8. Government as a facilitator

As the collaborative co-creation ecosystems are strengthened, co-creation participants start to rethink the government's role in the future. On the one hand, citizens and academia see the government's role as a mediator between individual interests and societal values. On the other hand, NGOs and citizens perceive that the bureaucratic and rigid style of the government does not allow for innovation to happen, a statement that is even shared with the government representatives. In this regard, NGOs and citizens pointed out a still-to-be-perfected role for the government as a facilitator. This role is meant to promote innovation in collaborative co-creative environments and then incorporate it into the public administration through co-creation. The government's role as a facilitator is essential to add legality and accountability to the co-creation process (I.1, I.4., I.6., I.8., I.9., I.10.).

5 Discussion

The primary and secondary data collected will be interpreted using the two main theoretical propositions of the Osborne framework, elements of value and the process of value creation (see Tab. 1 and Tab. 2). The first section will allow understanding in the light of the theoretical framework how and what kind of value is created during the co-creation process of the NAP, ODP&G, and OPD. The second section will facilitate understanding the roles and interactions that co-creation participants performed across the co-creation process.

5.1 Co-created value

The Osborne framework allows for in-depth exploration of the elements that create value in the short term, medium and long term, whole life, capacity, and societal value. When processing the data from the interviews, the five elements were applied as codes to the interviewees' statements, allowing for more precise visualization and understanding of how stakeholders create value.

The twelve themes identified are elements that generate value for participants during the co-creation process. As Osborne (2021) mentions, participants can create value for themselves or co-create value when sharing the experience and benefits with other participants. Applying the five elements of value co-creation as proposed by Osborne allows for an in-depth analysis of value co-creation for the twelve themes that emerged from the interviews. In Tab. 7, the twelve themes are correlated with the elements of value, and this visualization allows for spotting value co-creation.

A deeper analysis of the elements that create value allows for identifying shared experiences that facilitate value co-creation. Some interviewees expressed statements related to the topics that showed a particular element of value. In these cases, additional value is created for that specific interviewee from that element that is not fully shared with others. During the discussion, elements that are shared between more participants are explained first and further in detail since those have the potential to co-create more value. Elements that created value for individual participants are not discussed further since this research focuses on value co-creation.

	1 Short term satisfaction and user wellbeing				2 Medium/ long term service outcomes				3 Whole-life experience of service users				4 Capacity creation for future change				5 Societal Value			
	1 Academia	2 Citizens	3 Government	4 NGO	1 Academia	2 Citizens	3 Government	4 NGO	1 Academia	2 Citizens	3 Government	4 NGO	1 Academia	2 Citizens	3 Government	4 NGO	1 Academia	2 Citizens	3 Government	4 NGO
Participants																				
Recurrent topics																				
Community		x		x		x					x	x		x						x
Communications	x	x	x	x		x		x		x	x	x								
Continuity				x		x		x			x			x						
Digitalization		x		x		x												x		
Education	x	x		x				x	x			x	x		x	x				x
Efficiency			x	x				x			x									
Horizontality	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
Innovation											x	x								x
Intrinsic motivations	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x		x		x	x			x
Legal/mandatory		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x				x
Open Government		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Politics		x		x				x		x		x								x

Produced by the Author using elements from (Osborne et al. 2021)

Tab. 7 Elements of value analysis

5.1.1 Short term satisfaction and user wellbeing

Communications

In the short term, communications allow for the interactions between co-creation participants and generate value across the process, creating trust and reinforcing the formation of a horizontal structure of collaboration. In addition, communication is a powerful tool to keep participants engaged and fulfill citizens' intrinsic motivations to be recognized.

Communication between participants is critical to set the right expectations and keep engagement throughout the process. Also, communications have a crucial role in inviting citizens to participate in a collaborative process. Citizens, NGOs, and the Academia representatives agree that new communications channels such as social media have a significant impact on showing the government as more open and enabling a more extensive reach than in-person events or traditional governmental official communications. In order to have an innovative co-creation process, invitations should be as broad as possible to capture invitees from as many backgrounds as possible.

Intrinsic motivations

Intrinsic motivations are one of the reasons to stimulate participation in a co-creation process. Some of the participants' intrinsic motivations will overlap and potentially co-create additional value. For example, NGOs that participated in the co-creation process have similar mission statements, such as promoting opening data, citizens science, and citizen empowerment using technology. Spaces like co-creation workshops are valuable resources for NGOs to bring their expertise and advance their organizational missions in the short term. From the citizen's perspective, they participate in co-creation because they have an affinity with open data. Citizens mentioned as the first motivations that came to their minds to participate are curiosity, willingness to learn, put their knowledge into practice, improve the government, recognition, and patriotism. Academia sees the potential to generate value in two aspects. First, as experts, academia would like to contribute with recommendations and theoretical propositions to improving the ODP and the quality of the data and suggest technical insights to be considered in legal documentation such as the ODP&G. Second, they are interested in profiting from the datasets in the ODP available to conduct research. The government as an institution has its main motivations to co-create set in the Open Government agenda and summarized in its three-pillar transparency, collaboration, and participation. The public servants could have similar motivations to a citizen, especially patriotism and a willingness to improve the public administration. Nevertheless, also, their immediate motivations can be fulfilling their jobs.

Education

As Komulainen (2014) mentioned, education is a critical factor that motivates participation and keeps engagement in participants of co-creation processes. It was identified that citizens want to learn more about how public policies are created in the short term. Also, participants are willing to use their previously learned knowledge for public use. Academia and NGOs see co-creation opportunities to fulfill their institutional missions and educate citizens. In this regard, participants find common ground to generate value from education during co-creation.

Horizontality

Working in a collaborative process where all participants have the same opportunities to propose and make decisions creates a horizontal structure of responsibilities (Bason 2010; Osborne and Brown 2011). Co-creation is a process that relies upon horizontal interactions between actors to produce value-added services (Osborne and Brown 2011). NGOs and citizens had a positive first experience with horizontality from their

participation in the co-creation process. NGOs and citizens said that the element they value the most when experiencing horizontality is the openness of public servants to collaborate.

Participants recognized that the government's proposition to humble itself and recognized that they needed help created transparency and allowed for setting the right expectations about the co-creation process. The open government agenda to encourage citizens' collaboration and participation is a driver for public servants to start thinking outside of previously established procedures for policymaking. Additionally, new roles are being established product of the horizontal interactions during co-creation, e.g., NGOs taking the role of trainers for public servants.

Legal/mandatory

Legal and mandatory actives are an inherent part of the policymaking process, and this factor creates positive and negative perspectives from different co-creation participants. In the short term, for the co-creation process, participants acknowledge that the legalistic approach that instates responsibilities and mandates for a collaborative process to be carried out to develop policies and services has allowed for the process of co-creation to happen and produce the NAP, the ODP&G, and the ODP. Nonetheless, from the opinion of citizens and NGOs, the rigidity of previous interactions with the government creates distrust in the public servants as co-creation participants because there is the preconception that they are not genuinely involved in the process and they are only participating in fulfilling a task. Furthermore, public servants unfamiliar with or have mistaken interpretations of data privacy laws could create barriers to opening data.

Open Government

Government officials mentioned that open data is a tool to achieve the goal that is an open government. The Ecuadorian administration's motivations for having an open government are transparency, collaboration, and participation. The official documents reviewed, especially the reports about the co-creation of the NAP, show that citizens had a genuine interest in having access to open data. From the government's perspective having the ODP&G and the ODP fit in the pillar of promoting transparency associated with the goals of an open government. NGOs and academia supported the need to have open data to perform better their institutional activities such as conducting research and educating citizens. The ODP&G and the ODP are the first steps to accomplishing the goal of an open government, but by no means are the end of the journey.

Participants who used the ODP realized a need to have more datasets, keep the quality of the information, and open the platform to non-government organizations to publish additional datasets that could complement and help citizens solve problems. In this regard, from a first experience perspective, stakeholders realized that role of the data mediator is a key to adding value to the data. This role at the moment is being performed by the government, NGOs, and academia but rarely by citizens.

Politics

In Ecuador, high-level officials and middle-level managers are politically appointed by the President elected during their presidency term. Ecuadorians expect that the political affinity of elected government officials changes drastically over periods, causing those previously enforced laws and implemented projects to not fit in the new political agenda of the current government. The previous experiences from citizens to abrupt ideological changes in governments give the perception that it does not matter how much the government in power is willing to change because the next will overwrite the decisions previously taken.

Community

The formation of communities is a product of collaboration between actors. Communities contribute to enriching an environment that promotes the development, use, and promotion of open data. In the short term, NGOs and citizens have positive views about pre-existing communities and community leaders that contribute to the better exploitation of open data. NGOs can play a crucial role in assembling communities and channeling citizens' needs.

Digitalization

Using technology to deliver public services positively impacts citizens' and NGOs' perceptions of the public administration. In the short term, remote participation, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, has made it possible for Governments to keep delivering services. Regarding the participation in the collaborative process for the ODP&G and ODP, mostly all work has been done successfully remotely. However, there are shared concerns from NGOs and citizens that not all citizens have the abilities or the economic resources to use technology and interact with the government.

Efficiency

Some of the expectations from the government to implement a new paradigm of producing customer-centric services is to find an improved way of delivering services

with a reduction in time and costs. In a short time, constant collaboration and the increased amount of knowledge gathered thanks to collaborative ecosystems created during co-creation helped reduce time when producing policy. On the other side, concentrating on the co-creation process to find efficiencies to reduce costs can create negative value since participants collaborate without the idea of having an economic remuneration.

5.1.2 Medium/long term service outcomes

Legal/mandatory

In the medium to long term, Citizens, Academia, and NGOs agree that the legal approach to creating normative and official accountability allows for proper tracking and reporting of responsibilities. This legal basis is one of the foundations for citizens and NGOs to take the role of the government overseers, creating trust and transparency.

NGOs and citizens shared the perception that a too rigid framework makes public servants act as precise as the law establishes. This perception is mentioned as a reason because the co-creation process could not bring innovation or structural changes to the delivery of services. In general, citizens, NGOs, and Academia expect to work together with the government to reach a balance between a legal environment that establishes accountability and allows for flexibility and innovation.

In the medium/long-term, the implementation of the ODP&G establishes responsibilities for the public administration regarding open data. The ODP&G mandate is expected to positively influence open data by keeping the dataset updated and formalizing the processes to improve ODP functionalities and the addition of datasets. One of the functionalities mentioned by participants that can deliver high value is standardizing unique IDs to correlate databases. Keeping the ODP updated will reinforce trust in the government.

Open Government

In the medium/long term, participants envision that open government will deliver more positive value for them and society. Participants are content with the 558² datasets available in Open Data Portal and the possibility to request additional datasets as established in the Open Data Guidelines. The guidelines for publishing datasets allow standardization and deliver additional value when creating visualizations and other products using open data.

² The number of data set was taken on 5/15/2022 from the website www.datosabiertos.gob.ec. This number is constantly changing as new datasets are incorporated.

Horizontality

The establishment of a more horizontal communications and interaction structure between participants has propitiated the organization of long-lasting co-creation environments that keep producing resources and knowledge and congregating participants into new co-creation activities. The co-creation process enables establishing a collaborative ecosystem around open data in the medium to long term. This network of experts, professionals, academics, citizens and public servants is currently producing value using open data and contributing to an open government. For co-creation to keep engaging participants and deliver transparency, public servants and the government must show a genuine interest in learning from the civil society and be respectful of their contributions by using traceability tools to present the decisions taken regarding all citizens' contributions. In addition to the role of trainers for public servants, NGOs are also actively collaborating to develop indicators that will allow tracking and evaluating advancement in open government (DATALAT 2021).

Continuity

As participants took part in the different stages of the co-creation process, they started producing value from their participation (Sandström et al. 2008). NGOs and citizens had an overall positive impression of co-creation and open data, and they would like these positive elements to continue through time. There are conflicting opinions regarding the odds of the project's continuity. The concerns have several motivations, but the most recurrent aspect mentioned by NGOs, Academia, and Citizens is the political affiliation of the government.

Communications

In the medium- and long-term, making information about how the process of co-creation was being carried out and keeping those records available creates positive value. An NGO representative mentioned that communicating facts produced through open data analysis could reduce misinformation in citizens' daily lives (I.7.).

Intrinsic motivations

The academia sees potential in establishing methodologies that help in the medium to long term to measure progress regarding open government and other social issues through the application of open datasets. Citizens shared the vision of academia to develop medium to long-term tools that will bring benefits to society.

5.1.3 Whole life experience of service users

Open government

As stated from the government perspective, open data is not the end goal and is meant to influence positively the accomplishment of a whole-life process that is open government. In this regard, beyond the proposed outcomes of transparency, participation, and collaboration, participants see in an open government the possibility for the government to implement policy and make decisions based on data creating trust.

NGOs and traditional media could use open data to fight misinformation. The government identified that some of the datasets that could be useful to fight misinformation are located outside of the executive branch. In this regard, the government is taking steps to expand the range of datasets to the other four Ecuadorian government branches: legislative, justice, electoral, and citizen participation. Datasets reported from these other four government branches have high expectations from citizens to help further solve problems. The academia proposed that the role of the government in regards to open data should be to oversee the quality of datasets and the infrastructure that allows for the hosting of data. Ideally, scientific data should also be published as open data in the ODP.

Horizontality

The horizontal nature of the interaction during the co-creation process allows for the establishment of new roles. For example, NGOs are training public servants and start managing and producing data in citizens' observatories. In order for these new roles to have an impact on the whole life experience of the service, there is a need for public servants to start opening the doors of the offices where policies are being developed and use tools to reach out for citizens' contributions. Furthermore, keeping the horizontal structure of collaboration for further co-creation requires the government to change the behavior of public servants who are perceived as experts who do not need citizens' help.

Horizontality benefits from the diversity of participants; to keep bringing new ideas to the co-creation process, invitations to co-creation workshops should be extended to citizens regardless of their level of education, to academics regardless of their field of specialty, and to civil organizations regardless of their political affinity.

A horizontal participation structure means that co-creation participants have the same opportunities to collaborate in producing and consuming services. As mentioned before, NGOs are creating citizen observatories and will start producing data. In order for this data to produce positive value in the context of a horizontal open government, the data produced by NGOs that meet the requirements set in the OPD&G should be considered

at the same level as government-produced data and have the opportunity to be published in the ODP.

Communications

Communications have a whole life effect during the process of co-creation. For participants, using tools such as online platforms to keep the records of their participation generated trust in the process. Moreover, using these platforms for traceability purposes generates reinforced trust and even empathy with the public administration associated with visualizing the efforts put in the co-creation process.

Communications play a crucial role in making interactions between participants more horizontal, and participants are thankful when communications between them make them feel like equals. There is work to be done by the government, especially when presenting results that involve authorities. Since all participants are equals during a co-creation process, they expect to communicate the same level of recognition when presenting the project, even if the presenter is a political authority; this requires a change in the status-quo of governmental agencies.

Community

As the government's role shifts to facilitate open spaces for collaboration, the formation of collaborative communities is a natural result. In addition, citizens still appreciate the role of the government to enforce laws and look out to the government for equality when delivering services, even inside collaborative communities. As citizens are empowered and take a more active role, the government may be overwhelmed with citizens' contributions. For this situation to be more manageable, the government looks at the formation of communities and civil society organizations as an opportunity to consolidate citizens' needs. NGOs can organize experts and citizens that can contribute to finding solutions to problems using data. In this regard, the Secretariat of Planning acknowledges that it is more straightforward from a government perspective to address the needs of a community in contrast to a request from an individual.

Legal/mandatory

The establishment of legal requirements for public servants to have citizens' input in the process of policymaking and the positive experiences in co-creation processes has created consciousness in public servants that now have expectations and willingness to embrace co-creation processes.

Another factor that can influence positive or negative the whole life experience of open data is public servants having overprotective habits surrounding personal data. A positive value is created when public servants take additional steps to safeguard personal data, and a negative value is produced when relevant datasets requested by society cannot be published due to personal data concerns. In any case, the ODP&G establishes rules for the anonymization of personal data. In this regard, there is a need to develop technical skills inside the public administration to improve the quality of data, including the use of anonymization techniques in order to surpass the barrier of regulatory concerns.

Innovation

Innovation is a process that provides changes to improve services (Osborne and Brown 2011; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). There is a shared perception that innovation is complicated to achieve in the government due to its rigid legalistic structure. Participants mentioned this recurrent perception as an element that negatively impacts the perception of and long-term change in the government product of co-creation or open data. Nonetheless, the government recognizes this limitation and proposes that innovation should happen outside the government and be brought through collaborative processes to the public administration.

Intrinsic motivations

A motivation for citizens and NGOs is to achieve lifetime societal benefits product of their participation in co-creation projects. Appealing to intrinsic motivations is essential to keep the involvement of participants in co-creation. Additionally, NGOs mentioned that to spark further citizens' participation, there is a need to create curiosity in citizens who do not have the skills to process data.

Politics

Citizens and NGOs are looking for structural lifetime changes regardless of the in-power government's political ideology; they want practices such as horizontality, transparency, collaboration, and the legal frameworks to stay so that an open government could have life term benefits for society.

Education

Education can have life-lasting results in participants' lives (Hersh and Walker 1983). NGOs expressed an expectation that a cultural change promotes co-creation and the use of open data through education. The academia and the public education systems should

play a transcendental role in educating citizens and creating skills that will allow for the maximum use of open data in society.

5.1.4 Capacity creation for future change

Open government

As the Open Data portal was officially launched in 2022, there is still work to create capacity for citizens and public servants to create value-added products using the ODP independently. The role of the data mediator is responsible for creating visualizations and other solutions using data. Even when NGOs perform the role of data mediator, it is still an intermediate step that creates a dependency to accomplish the expected value. Government, NGOs, and academia are working on different projects to develop abilities to allow citizens and public servants to create solutions independently using open data. As the open government initiative is transversal to government agencies, learning from each other's internal datasets promotes knowledge creation that could be applied to produce or improve public services.

Education

Education is one of the instruments to create capacity (Komulainen 2014). During the interviews, participants commented that there is still work to do to create the capacity for citizens to be empowered and able to understand and utilize open data. The ODP has a section with online training for citizens and public servants on how to use the ODP and the basics in topics related to open data. The Academia, NGOs, and the Government also provide training and events where citizens and public servants can learn about open data and the tools to analyze and produce value-added products.

Horizontality

New co-creation opportunities will keep collaborative ecosystems evolving. As these ecosystems are outside of the rigid structure of the government, they can generate knowledge in a different set of skills than the government (Osborne and Brown 2011; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2011). One of the skills that NGOs identify they could contribute is agility. NGOs mentioned that due to their rigidity and legalistic approach, the government has a reduced possibility of generating skills related to agile and iterative processes. NGOs can experiment, take additional risks, and have an agile and iterative approach to policymaking. All participants agreed that to create capacity and ensure participation and collaboration are produced as outcomes of open government, the government needs to rethink civil servants' roles and train them accordingly.

Intrinsic motivations

Citizens mentioned that they do not feel motivated when asked to participate in a process that is presented as too technical. In this regard, NGOs noticed that people who do not have sufficient skills are more reluctant to trust in the process, losing engagement. Participants agree that citizens need to develop skills and confidence around open data to keep appealing to intrinsic motivations as a driver of engagement. In this regard, Academia and NGOs' motivation to create capacity can quickly generate added value with citizens looking to learn during their participation in co-creation processes.

Legal/mandatory

The ODP&G includes recommendations and actual responsibilities to promote the use of the ODP (Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones 2021). Some of the activities mentioned in the ODP&G include promoting events where capacity is created with NGOs and citizens through events such as hackathons whose main objective is to decrease a technical entrance barrier that citizens can perceive. Furthermore, NGOs mentioned that public servants are expected to go further than only performing the tasks described in the law and guidelines in order to create capacity.

5.1.5 Societal Value

Horizontality

Additional value from horizontality could be achieved through a cultural change in how policymaking is carried out. In most cases, creating policies starts with framing a problem and establishing a solution, these activities being governmental responsibilities. However, in events like crowdsourcing or the Ecuadorian case, “mingas,” citizens have shown their availability to identify and solve problems without the government. The government has to define how they will manage sustained empowerment of citizens and changes in the roles of NGOs and academia. New roles come with new responsibilities; in this regard, the Ecuadorian government believes that its ethos is to safeguard the interest of all society, manage public funds, and deliver public services. There is still no consideration for a scenario where a public service could be delivered entirely or administered by citizens in the near future. From the societal perspective, the government's role in the future is to co-govern with the citizens.

Open government

Co-creation methodologies allow for citizens' inputs across all the stages of the service delivery. In the case of the ODP, citizens can ask for new datasets even after the co-

production workshops. The offer and demand for data are unbalanced. Before the ODP was launched, there were insufficient datasets available. After the launching, there are 558³ datasets and growing. However, citizens' perception is that there is a need for additional data. This is due to the level of importance citizens give to specific datasets. E.g. during the COVID-19 pandemic, citizens and NGOs were eager to access health-related datasets. Managing the citizens' expectations about data availability with a structured process established in the ODP&G is vital to keep the ODP as a relevant resource with a positive connotation in the society's perception.

Intrinsic motivations

As presented in the interviewees' statements, some of their motivations to participate in the co-creation process correspond to intrinsic motivations. However, these individual motivations are mostly linked to the production, direct or indirectly, of societal value. For example, NGOs and academia's organizational missions are to achieve societal value. In this regard, their motivations to participate in co-creation activities have an engrained societal value orientation. In the case of the citizens interviewed, their participation was not motivated by economic interests; their motivations were related to learning, changing the government, and helping their community.

Academia, NGOs, and citizens mentioned that their intrinsic motivation is the aspiration for their contributions and participation to influence society positively. They justify additional work and effort put into the project when they have the perception that not only they will profit but also their families and communities can access a better public service. There is a strong motivation to improve the government coming from society, and they see an opportunity to do so in co-creation.

5.2 Co-creation participants and the process of value creation

The government agencies, in partnership with the officials' counterparts, used similar co-creation methodologies to the NAP to co-create the Open Data Policy and Guidelines (ODP&G) and Open Data Portal (ODP). In this regard, the analysis of the value creation process as proposed by Osborne was convoluted. As mentioned by Osborne (Osborne et al. 2021) one of the limitations of the framework is that “the process is more cyclical and iterative than this simple heuristic suggests” (Osborne et al. 2021), referring to the proposed Tab. 1. In the Ecuadorian case study, this limitation was especially evident since the production and consumption of the NAP, ODP&G, and ODP were carried out as

³ The number of data set was taken on 5/15/2022 from the website www.datosabiertos.gob.ec. This number is constantly changing as new datasets are incorporated.

independent co-creation processes where some of the same participants collaborated in both stages of co-creation, as shown in Tab. 6.

As an interpretation for the empirical application of the framework, the recurrent roles mentioned in the interviews were identified and described as proposed in the results section. The eight roles are correlated with the co-creation process in Tab. 8. This correlation allows for spotting when value is produced for participants performing specific roles during the process of co-creation. Additionally, it helps to describe the relations between co-creation participants.

Co-creation participants' role(s)	Production		Consumption	
	Co-design	Co-production	Co-experience	Co-construction
1. Data mediator		X		
2. Citizen observatory		X		
3. NGOs as trainers of public servants			X	X
4. Citizens as overseers				X
5. Public servants as co-creators	X	X	X	X
6. Participants in collaborative co-creation ecosystems	X	X	X	X
7. Citizens as co-creators	X	X	X	X
8. Government as a facilitator	X	X	X	X

Produced by the Author using elements from (Osborne et al. 2021)

Tab. 8 Co-creation process and participants' role(s)

5.2.1 Roles producing value through the production of public services

1. Data mediator:

This role is essential in producing services related to open data since all co-creation participants agreed that it is thanks to a data mediator role that ODP can produce added value. Currently, government, academia, or NGOs are acting as data mediators; nonetheless, this role is envisioned to be performed by citizens.

2. Citizen observatories:

This role allows non-governmental actors to be included as managers and administrators in the co-creation process. Citizen observatories will be responsible for collecting and analyzing data that government is not currently gathering, especially data related to minorities. This role is under development by a collaboration between NGOs and the government.

5.2.2 Roles producing value through the consumption of public services

3. NGOs as trainers of public servants

This role is co-creating value for NGOs and the government. On the one hand, NGOs fulfill their intrinsic motivation of sharing knowledge, and on the other hand, the government profits from knowledge sharing. Furthermore, societal value is created from improvements in public service delivery.

4. Citizens as overseers:

This role results from citizens experiencing the services related to open data. As citizens keep creating value from open data, they could potentially profit from the Ecuadorian legal framework that, combined with open data, could allow overseeing government activities, creating transparency.

5.2.3 Roles producing value through the co-creation process

5. Public servants as co-creators:

Public servants are expected to keep learning and generating value from the co-creation process. As they keep participating in more horizontal co-creation ecosystems, there is an expectation that public servants will embrace a role of co-creation. This means that public servants will participate in the co-creation process beyond the legal requirements, showing genuine interest, creating additional trust and empathy, and boosting engagement through the co-creation process with all participants.

6. Participants in collaborative co-creation ecosystems:

Outside of the official co-creation workshops, there are no co-creation ecosystems. Horizontality is a requirement inside these spaces, making participants from the government, academia, NGOs, or citizens act as equals. These conglomerates co-produce organically additional services that add value to open data and open government. Furthermore, the exchange of knowledge has the potential to cross-pollinate the organizations or communities from where the participants are members.

7. Citizens as co-creators:

Empowered citizens that actively engage through the process of co-creation are the critical actor to co-create value. Currently, citizens are more likely to participate sporadically and in segmented stages of the co-creation process. Ideally, citizens should be part of the production and consumption of services to benefit from co-creation fully.

8. Government as a facilitator:

Co-creation participants had positive first encounters with the government when participating in the co-creation process. Participants expect that the government keeps its role as a facilitator throughout the co-creation process allowing for collaborative ecosystems to thrive while providing legitimacy.

6 Conclusions

The Osborne framework was a valuable tool to study value co-creation in the Ecuadorian case study. A first benefit of using the Osborne framework is that the elements of value proposed and used as the structure to carry the semi-structured interviews were very intuitive to interviewees. All interviewees immediately expressed their experiences referencing and using the elements of value proposed by Osborne. A second benefit is that holistically analyzing the production and consumption of co-created services allows for an in-depth analysis of the participants' experience in both stages. If only the production or consumption of the service had been studied, essential elements of value creation would have been left outside of the research.

The decision of the Ecuadorian government to join the Open Government Partnership in 2018 paved the road for co-creation to be used as a tool to create policy and deliver services in the Ecuadorian public administration. Furthermore, the three pillars of the Open Government agenda, transparency, collaboration, and participation, set the expectations from the government regarding the value expected to be produced from the implementation of an Open Government National Action Plan. As the co-creation workshops took place, the experiences and inputs from participants shaped the commitments that later would translate into policies and services that have a value proposition when in place.

Value was created through the shared experiences of co-creation participants. The twelve common themes found when analyzing the interviews propose that those elements co-create value for the participants under different circumstances, as presented in Tab. 7.

Since most of the participants contributed across the co-creation process, the value was created for them across the whole co-creation process. It is worth mentioning that identifying the roles that participants took during the co-creation process was paramount to identifying when the value was co-created (see Tab. 6 and Tab. 8).

The twelve identified themes from the interviewed participants' statements are elements that co-create positive or negative value during the co-creation process of the National Action Plan, the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and the Open Data chapter. Tab. 9 summarizes how value and what type of value are co-created.

Recurrent themes	Value co-created
Community	Previously established and new communities established as a product of the interaction between participants allowed the co-creation process to be more empathetic and near to the co-creation participants, boosting their engagement.
Communications	<p>Direct and open communications allowed for a horizontal working structure, creating trust and proximity between participants.</p> <p>Government should exercise caution when communicating the result of the co-creation process. Ceremonial events, where authorities present the result of co-creation processes as an achievement for the government, can negatively impact the feeling of being at the same level, damaging trust and empathy.</p>
Continuity	Accomplishments reached should remain regardless of the political affiliation of future governments to keep the engagement of non-governmental participants.
Digitalization	<p>Technology allows for more direct and recurrent interaction with the government creating additional trust and proximity with participants.</p> <p>A negative connotation is created if the use of the technology represents a barrier to participation, e.g., in rural areas with no access to the internet or citizens without the skills to use technology.</p>
Education	<p>The government co-created value from knowledge transfer from NGOs, academia, and citizens and used it to improve service delivery.</p> <p>NGOs, academia, and citizens created value by fulfilling their intrinsic motivation to learn and share knowledge, boosting participants' engagement.</p>
Efficiency	Government generated efficiencies reducing the time to produce policies and services thanks to the collaboration of NGOs, academia, and citizens.
Horizontality	Collaborative networks allow participants to take on new roles and generate value such as trust, collaboration, participation, and fulfillment of intrinsic motivations.
Innovation	Innovation is expected to happen outside of the public administration. The government can co-create value when implementing best practices provided by non-governmental participants and improving service delivery for citizens.
Intrinsic motivations	The fulfillment of intrinsic motivations created positive value that led to participants' engagement with the process. Furthermore, most of the intrinsic motivations had direct and indirect links to the co-creation of societal value.
Mandatory/legal	<p>The establishment of legal accountability and mandatory tasks created positive value for all participants, and it allowed for the co-creation process to have legal bases to be executed and accountability for accomplishing objectives.</p> <p>The rigid, legalistic attitude of the public servants to approach co-creation creates distrust in the co-creation process since other participants perceive them as not genuinely interested in the process.</p>
Open government	<p>Co-creation of the Open Data Portal contributed to generating positive value supporting the accomplishment of the open government pillars: transparency, participation, and collaboration.</p> <p>The Open Data Portal could be in disuse and negatively impact transparency participation and collaboration if there is no cultural change regarding open data that empowers citizens and public servants as co-creators.</p>
Politics	Politics is a topic that most impacted the trust in the process of co-creation. Previous experiences with drastic changes in government agenda due to political affiliation have a negative connotation that leads to disengagement and distrust from non-governmental participants.

Tab. 9 Value co-created summary

Future research

The Osborne framework does not provide specific indications on how to handle overlapping or the cyclical nature of the co-creation process. In the Ecuadorian case, production and consumption of services were carried out as complete co-creation processes, involving participants in the four sub-stages of co-creation. Further research is recommended to complement and develop indications on handling cases that present similar overlapping and cyclical production and consumption processes.

Limitations

The first limitation of this research is presented when delimiting the scope of the research. The Open Government National Action Plan has ten commitments, and this research only concentrates on two: 1. Collaborative drafting of the Open Data Policy and Guidelines, and 2. Re-design and update the Open Data Portal. From reading the description provided in the NAP about the other eight commitments, there could be overlapping experiences that could generate positive or negative value that spilled over to this research since some of the co-creation participants also collaborate on the other commitments.

In addition, even though the milestones for the Collaborative drafting of the Open Data Policy and Guidelines and the re-design and update of the Open Data Portal are completed, additional value is expected to be achieved in the long term. A subsequent revisit could provide further insights if an additional co-created value is achieved.

This research aims to contribute to empirical testing of the generalizability of the Osborne framework. Generalizations cannot be applied to the whole co-creation process for the Ecuadorian Open Government National Action Plan since only two of the ten commitments were analyzed in this research. However, valuable insights regarding the co-creation of commitments one and two of the Ecuadorian First Open Government National Action Plan could be obtained since representatives from all official counterparts were interviewed.

References

- Alam, I. 2006. "Removing the Fuzziness from the Fuzzy Front-End of Service Innovations through Customer Interactions," *Industrial Marketing Management* (35:4), pp. 468–480. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2005.04.004>).
- Alford, J. 1998. "A Public Management Road Less Travelled: Clients as Co-Producers of Public Services," *Australian Journal of Public Administration* (57:4), pp. 128–137. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.1998.tb01568.x>).
- Alford, J. 2015. "Co-Production, Interdependence and Publicness: Extending Public Service-Dominant Logic," *Public Management Review*, Routledge. (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14719037.2015.1111659>).
- Andersen, S. C., and Hjortskov, M. 2016. "Cognitive Biases in Performance Evaluations," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* (26:4), pp. 647–662. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muv036>).
- Bason, C. 2010. *Leading Public Sector Innovation: Co-Creating for a Better Society*, Bristol, UK ; Portland, OR: Policy Press.
- Bejar, E. 2020. "Diagnóstico Portal de Datos Abiertos de Ecuador," Ecuador: FUNDAPI, February, p. 68. (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OXovEH93pEpDP57B4D-0SOY4myHmRGzGjDL7G7iXhgE/edit?usp=embed_facebook).
- Bertot, J. C., McDermott, P., and Smith, T. 2012. "Measurement of Open Government: Metrics and Process," in *2012 45th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, IEEE, pp. 2491–2499.
- Bouchard, N. 2016. "The dark side of public participation: Participative processes that legitimize elected officials' values," *Canadian Public Administration* (59:4), pp. 516–537. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/capa.12199>).
- Bozeman, B. 2002. "Public-Value Failure: When Efficient Markets May Not Do," *Public Administration Review* (62:2), pp. 145–161. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00165>).
- Bozeman, B. 2007. *Public Values and Public Interest: Counterbalancing Economic Individualism*, Washington, UNITED STATES: Georgetown University Press. (<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tuee/detail.action?docID=547786>).
- Brandsen, T., and Honingh, M. 2016. "Distinguishing Different Types of Coproduction: A Conceptual Analysis Based on the Classical Definitions," *Public Administration Review* (76:3), [American Society for Public Administration, Wiley], pp. 427–435.
- Brandsen, T., and Pestoff, V. 2006. "Co-Production, the Third Sector and the Delivery of Public Services: An Introduction," *Public Management Review* (8:4), pp. 493–501. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030601022874>).

- Brandsen, T., Steen, T., and Verschuere, B. (eds.). 2018. *Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Services*, (1st ed.), New York, NY : Routledge, 2018.: Routledge. (<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315204956>).
- Brodie, R. J., Hollebeek, L. D., Jurić, B., and Ilić, A. 2011. “Customer Engagement: Conceptual Domain, Fundamental Propositions, and Implications for Research,” *Journal of Service Research* (14:3), SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 252–271. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511411703>).
- Campbell, S. 2015. “Conducting Case Study Research,” *American Society for Clinical Laboratory Science* (28:3), pp. 201–205. (<https://doi.org/10.29074/ascls.28.3.201>).
- Chandler, J. D., and Lusch, R. F. 2015. “Service Systems: A Broadened Framework and Research Agenda on Value Propositions, Engagement, and Service Experience,” *Journal of Service Research* (18:1), SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 6–22. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670514537709>).
- Chavis, D. M., and Wandersman, A. 1990. “Sense of Community in the Urban Environment: A Catalyst for Participation and Community Development,” *American Journal of Community Psychology* (18:1), pp. 55–81. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00922689>).
- Cook, A. 2017. *Outcomes Based Approaches in Public Service Reform*, p. 24.
- Crabtree, B. F., and Miller, W. L. (eds.). 1999. *Doing Qualitative Research*, (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- DATALAT. 2021. “Construcción de Indicadores para evaluar la implementación de la política y la guía de datos abiertos,” *Datalat*, , December 14. (<https://www.datalat.org/proyectos/construccion-de-indicadores-para-evaluar-la-implementacion-de-la-politica-y-la-guia-de-datos-abiertos>, accessed May 29, 2022).
- Dawes, S. S., and Helbig, N. 2010. “Information Strategies for Open Government: Challenges and Prospects for Deriving Public Value from Government Transparency,” in *Electronic Government*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, M. A. Wimmer, J.-L. Chappelet, M. Janssen, and H. J. Scholl (eds.), Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 50–60. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14799-9_5).
- Dehghan, H., Keshtkaran, A., Ahmadloo, N., Bagheri, Z., and Hatam, N. 2018. “Patient Involvement in Care and Breast Cancer Patients’ Quality of Life- a Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Approach,” *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention : APJCP* (19:9), pp. 2511–2517. (<https://doi.org/10.22034/APJCP.2018.19.9.2511>).
- DiCicco-Bloom, B., and Crabtree, B. F. 2006. “The Qualitative Research Interview,” *Medical Education* (40:4), pp. 314–321. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x>).

- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., and Tinkler, J. 2006a. *Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, the State, and e-Government*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199296194.001.0001>).
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., and Tinkler, J. 2006b. “New Public Management Is Dead—Long Live Digital-Era Governance,” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* (16:3), Oxford University Press, pp. 467–494.
- Eagly, A. H., and Chaiken, S. 1993. *The Psychology of Attitudes*, The Psychology of Attitudes, Orlando, FL, US: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, pp. xxii, 794.
- Ecuador Open Government Core Group. 2020. *First National Action Plan Ecuador 2019-2022: Open Government Partnership*. (https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Ecuador_Action-Plan_2019-2021.pdf).
- Ecuador Open Government Core Group. 2022. “Proceso de Co-creación 2 – Gobierno Abierto Ecuador,” *Open Government Ecuador*, , May 29. (<https://www.gobiernoabierto.ec/proceso-de-co-creacion-2/>, accessed May 29, 2022).
- Ehn, P. 2008. *Participation in Design Things*, , January 1, pp. 92–101. (<https://doi.org/10.1145/1795234.1795248>).
- Ellis, S. J., Bailey, L., and McNeil, J. 2014. “Trans People’s Experiences of Mental Health and Gender Identity Services: A UK Study,” *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, Routledge. (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19359705.2014.960990>).
- Etgar, M. 2008. “A Descriptive Model of the Consumer Co-Production Process,” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* (36:1), pp. 97–108. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0061-1>).
- Faas, A. J. 2017. “Enduring Cooperation: Time, Discipline, and Minga Practice in Disaster-Induced Displacement and Resettlement in the Ecuadorian Andes,” *Human Organization* (76:2), Oklahoma City, United States: Society of Applied Anthropology, pp. 99–108.
- Farr, M. 2016. “Co-Production and Value Co-Creation in Outcome-Based Contracting in Public Services,” *Public Management Review* (18:5), Routledge, pp. 654–672. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1111661>).
- Go Jefferies, J., Bishop, S., and Hibbert, S. 2021. “Service Innovation through Resource Integration: An Empirical Examination of Co-Created Value Using Telehealth Services,” *Public Policy and Administration* (36:1), SAGE Publications Ltd, pp. 69–88. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076718822715>).
- Grohs, S., Schneiders, K., and Heinze, R. G. 2015. “Social Entrepreneurship versus Intrapreneurship in the German Social Welfare State: A Study of Old-Age Care

- and Youth Welfare Services,” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* (44:1), SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA, pp. 163–180.
- Grönroos, C. 2017. “On Value and Value Creation in Service: A Management Perspective,” *Journal of Creating Value* (3:2), Sage publications Sage India: New Delhi, India, pp. 125–141.
- Harrison, T. M., and Sayogo, D. S. 2014. “Transparency, Participation, and Accountability Practices in Open Government: A Comparative Study,” *Government Information Quarterly* (31:4), pp. 513–525. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2014.08.002>).
- Hersh, R. H., and Walker, H. M. 1983. *Great Expectations: Making Schools Effective for All Students*, ERIC.
- von Hippel, E. 1987. “Cooperation between Rivals: Informal Know-How Trading,” *Research Policy* (16:6), pp. 291–302. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333\(87\)90015-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0048-7333(87)90015-1)).
- Hjortskov, M. 2019. “Citizen Expectations and Satisfaction Over Time: Findings From a Large Sample Panel Survey of Public School Parents in Denmark,” *The American Review of Public Administration* (49:3), SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 353–371. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074018765822>).
- James, O. 2011. “Managing Citizens’ Expectations of Public Service Performance: Evidence from Observation and Experimentation in Local Government,” *Public Administration* (89:4), pp. 1419–1435. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01962.x>).
- Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y., and Zuiderwijk, A. 2012. “Benefits, Adoption Barriers and Myths of Open Data and Open Government,” *Information Systems Management* (29:4), Taylor & Francis, pp. 258–268. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2012.716740>).
- Jin, M. H., and Guy, M. E. 2009. “How Emotional Labor Influences Worker Pride, Job Satisfaction, and Burnout,” *Public Performance & Management Review* (33:1), Routledge, pp. 88–105. (<https://doi.org/10.2753/PMR1530-9576330104>).
- Jo, S., and Nabatchi, T. 2016. “Getting Back to Basics: Advancing the Study and Practice of Coproduction,” *International Journal of Public Administration* (39:13), Routledge, pp. 1101–1108. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2016.1177840>).
- Jørgensen, T. B., and Bozeman, B. 2007. “Public Values: An Inventory,” *Administration & Society* (39:3), SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 354–381. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399707300703>).
- Kampen, J. K., De Walle, S. V., and Bouckaert, G. 2006. “Assessing the Relation Between Satisfaction with Public Service Delivery and Trust in Government. The Impact of the Predisposition of Citizens Toward Government on Evaluations of Its Performance,” *Public Performance & Management Review*

- (29:4), Routledge, pp. 387–404.
(<https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2006.11051881>).
- Komulainen, H. 2014. “The Role of Learning in Value Co-Creation in New Technological B2B Services,” *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* (29:3), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 238–252.
(<https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-04-2011-0042>).
- Kumar, N., Scheer, L., and Kotler, P. 2000. “From Market Driven to Market Driving,” *European Management Journal* (18:2), Elsevier, pp. 129–142.
- Lee, S. M., Olson, D. L., and Trimi, S. 2012. “Co-innovation: Convergencomics, Collaboration, and Co-creation for Organizational Values,” *Management Decision* (50:5), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 817–831.
(<https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741211227528>).
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Claycomb, V. C., and Inks, L. W. 2000. “From Recipient to Contributor: Examining Customer Roles and Experienced Outcomes,” *European Journal of Marketing*, MCB UP Ltd.
- López, J., Llerena, A., Susana, C., Yépez, M., Silva, F., Enríquez, R., Pazmiño, J., and Castillo, J. C. 2021. “Informe Co-creacion de la Guia Datos Abiertos REDAM MINTEL 2020,” Ecuador: REDAM, January 13, p. 5.
(https://drive.google.com/file/d/1xHrEYSGhRyyjquP398oMvOtGY_-bK1KB/view?usp=sharing&usp=embed_facebook).
- Lowe, T. 2013. “New Development: The Paradox of Outcomes—the More We Measure, the Less We Understand,” *Public Money & Management* (33:3), Routledge, pp. 213–216. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2013.785707>).
- Lusch, R. F., and Vargo, S. L. 2009. “Service-Dominant Logic—a Guiding Framework for Inbound Marketing,” *Marketing Review St. Gallen* (26:6), Springer, pp. 6–10.
- Manen, M. van. 2016. *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*, (2nd ed.), New York: Routledge.
(<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315421056>).
- McGill, A. L., and Iacobucci, D. 1992. “The Role of Post-Experience Comparison Standards in the Evaluation of Unfamiliar Services,” *ACR North American Advances* (NA-19).
(<https://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/7358/volumes/v19/NA-19/full>).
- Meakin, B., Cameron, C., Moore, M., and Matthews, J. 2017. *Improving Understanding of Service User Involvement and Identity: A Report of Research Findings, Shaping Our Lives*.
- Meynhardt, T. 2009. “Public Value Inside: What Is Public Value Creation?,” *International Journal of Public Administration* (32:3–4), Routledge, pp. 192–219. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690902732632>).

- Meynhardt, T. 2015. *Public Value: Turning a Conceptual Framework into a Scorecard*, J. M. Bryson, B. Crosby, and L. Bloomberg (eds.), Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 147–169. (<https://www.alexandria.unisg.ch/243912/>).
- Meynhardt, T., Chandler, J. D., and Strathoff, P. 2016. “Systemic Principles of Value Co-Creation: Synergetics of Value and Service Ecosystems,” *Journal of Business Research* (69:8), pp. 2981–2989. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.02.031>).
- Ministerio de Telecomunicaciones. 2021. *Open Data Guide*, p. 51. (<https://www.gobiernoelectronico.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Guia-Datos-Abiertos-con-portada.pdf>).
- Oikonomakis, Leonidas. 2020. *We Protect the Forest Beings, and the Forest Beings Protect Us: Cultural Resistance in the Ecuadorian Amazonia*, Zenodo. (<https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4315282>).
- Orr, M., and West, D. M. 2007. “Citizen Evaluations of Local Police: Personal Experience or Symbolic Attitudes?,” *Administration & Society* (38:6), SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 649–668. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399706293989>).
- Osborne, S. P. 2006. “The New Public Governance?,” *Public Management Review* (8:3), pp. 377–387. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030600853022>).
- Osborne, S. P. (ed.). 2010. *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*, London ; New York: Routledge.
- Osborne, S. P., and Brown, L. 2011. “Innovation, Public Policy and Public Services Delivery in the Uk. the Word That Would Be King?,” *Public Administration* (89:4), pp. 1335–1350. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2011.01932.x>).
- Osborne, S. P., Nasi, G., and Powell, M. 2021. “Beyond Co-production: Value Creation and Public Services,” *Public Administration*, Padm.12718. (<https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12718>).
- Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., and Strokosch, K. 2016. “Co-Production and the Co-Creation of Value in Public Services: A Suitable Case for Treatment?,” *Public Management Review* (18:5), pp. 639–653. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1111927>).
- Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge university press.
- Palumbo, R., and Manna, R. 2018. “What If Things Go Wrong in Co-Producing Health Services? Exploring the Implementation Problems of Health Care Co-Production,” *Policy and Society* (37:3), Routledge, pp. 368–385. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2018.1411872>).
- Perrin, B. 2006. *Moving from Outputs to Outcomes: Practical Advice from Governments around the World*, IBM Center for the Business of Government.

- Pestoff, V., Osborne, S. P., and Brandsen, T. 2006. "Patterns of Co-Production in Public Services: Some Concluding Thoughts," *Public Management Review* (8:4), pp. 591–595. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030601022999>).
- Pollitt, C., and Bouckaert, G. 2011. *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis - New Public Management, Governance, and the Neo-Weberian State*, Oxford, UNITED KINGDOM: Oxford University Press. (<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tuee/detail.action?docID=829484>).
- Pollitt, C., and Hupe, P. 2011. "Talking About Government," *Public Management Review* (13:5), pp. 641–658. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2010.532963>).
- Roseth, B., Farias, P., Porrúa, M., Peña, N., Reyes, A., Acevedo, S., Villalba, H., Estevez, E., and Lejarraga, S. 2018. *El Fin Del Trámite Eterno: Ciudadanos, Burocracia y Gobierno Digital*, Inter-American Development Bank. (<https://doi.org/10.18235/0001150>).
- Sanders, E. B.-N., and Stappers, P. J. 2008. "Co-Creation and the New Landscapes of Design," *CoDesign* (4:1), Taylor & Francis, pp. 5–18. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/15710880701875068>).
- Sandström, S., Edvardsson, B., Kristensson, P., and Magnusson, P. 2008. "Value in Use through Service Experience," *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal* (18:2), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 112–126. (<https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520810859184>).
- Scartascini, C. 2022. *Trust: The Key to Social Cohesion and Growth in Latin America and the Caribbean*, (P. Keefer, ed.), Inter-American Development Bank. (<https://doi.org/10.18235/0003792>).
- Schembri, S., and Sandberg, J. 2002. "Service Quality and the Consumer's Experience: Towards an Interpretive Approach," *Marketing Theory* (2:2), SAGE Publications, pp. 189–205. (<https://doi.org/10.1177/147059310222003>).
- Schnell, S. 2022. "Transparency in a 'Post-Fact' World," *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, p. gvac010. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvac010>).
- Shirky, C. 2010. *Cognitive Surplus: Creativity and Generosity in a Connected Age*, Penguin.
- Sirianni, C., and Friedland, L. 2001. *Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Renewal*, University of California Press.
- Song, M., An, S.-H., and Meier, K. J. 2021. "Quality Standards, Implementation Autonomy, and Citizen Satisfaction with Public Services: Cross-National Evidence," *Public Management Review* (23:6), Routledge, pp. 906–928. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1730939>).
- Sood, N. 2010. *Transgender People's Access to Sexual Health and Rights: A Study of Law and Policy in 12 Asian Countries*, Arrow.

- Sørensen, E., and Torfing, J. 2012. "Introduction: Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector," *The Innovation Journal* (17:1), The innovation journal, p. 1.
- Steen, M., Manschot, M., and De Koning, N. 2011. "Benefits of Co-Design in Service Design Projects," *International Journal of Design* (5:2), Chinese Institute of Design.
- Steen, T., Brandsen, T., and Verschuere, B. 2018. *Co-Production and Co-Creation: Engaging Citizens in Public Services*, Routledge.
- Strathern, M. 2000. "The Tyranny of Transparency," *British Educational Research Journal* (26:3), [Wiley, BERA], pp. 309–321.
- Strokosch, K., and Osborne, S. P. 2021. "Co-Production from a Public Service Logic Perspective," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Co-Production of Public Services and Outcomes*, E. Loeffler and T. Bovaird (eds.), Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 117–131. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53705-0_6).
- Tania Zabala-Peñañiel and Open Government Partnership. 2021. "Ecuador Design Report 2019 - 2021," Design, Independent Reporting Mechanism, Design, Ecuador: Open Government Partnership, p. 58. (https://www.opengovpartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Ecuador_Design_Report_2019-2021.pdf).
- Van de Walle, S. 2004. "Context-Specific Images of the Archetypical Bureaucrat: Persistence and Diffusion of the Bureaucracy Stereotype," SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 2444705, SSRN Scholarly Paper, Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, June 2. (<https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2444705>).
- Van de Walle, S. 2018. "Explaining Citizen Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Public Services," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Public Administration and Management in Europe*, E. Ongaro and S. Van Thiel (eds.), London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 227–241. (https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55269-3_11).
- Van Ryzin, G. G. 2004. "Expectations, Performance, and Citizen Satisfaction with Urban Services," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* (23:3), pp. 433–448. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20020>).
- Vargo, S. L., Akaka, M. A., and Vaughan, C. M. 2017. "Conceptualizing Value: A Service-Ecosystem View," *Journal of Creating Value* (3:2), SAGE Publications Sage India: New Delhi, India, pp. 117–124.
- Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J. J. M., and Tummers, L. G. 2015. "A Systematic Review of Co-Creation and Co-Production: Embarking on the Social Innovation Journey," *Public Management Review* (17:9), pp. 1333–1357. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.930505>).
- Whiting, L. S. 2008. "Semi-Structured Interviews: Guidance for Novice Researchers," *Nursing Standard (through 2013)* (22:23), London, United Kingdom: BMJ Publishing Group LTD, pp. 35–40.

- Wimbush, E. 2011. "Implementing an Outcomes Approach to Public Management and Accountability in the UK—Are We Learning the Lessons?," *Public Money & Management* (31:3), Routledge, pp. 211–218.
(<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2011.573237>).
- Yin, R. K. 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, (4th ed.), Applied Social Research Methods Series 5, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Zhou, K. Z., Yim, C. K. (Bennett), and Tse, D. K. 2005. "The Effects of Strategic Orientations on Technology- and Market-Based Breakthrough Innovations," *Journal of Marketing* (69:2), SAGE Publications Inc, pp. 42–60.
(<https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.2.42.60756>).

Appendix

A Subsection of Appendix

The following table shows the extracts of the interviewees' statements that expressed elements of value in the original language Spanish.

The table shows the themes assigned after several rounds of coding, a general identification of the interviewee, the “tag” element of value from the Osborne framework, a general identificatory, and if the statement included a direct mention of roles and what type.

Full transcripts of the interviews can be accessed at the following [link](#) in Spanish. Translation can be arranged on demand. However, please consider that some of the interviewees' statements are better captured in their original language Spanish (the interviews and statements include regional lingo and fillers).

Statement in original language Spanish	Themes	Elements of value	Actor	Roles
Aprender del proceso	Education	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Entender cosas proceso	Education	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
ser parte del proceso	Community	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
hay algún valor para mí en hacer esta esta participación	Intrinsic	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
mis aportes. Causaron una diferencia importante en el en el resultado	Intrinsic	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
de motivación, tampoco tenía la expectativa de que participando ya me iba a sentir realizado	Intrinsic	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
sigan enganchando a las mismas personas, engagement	Community	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
formar parte de un grupo	Community	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	Ecosystem
un post en social media que diga agradecemos estos son los contribuyentes.	Intrinsic	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
más del reconocimiento, quizás al orgullo de hacerlo, y también quizás el orgullo de ver el beneficio,	Intrinsic	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
capaz de crear más sentido de Comunidad	Community	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
se disemina la información, incluso mucho más rápido.	Communications	1 Short term	2 Citizens	Ecosystem
Sentido de patriotism	Intrinsic	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Me gusta tema de datos	Intrinsic	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned

cómo crear realidad una comunidad de ciudadanos un punto de encuentro para todos punto central de un grupo de ciudadanos	Community	4 Capacity	2 Citizens	Ecosystem
no necesariamente sabes cuáles son los problemas, me entiendes y cuando eres como cliente de servicio no sabes dónde quejarte entonces	Education	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Todo el mundo sabe que si estás en tu casa y te caes de las gradas y te rompes un pie que vas a llamar al 911	Open Government	4 Capacity	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
al mundo digital sigan dejando abierta esa ventana para que gente que no esté físicamente presente participe	Digitalization	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
la gente no respeta los procesos, la gente no participa tampoco porque dice para qué va a participar, si es que lo que yo haga no va a tener valor y se la van a robar o lo que sea	Intrinsic	4 Capacity	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
adopción de tecnología para los gobiernos es fundamental para el desarrollo de los países,	Digitalization	5 Societal Value	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Relación en ambos sentidos	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
simplemente digan ya hice mi parte y se van.	Legal/mandatory	4 Capacity	2 Citizens	Co-creators
trabajar fuerte en brindar asistencia técnica entidades del sector público para que abran datos de la mano del mintel y por el otro lado,	Open Government	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
un proceso continuo de mejora y no querer coger y construir el castillo en el día uno	Continuity	4 Capacity	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
proceso de revisión ya había como que cierta presión para finalizar el proceso	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
manejas la presión política o de lo del Gobierno de cumplir con este proceso, d	Politics	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
comunicación sería clave	Communications	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
en cuenta todos mis comentarios, pero voy a tener el chance en dos años	Continuity	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Gobierno tiene que estar ahí casi que holding People hands	Horizontality	4 Capacity	2 Citizens	Facilitator
El reto de abrir datos y cómo ha evolucionado en el tiempo, porque si no, obviamente va a pasar lo que antes pasaba que no, o sea que se lanzó pero no hubo un seguimiento detrás.	Open Government	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
por cualquier razón, entonces siento que ahí el hecho de que existan la los datos abiertos ya no es una barrera para yo poder consumir ciertos datos dentro del mismo sector público que eso pasa un montón	Open Government	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned

Convocar para dar estos problemas todos estos planes de estas personas sobre este proceso.	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Y, una vez que ya conozca esto va a ser más fácil si manejar los datos a ver, va a ser de más utilidad del portal.	Open Government	4 Capacity	1 Academy	No role mentioned
prácticas de gobierno abierto que están haciendo otras entidades con el apoyo de otras organizaciones civiles o sector privado. Para decirles hey lo que tú estás haciendo es gobierno abierto entonces tratar de posicionar el tema para que hasta las primeras instituciones se sientan ejemplo.	Open Government	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
despertar el interés hacia la importancia de los datos y hicimos un concurso de creación de aplicaciones cívicas.	Open Government	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Mediator
la segunda Hasta cuando van a estar intermediarios	Open Government	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Mediator
ciegamente confiar de que la oficina de registro público tenía todo bien o salían los reportes y eso es lo que teníamos acceso	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
No tiene acceso a internet	Digitalization	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
para cuando los hice ya era muy tarde ya el documento existía, el documento estaba casi que básicamente materializado había premura de tiempo, etcétera	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
haya una visibilidad práctica, es decir, mientras no venga alguien y cree una aplicación usando los datos, por ejemplo	Open Government	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
el proceso profesionalmente	Intrinsic	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Experiencia positiva en términos, por ejemplo, de construir una política pública partiendo desde el 2018 que arrancó el proceso, pero desde mucho antes que ya veníamos trabajando en el tema.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
ciudadano está tomando sus datos y está creando alguna aplicación, alguna solución que a mí me resuelve un problema Del día a día. Entonces yo creo que es un desafío, al menos por ahora.	Open Government	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
también fortalecer el conocimiento y qué más organizaciones e individuos o actores fuera del Gobierno también demanda y utilicen datos y los consuman	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Ecosystem
organizaciones que tienen la capacidad o individuos que tienen la capacidad de, por ejemplo, consumir estos datos pueden traducir por así	Education	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	Mediator

decirlo, hacerlos más amigables para el ciudadano común				
La información que puedas generar con esos insumos. Entonces siente que a través de iniciativas que involucren estas habilidades, por un lado, estas organizaciones tendrían esa responsabilidad quizás o esa tarea de poder hacerlos más cercanos al común.	Education	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	Mediator
Entonces tenemos que trabajar muchísimo en educación al respecto, más aún en Ecuador, cuando no tenemos políticas tan claras de la transformación digital, recién se está trabajando en una política nacional al respecto ambiental está haciendo y ahí, por ejemplo, hay un componente de skills o habilidades digitales.	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Que tiene estas distintas aristas no involucrar a actores no tradicionales para retos que en general	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	Ecosystem
forma vas rompiendo estás barreras de que la gente vaya conociendo más, de interesándose un poco más en estos temas que pueden llegar a ser técnicos y no tan agradables, no, entonces este, pero por ahí es más o menos.	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Nada, deberían tener un solo número. un punto focalizado	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
mecanismos de participación ciudadana que existe en el país a través de la ley de participación ciudadana. Lo aplican todas las entidades públicas, por ejemplo, y muchas de las organizaciones sociedad civil demandan que se cumplan esos espacios o esos mecanismos que ya están existentes en la sociedad	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	4 NGO	Overseer
Creo que las universidades en esto de poder justamente la pregunta que tú haces es darle un marco analítico.	Education	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Todavía no siento que es algo que todo el mundo entienda que se trata y tampoco lo utiliza, no lo ven como quizás algo prioritario.	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
para nosotros todavía hablar ahorita de temas sociales, temas de económicos sigue siendo lo preponderante en el discurso público. Por ende, no tenemos todavía como el algo así concreto que todo el mundo se vuelve a hablar de esto.	Efficiency	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned

Y se podría generar esta especie de dinámicas donde creaba coparticipabas en procesos mucho más fácil porque estás desde tu casa, te conectas y hay procesos que están pasando ahí y no tienes que quizás de invertir mucho más que el tiempo.	Digitalization	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Así que ya incluye un componente de datos abiertos a todas las funciones del Estado. Y ahí me parece que se va a hacer super interesante a futuro porque ahí vamos a tener iniciativas de datos en todos los niveles y el que uno de los que más me interesa a mí es el de las ciudades de los gobiernos locales.	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	Observatories
promueve y ahí si tú te fijas en la guía, en el documento hay muchísimas formas que se sugiere como promover la utilización del portal y cómo generar procesos de creación a través de los datos.	Legal/mandatory	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Sino es parte de un deber, o sea de una responsabilidad que está enmarcada en un algo legal o en una obligación por lo general, no se hace. Entonces lastimosamente nuestro país todavía tiene una cultura de hacer todo lo normativo. Así es que no es normativo, no, no aplica.	Legal/mandatory	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Co-creators
Y para nosotros es súper vital esto de que lo que no mides no, no puedes mejorarlo	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	Observatories
una buena Administración General en datos mayor, más confiables, si es decir, de calidad y mantener actualizado todo el tiempo	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	1 Academy	No role mentioned
Identificar que demanda existe de esos datos por parte de la ciudadanía y otros datos que tienen ciertas entidades. Y por el otro lado, la reutilización de la información porque, y también ahí hay que ver las barreras de entrada porque, analizar todos estos datos, visualizarlos y tener como un documento potente, digamos, para poder discutirlo con en este caso las en la asamblea.	Community	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Mediator
es decir que yo vea la implicación de incluir o no los aportes e incluso comunique al ciudadano que lo aportó. Si se incluyeron o no, porque se creó, sería un ejercicio sano y que yo también podría hacer una especie de rendición de cuentas como estado frente a mí ciudadano que está interesado de aportar en la política pública, pero quizás sus aportes en su momento no los puedo incluir, no tienen asidero, no es transversal con	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned

los objetivos, pero ya le informé que te estoy haciendo caso de alguna manera.				
A veces se piensa que el dato abierto es un dato publicado. Yo creo que el siguiente paso para nosotros como sociedad civil justamente es, abrimos a esos otros territorios en donde no se está hablando de la temática, que si bien es cierto, ahí se debe hacer otro tipo de trabajo	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
no sólo yo diría una evaluación de las políticas públicas sino en la construcción, desarrollo, ejecución y culminación de todos los proyectos que se enmarcan en el marco de gobierno abierto	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
Eso genera iconografías por storytelling en sus medios, sobre todo los digitales.	Communications	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
importante en poder también utilizar los datos y generar como información para el resto de la de la de la sociedad, incluso en términos de, por ejemplo	Communications	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	Mediator
Entonces ahí siento que es una es una herramienta super fuerte para luchar contra la desinformación.	Communications	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
No puedes encontrarlos y demás, entonces ahí siento que esto puede ayudar mucho a combatir esos 3 segmentos. Analizando un poco podrían ser interesantes ver como el impacto general en la sociedad. La mayoría todavía no ve como estos beneficios y nos toca ir poco a poco.	Intrinsic	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
busca materializar las ofertas o el plan de gobierno	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
no sirve de nada subir información a un instrumento que tiene una finalidad bastante grande sin la información, no es de calidad	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
el tema de datos abiertos es un proyecto a largo plazo porque a pesar de que hemos creado ahora datos abiertos, el portal de datos abiertos, tenemos una guía y tenemos luces de hacia dónde queremos ir, aún no existe, como te digo, una cierta resiliencia por parte de las entidades públicas. Porque creen que la información les pertenece	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned

Donde tenías que te llegaban a invitar a un proceso de socialización y siento que el tema de creación cambia el paradigma y no llegas a escuchar algo que hasta tomas, sino que llegas a aportar y hacer parte de un proceso de construcción	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
O sea, y eso creo que ha ayudado mucho a que más personas se involucren en procesos, se sientan parte de que solo sean llamados a justificar algo o a informarte	Intrinsic	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Tanto para el servidor público que ve que esto puede ser así, que tienes contrapartes fuertes y que tienes estas entidades que también pueden aportarte técnicamente.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Trainers
Nunca antes he participado en un proceso política pública, pero me parece interesante lo que estamos haciendo acá, porque yo sí entiendo lo que me están preguntando y puede aportar y no me veo ajeno a estos temas. Entonces, por ejemplo, ya estoy rompiendo esas barreras de quienes tradicionalmente participaba en estos procesos versus cuales ahora pueden participar.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Co-creators
es un tema super técnico que no todo el mundo lo maneja y más aún si te refieres ya la arquitectura del software y a todo el desarrollo tecnológico está detrás. Entonces nosotros en el equipo quien lidera eso es Susana cadena que es doctora en estos temas y ella hizo su doctorado en datos abiertos y además en sistemas conocer super bien esto y es quién está detrás de todos estos proyectos tecnológicos, entonces ahí tienes una contraparte super fuerte en esos temas.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
También lo que yo decía antes, el cambiar este chip del servidor público de es súper importante porque yo creo que no estamos ya en una relación de poder distintas, ahora creo que estamos entre pares como decir iguales y es muy importante que esto se vea así. Porque a futuro yo creo que se puede beneficiar mucho y reducir costos, ser más eficientes desde la política pública, incluyendo estos procesos, creo que eso es una gran ganancia de esto.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Ecosystem
Entonces, por ejemplo, ahí o algo super interesante tienes un montón la gente participando y aunque no lo vean así, eso ya era un proceso de cocreación y salieron cosas super	Community	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned

chévere, entonces yo siento que cada vez esto va tomando más fuerza, pero hay que darle ciertos tintes y ciertas dimensiones distintas.				
Porque también lo a veces las barreras son los recursos financieros, no todas las entidades públicas pueden invertir en esto, entonces necesitas de la cooperación, necesitas de los bancos, de los multilaterales, del de agencias de innovación que puedan invertir y crear en estos procesos.	Efficiency	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
está relacionado justamente en utilizar los datos para hacer investigación científica dentro de mis áreas	Education	1 Short term	1 Academy	No role mentioned
abiertos y utilizar el portal nos ayuda mucho para saber cuáles son las falencias en donde debemos investigar más	Education	4 Capacity	1 Academy	No role mentioned
yo le veo que es bastante interesante porque siempre para construir algo siempre es clave trabajar en equipos multidisciplinarios y como lo han venido haciendo, se ve ahora los resultados.	Horizontality	1 Short term	1 Academy	No role mentioned
Por más que haya participación de la Academia de la empresa y si el Gobierno o alguna institución no toma la batuta	Horizontality	1 Short term	1 Academy	Facilitator
Ya primero creo que antes de ocupar se debe dar una capacitación. Porque no todos están con el conocimiento previo para poder utilizarlos	Education	4 Capacity	1 Academy	No role mentioned
. Porque puede haber millones de datos pero si las personas no saben usar, no saben para que sirven, no saben cómo manejar la herramienta ni cómo proyectar esos datos entonces, de nada habría un portal valioso estaría desperdiciando ahí el trabajo que han realizado los recursos que están manejando. Entonces yo pienso que para que haya un buen uso de estos datos es bueno capacitar desde la parte normativa la parte como tienen los datos y cómo usar, al menos en dos visualizadores más básicos, más sencillos para que no sea complicado ya desde la parte mucho más avanzada.	Education	3 Whole-life	1 Academy	Mediator
. Bueno, al menos a la UDLA llega, nosotros siempre colaboramos, pero yo a veces he conversado con otros compañeros de la misma oficina y a veces no saben de la existencia. Peor si vas a otra Universidad a la Politécnica, otros lados, no todos	Communications	1 Short term	1 Academy	Ecosystem

están enterados, entonces yo pienso que tal vez ahí falta un poco de difusión				
a dónde más llega a tal vez sea los electrónicos a los informáticos y desde ahí ya nadie se entera, entonces pienso que falta un poco más de difusión.	Communications	1 Short term	1 Academy	No role mentioned
pero sí debería ser bueno que antes de lanzar al público ya directamente que todos usen revisar con los expertos. Ahí sí expertos que estén manejando en datos una primera parte, luego con usuarios finales, tomar pequeñas muestras para ver e ir depurando que se puede. Y mejorar y una vez que estás listo, empezar por la parte de difusión, luego por la parte de capacitación.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	1 Academy	No role mentioned
es lo que tenemos que hacer, es educar al sector público para que libere la información. La información no le pertenecen a ellos, le pertenece al pueblo y eso es lo que estamos haciendo.	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
Porque el ciudadano de a pie no le va a interesar los datos tan sofisticados para hacer investigación, sino algo del día a día en donde puede comprar productos de oferta en donde puede hacer sus compras de algo que él ya no va a utilizar, en donde puede vender así más o menos.	Intrinsic	1 Short term	1 Academy	No role mentioned
si es que la Universidad quiere que se le reconozcan que está haciendo investigación el publicar los datos también genera cómo se dice un poco de métricas.	Intrinsic	2 Medium/Long	1 Academy	Ecosystem
Entonces, es una forma de contribuir y de colaborar con mis otros compañeros. Que a mí me hubiese gustado que me den datos. Para ellos no pasar evaluando tanto tiempo y luego trabajar en comparativas para estudios futuros.	Intrinsic	5 Societal Value	1 Academy	No role mentioned
También ya estamos empezando a trabajar en ese entonces, estamos desde las competencias de cada uno de los departamentos, está empezando a implementar cosas nuevas y eso es lo que obviamente a la larga esto se va a ir mejorando entonces, Si los vemos, analizamos a través de personas, digamos, número de cédula, es un buen ID. identificadores únicos no se repite, pero existe un reglamento del verdad.	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned

política que permita precisamente impulsar, o normar o inspirar, porque si te das cuenta, la política no es sancionatoria, pero de alguna manera busca regular o establecer las bases para que se publiquen datos. Lo siguiente, obviamente un portal de datos, había un portal de datos, no sé si alguna vez lo oíste, que realmente no servía para nada	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Y si quieres estar a nivel un poquito más, o sea, hacerte conocer que estás aplicando esas leyes, falta reforzar la ley y todo. Y aunque sea empezar con multas pequeñas.	Legal/mandatory	2 Medium/Long	1 Academy	No role mentioned
creando una ordenanza, datos abiertos para innovación, es decir, dándole un sentido, o sea, no simplemente publiquemos datos por datos, si no hay un contexto de contribuir a la recuperación económica Pospandemia.	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Tengo algún tema de precisamente investigaciones sobre Gobierno abierto y administración pública	Education	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Lo había trabajado en mi espacio laboral y por ende luego, cuando ya me enteré de esta iniciativa fue por un link de una red social, entonces dije, ok, es la oportunidad de revisar este proyecto que va a ser una política pública de estatal y quizás ver cómo se interconectan todos estos estas vertientes de información	Communications	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
en los que estaba claro en los niveles de participación, en la creación de la política pública.	Communications	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Había un link en una página de Facebook en ese momento. Entonces podrías ingresar en y era una delimitación clara. Recuerdo que la publicación decía, abrimos la política pública para los aportes ciudad y este es el link	Communications	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
En, en la mayoría de los casos, creo que en estos procesos de CO creación lo que hace el aporte ciudadano es el cumplir simplemente una regla de creación de política pública más. No es que tú esperas que la persona que lo está elaborando los lea.	Legal/mandatory	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
hay una bitácora de las aportes ciudadanos en los que se de alguna manera se incluyeron en la política o	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Eso me permite hacer estas cosas jurídicamente y entonces yo también puedo dar un aporte a la persona con la que trabajaba o la persona a la que sonaba en ese momento.	Legal/mandatory	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned

Porque si yo solamente lo público en mi página e institucionales, realmente, no creo que las personas vayan y lo vea, o sea, están cumpliendo solamente con un requisito y no en realidad con el proceso de difusión.	Legal/mandat ory	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Sí han estado en este ejercicio académico en ese ejercicio laboral y realmente están interesadas en que esa política sirva para él, para su diario vivir, o sea que el Estado adopte. Entonces, para mí la idea sería que se adopte una posición de llamar al ciudadano. La difusión de que se está construyendo una política pública debería ser realmente masiva, o sea, realmente difundir. Creo que no se agota con la idea de convocar nada mas. A veces lo que ocurre se convoca a una jornada de mesas con los ciudadanos que invita el estado y no llega un impacto, creo que el éxito de esa política fue que su difusión fue en redes sociales.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	Co-creators
La experiencia creo que en la mayoría de los casos es muy negativa, porque si no hay ese aporte, si no hay esa ese proceso con los ciudadanos ya te digo, es como que tú lo pones. En una página web se llena un formulario de Google, ¿qué es lo que pasa?. Creo que en este caso hasta había un una plataforma creada para el efecto. Se llena un formulario, tú lo envías y hasta ahí.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Eh mira yo creo que actualmente estamos hablando de algunos años después que existió ese aporte, creo que estamos en un proceso de cocreación o de trabajo más bien formal. Aún es formal porque cumpla un requisito	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
técnico, cómo estructurarlos, cómo hacer limpieza de datos para que puedan servir, cómo aprovecharlos, cómo identificar demanda, incluso definir una metodología de datos públicos para que eventualmente puedan ser aprovechados	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
todavía datos que pueden ser irrelevantes, pero es parte del proceso hasta que ya digamos se conecte con esa identificación de demanda	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
entonces ahí tiene que haber un tratamiento y ese es una barrera super fuerte para que todo el mundo diga sí apoyó los datos abiertos porque todo el mundo piensa que van a publicar tu información personal.	Open Government	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned

Las organizaciones también vienen con su línea, incluso ideológica, entonces el estado tiene que saber manejarlo, porque en algunos casos la línea ideológica del Estado, y no porque no quiera, sino porque su línea.	Politics	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Entonces para mí en esa instancia es vital, pero creo que el Estado aún le falta abrirse a los aportes de las organizaciones.	Open Government	1 Short term	2 Citizens	Ecosystem
de gobierno abierto y todos sus pilares que es transparencia colaboración y participación ciudadana en innovación pública	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
Y es el tema de poder transparentar sus actividades, las acciones del Gobierno,	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
Entonces, lo ideal sería que el Estado se abra a esa calidad y que comunique a sus ciudadanos y no solamente haciendo estos que justamente estamos en el periodo de rendición de cuentas y no comunique a los ciudadanos que incluso necesita del ciudadano. Y la idea de necesidad del ciudadano puede aportarme y el ciudadano de a pie no el ciudadano que tenga una organización, el ciudadano puede aportar con lo que necesita, sea su necesidad, es la idea de lo que rige la política pública y luego ok si hace lo que necesita, pero como un ciudadano de a pie lo solucione.	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	2 Citizens	Co-creators
El ciudadano de a pie no lo soluciona yendo al estado, lo soluciona haciendo una cooperativa en su mismo barrio. Entonces la política pública, al ser visión estatal no está enfocada a lo que pasa en los grupos humanos pequeños, como son los barrios y las comunidades que tienen una forma de solucionar las cosas mucho más fácil, mucho más práctica y en realidad es lo que debería transversalizar la política.	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	2 Citizens	Co-creators
Y una de las principales razones de ellos es básicamente porque un existe un limitado acceso a la información pública	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
No podemos simplemente dar un paso, por qué lo queremos dar, sino que tenemos que darlo sabiendo que vamos a pisar en un lugar firme, seguro, sin que no caigamos, resbalemos, etcétera.	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned

Dijimos, entonces cómo podemos empezar a demandar esta información, pero también como contribuir a los procesos en donde seamos parte de esa toma de decisiones	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	Ecosystem
nuestro marco de referencia para impulsar una cultura de datos o basada en datos espacios independientemente de la tendencia política partidista.	Politics	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Para ese entonces habíamos trabajado con él, MINTEL como desde nuestro lado de sociedad civil, impulsando el lado técnico	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Entonces el MINTEL hizo su trabajo de convocar, pues a sus equipos que están relacionados al tema. Y desde nuestro lado identificamos como cuál sería la metodología con la que vamos a trabajar en ese proceso de cocreación	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
ver cómo con toda la parte técnica de establecer las estrellas de apertura de datos, por ejemplo,	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
entonces tenía académicos de diferentes universidades y entre ellos, pues quedamos de acuerdo de	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
establecimos una metodología de trabajo, como unos templates, formularios, etcétera, para que el Necesitas tropicalizar la información, adaptarla a la realidad local y eso fue lo que empezamos a hacer con las personas	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Y es por eso que todo este proceso lo hicimos, pues como por amor a la camiseta, porque queríamos que haya una política y una guía de datos abiertos	Intrinsic	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
clave es que mucha gente que participó lo hizo porque de verdad cree que el acceso a la información es clave para lograr cualquier tipo de transformación e innovación pública y también por procesos de transparencia.	Intrinsic	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
un proceso bastante sostenido por una parte por quienes querían aprender de un proceso de CO creación, otros por curiosidad y otros porque de verdad querían aportar también desde el lado de que esto pueda generar luego, como este efecto dominó	Intrinsic	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
donde como ciudadanía podemos exigir, pero también aportar.	Intrinsic	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Overseer
Luego creamos los indicadores, por ejemplo, la batería de indicadores que van a medir el proceso de implementación. Ahora estamos	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	Observatories

haciendo el módulo de los indicadores también, o sea que va a estar anclado al portal de datos				
fortalecimiento de capacidades a la institución pública, para que luego estos servidores sepan cómo van a levantar, como van a entregarnos esa información como sociedad civil.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Trainers
nosotros estamos manteniendo vivo y alimentando y dándole fuerza al portal de datos abiertos a través de un seguimiento constante.	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
nosotros monitoreando qué es lo que está pasando con esos procesos, en este caso con la apertura de los datos, si están cumpliendo con lo que nosotros también estamos demandando	Legal/mandatory	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	Overseer
porque sabemos que en el sector público primero no hay un presupuesto destinado para datos abiertos como.	Efficiency	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
aprovechando los datos	Open Government	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
? Trabajamos con académicos que están especializados justamente en la parte de datos abiertos.	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
nuestro lado, pues como como no solamente como usuarios de la información, sino que no también quisiéramos que lo que producimos como como sociedad civil en algún momento pueda ser también tomado como un dato oficial.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Observatories
Al menos vemos que podemos agilizar los procesos para tener, por ejemplo, capacitaciones mucho más aterrizadas a lo que nosotros detectamos que no.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Trainers
En cambio, desde nuestro lado podemos hacerlo más ágil, más rápido, entonces por esa razón decidimos como miren en estos espacios, detectamos que los servidores públicos no han leído la guía del abiertos o no conocen que hay una política de datos abiertos, entonces sabemos que los contenidos iniciales estaban justamente relacionados a suplir a cómo solventar este tipo de información.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Trainers
Entonces nosotros vamos a hacer ese acompañamiento a ellos directamente, siguiendo todos los pasos de la guía para que sea más fácil y luego todos esos resultados de lo que se den ese tiempo de trabajo y de acompañamiento, o sea, quedarán como plasmados en un documento	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Trainers

que luego el MINTEL podrá reutilizarlo una y otra vez para trabajar en la apertura				
pero esto que hemos hecho para suplir ese tipo de demanda, también de las instituciones públicas para capacitarse.	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	Trainers
las mesas de trabajo, lo que más la gente pedía eran datos	Open Government	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
conversatorios en años pasados que se puede aterrizar de lo digital a un plano más análogo para personas, por ejemplo para personas mayores, adultos mayores.	Digitalization	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Por eso los mapeos sectores para nosotros han sido claros, o sea, sabemos que los mapeos de actores te permiten entender el ecosistema cómo se están desarrollando las cosas y una de las de para nosotros que nos hace más sentido desde edades, no importa el tipo de actor.	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
O sea, si es que no tienes buena relación con un actor, sino más bien invitas a todos los actores, independientemente como de sus tendencias políticas y demás, porque debemos, o sea todos tenemos necesidades y no puede suplir las como sólo para la gente	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
vayamos, esto también para nosotros es una prueba y error porque como ciudadanos nos ponemos en la piel del ciudadano y estamos ahí como impulsando cosas, pero también el acceso a la tecnología, en muchos casos ha sido una barrera para mucha gente.	Digitalization	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
sensibilizar en cuanto al tema de información, cómo pueden participar, como pueden ser escuchados y sabemos que hay unos espacios asamblearios muy chiquitos a nivel barrio.	Communications	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Por eso los actores como dirigentes barriales, por ejemplo	Community	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
No se sabe que si esta población necesita tal cosa, entonces se puede generar tal producto o servicio, etcétera, que este justamente he realizado para solventar esas necesidades y que nos haga como un producto estandarizado para todos, creyendo que eso va a suplir la necesidad de todas estas personas, sino más bien que la toma de decisiones sea una forma inteligente.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned

Y como quisieran que sea el portal, a todos los pusimos a dibujar las Características y digamos funcionalidades que va a tener.	Open Government	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Puede ser coyuntura, no lo sabemos, pero al menos sabemos que es una oportunidad para que empecemos a transformar y que los procesos en si queden institucionalizado	Politics	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
En realidad, nosotros si quisiéramos llegar a eso que el Gobierno que venga o se vaya	Politics	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
como que no cambie esos programas que se pueden hacer como mucho bien a en este caso la sociedad y que y que continúan ejecutándose. Quién esté en el poder o no. Entonces creo que eso es una de las cosas de las alas que aspiramos.	Politics	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Asegurarse de que existan datos actualizados siempre	Open Government	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
No hacer las visualizaciones, no hacer el proyecto de innovación, sino realmente asegurarse que existen las condiciones para que suban, para que surja adopte, para que hayan más proyectos, han datos.	Open Government	1 Short term	4 NGO	Facilitator
articula al sector público privado academia que se ven representados de un grupo denominado Grupo Núcleo	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
canalizar todas estas necesidades de la ciudadanía y volverlas a materializarlas a través de una política pública.	Legal/mandatory	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Facilitator
coordina que los responsables de ejecutar estos compromisos con sus contrapartes.	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	Facilitator
Pues en el caso específico del portal, esa política que se creó dice claramente que MINTEL tiene que recoger de forma anual la demanda de datos.	Open Government	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
formalice este acto de compromiso	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
abierto lo que hace es seguimiento a los compromisos	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
recursos económicos técnicos o tecnológicos articula con las cooperaciones internacionales.	Efficiency	1 Short term	3 Government	Facilitator
generar espacios. Sobre todo para la participación y colaboración ciudadana	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Ecosystem
de innovación utilizando datos abiertos públicos, puede mejorarse en tema de las políticas públicas.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
una manera en la que claro a puerta cerrada como cuarto de guerra. Los mismos funcionarios públicos	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Co-creators

son los que dicen haber este es el problema creo que podemos hacer esto es todo.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
Nuevos negocios e innovación puede ser políticas públicas a ser más target de las políticas públicas.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Entonces la ley de orgánica de transparencia y acceso a la información pública, establece el mecanismo para tu solicitar información siempre y cuando no sea por temas de defensa nacional datos privados etcétera. Es claro entonces que si la ciudadanía quería de una u otra manera intervenir en algún acto público o en algún proyecto que se esté desarrollando era muy difícil la barrera de entrada	Legal/mandatory	4 Capacity	3 Government	Overseer
Entonces claro que resultaba eso que pasaba servicios públicos que no cumplían las expectativas de los ciudadanos porque ningún punto del desarrollo del programa o proyecto público se le consultó al ciudadano	Horizontality	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
cómo construir un edificio, el sector público dice que iba a tener cinco pisos, pero no va a tener terraza y solo va a tener un subsuelo. Pero resulta ser que ya tu terminaste de construir y el ciudadano viene y te dice: no hay rampa para acceso para discapacitados, no hay una terraza, no hay escalera de incendios. Entonces todo eso genera problemas en que el ciudadano genera desconfianza.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
el común y corriente del servidor público le ve como que hace el metiéndose en problemas o en temas públicos	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Co-creators
dice queremos trabajar en proyectos de liberación de información de transparencia y lleven a la ciudadanía, se asustan	Horizontality	1 Short term	3 Government	Co-creators
sector publico es ver la normativa decirte porque tal vez no se puede ellos no intervienen en la parte pública y etcétera.	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
es dar servicios con eficiencia entonces pienso que si actualmente se empieza a poner al ciudadano en el centro de estos servicios creo que van a ser mejorados	Efficiency	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
todavía se sigue manteniendo en un desarrollo de políticas públicas de cuarto cerrado y viéndole a la sociedad civil o academia no tu aliado sino cómo que qué así tiene que hacer, como una obligación.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned

de poder utilizarla data disponible y traducirla a mensajes o información que ya puede ser consumida por el resto de personas que quizás no están interesadas en el tema, pero que detrás de todo eso existe, digamos, un trabajo que se hace para poder pasar de datos crudos a información y posteriormente en algún punto conocimiento.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
aspecto importante aquí son los observatorios que existen o se han conformado a lo largo de antes y durante el plan de acción, p	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	3 Government	Observatories
les hago partícipes a este grupo de minoría entonces uno lo que tiene que servir de esos grupos de minoría cuyas necesidades son altas	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	3 Government	Observatories
Estado no puede ir solo o sea la innovación de por sí no viene primero del estado viene mucho más rápido del sector privado	Innovation	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Facilitator
El estado es una organización sumamente superior, parte del ser humano tiende a organizarse porque tiende a responder a temas que les afectan. El tema de la supervivencia es uno de ellos, entonces de ley, el ciudadano lo va a hacer.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Ósea si toda la ciudadanía no le das las herramientas la innovación va a morir el sector público. Se va a demorar demasiado.	Innovation	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Co-creators
Entonces a veces la LOTAIP más que una oportunidad de la interacción del ciudadano para que quiera un cambio es un obstáculo.	Legal/mandatory	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Co-creators
no podemos seguir esperando a que esto ocurra, o sea, podemos seguir demandando y generar siempre el debate de que no hay datos, no hay datos, pero entonces como nosotros también podemos aportar	Open Government	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	Ecosystem
no hay que tenerle miedo primero a una ciudadanía empoderada pienso	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Co-creators
ciudadanía más empoderada nos da puede combatir muchas cosas desde combatirá la corrupción combatir problemas de salud combatir problemas	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	3 Government	Overseer
Entonces pienso que ahí el estado se va a volver más bien en facilitador en el cual pueda darle el camino a la sociedad civil. A la academia para que ellos puedan ejecutar estas buenas prácticas y al final el estado aparte de ser el facilitador simplemente va a poder ser el constructor de esto y ciudadanos seguirá siendo el veedor. Entonces	Horizontality	4 Capacity	3 Government	Facilitator

siempre va a ser el ciudadano el veedor de lo que ellos mismos trazaron.				
preparar el terreno para que la ciudadanía siga aportando y siga apoyando.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Co-creators
creas políticas públicas con la ciudadanía, difícilmente va a fracasar porque es la misma ciudadanía la demandante la que estaba diciendo y la que va a determinar a quién le vas a terminar rindiendo cuentas.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	3 Government	Overseer
ciudadanía va a ser super más de co-ejecutor	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Co-creators
como institución puedo decir ok voy a liberar cierta información pero al final el que me demanda y el demandante es ciudadano	Open Government	5 Societal Value	3 Government	Co-creators
Entonces pienso que lo que mencionaba antes es súper importante cuando tú liberas la información es el ciudadano que puede venir con soluciones al estado. Que a veces al estado no se le pueden ocurrir incluso puede venir con soluciones que le resulten al estado gratis.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	3 Government	Co-creators
en tecnologías para el cambio social fue enfocarnos en la importancia de activar el cambio social a través del uso de las nuevas tecnologías y luego, a través de lo que es fortalecer la transparencia, el aprovechamiento, básicamente de los datos abiertos.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
información para tomar decisiones, y decisiones se toman en todos los ámbitos.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
ciudadano porque claro ósea exigir al que está bien pero la ciudadanía también tiene que empoderarse	Horizontality	4 Capacity	3 Government	Co-creators
es confianza y para dar confianza a la gente está la transparencia	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
el saber que existe todos estos datos abiertos	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
de decir, mira, soy transparente, aquí está toda la información, tú puedes revisarla y me haces las preguntas, si existe un como que un proceso de decir me puedes hacer unas preguntas de esta manera o puedes canalizar tu feedback de esta manera y eso es el valor de la confianza en las instituciones es fundamental porque es un Pilar de la democracia.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	Overseer

cultura de datos, iniciativas con datos abiertos	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Y detrás de toda una estrategia de al menos de su objetivo, globales, por ejemplo, empoderado a todo el mundo sobre sus derechos digitales, que eso es algo que también va de la mano con este tema de datos abiertos.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Las entidades creen que, porque generan una información, la información les pertenece a ellos y no le pertenece a la sociedad. Recuérdame que cuando somos entidad pública la información no nos pertenece a nosotros, le pertenece al pueblo y eso es lo que nosotros también intentamos romper. A través de esta de esta nueva onda de Gobierno abierto	Horizontality	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
del portal de datos abiertos que reposa en la infraestructura de la Secretaría nacional de planificación, dentro de mi equipo, específicamente.	Intrinsic	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
El Mintel, es responsable de la guía y política de datos abiertos. Ellos verifican que la información que se carga a través del portal de datos abiertos cumpla con los requisitos necesarios para poder publicar la información	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
entonces siento que ahí esto de que la tecnología digital pasa a ser parte de tu vida también puede influir en que estos procesos de creación o llamados a innovación,	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
. Beneficios tanto a la toma de decisiones como la información que estoy consumiendo.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Considerando varias otras cosas que qué tal vez se nos escape a nosotros como entidad pública,	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Entonces, eso va a hacer que la oferta de datos sea mucho mayor en Ecuador. Y también eso va a beneficiar muchísimo cualquier otra toma de decisiones, mejorar políticas públicas y demás, porque son datos que realmente son super interesantes de trabajar con varios municipios. Y he visto la información que tiene y creo que eso va a generar muchísimo beneficio en la sociedad y más específicamente a esa población.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned

Ellos primero tendrían que estar, es parte del trabajo, debería estar todo actualizado, deberían ser datos de calidad porque antes de publicar, por ejemplo, cuando yo voy mandó a MENDELEY, ellos se demoran al menos 48 horas en revisar, entonces no se puede tampoco publicar cualquier cosa, no por tener mayor cantidad de datos, hay que también controlar la calidad de sus datos.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	1 Academy	Facilitator
si es que no se maneja datos de calidad, actualización, responsabilidad con esos datos, entonces yo sí pienso que debería estar más bien a cargo del Gobierno.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	1 Academy	No role mentioned
O sea, no, no hay ninguna opción porque el estado por sí mismo no tiene el alcance organizacional para llegar a poblaciones de difícil acceso o tratar temas muy complejos como pobreza, pobreza extrema o violencia.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Porque no solamente está el hecho en crear un nuevo paradigma o romper el paradigma inicial que tiene el sector público, sino que también hay que educar a la ciudadanía.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
pero ¿qué pasa con la ciudadanía promedio y para abajo? Probablemente no tiene ese conocimiento. Estoy casi seguro que no tiene ese conocimiento y no está mal que no lo tenga. La verdad es que deben tener otras prioridades en su vida, que es como llevar el pan de cada día haciendo trabajo poco remunerado de actividad física de fuerza, etcétera	Horizontality	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
no tiene esa cultura, la mayor parte de la ciudadanía no tiene esa cultura. Inclusive muchos de los universitarios posiblemente tampoco tengan esa cultura,	Horizontality	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
que la parte de la Universidad para arriba es el estatus donde debemos enfocar todos esos esfuerzos para decir miren, aquí hay un portal de datos abiertos, el sector público esta disponibilidad, ando toda su información aquí para que ustedes puedan hacer el análisis que ustedes deseen hacerlo.	Education	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
aún cuando pueda tener toda la voluntad y todos los recursos no alcanza y eso implica que no alcanza al ciudadano	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned

Y se llama el principio de la buena administración. Entonces la idea de la buena administración en sí misma es que yo tenga un estado cercano al ciudadano. Y que pueda adoptar todas las herramientas que tiene el mundo para beneficio del ciudadano.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Y diciéndonos hagamos esto, hagamos esto. Así se va haciendo esa costumbre y como cuando la mamá a uno lo mandaba, decía, levántate temprano que tienes que irte a la escuela, no quería, no quería bueno, después ya la a la fuerza te acostumbraste y te levantaste temprano.	Horizontality	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
Pues es simplemente seguir dando seguimiento a las entidades ir viendo, revisando la información que está cargada, que esta de acuerdo a la guía.	Legal/mandatory	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
y para él para Gobierno, donde le hacemos, le indicamos que sería bueno que también empecemos a presentar la información geográfica	Intrinsic	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
que el Estado se concrete en un rol que permita tener los mecanismos para acceso a la ciudadanía	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	Facilitator
Entonces, ese es el tema de la información que podemos publicar y qué no podemos publicar las propias trabas.	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
Tanto si lo hacen como si lo hacemos nosotros. Pero si yo creería que tal vez pueda hacer algo que todavía toma un tiempo de que sea beneficioso o no habría que hacer análisis más profundo, por así decir	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
la población quien baja la información me dice mira, sabes que no entiende esta información o yo creo que está mal a esta información podría darme respuesta.	Horizontality	1 Short term	3 Government	Co-creators
Pero ahí hay que tener claro si una persona lo dice, no es suficiente estadística. O no es suficiente información para de considerarlo un dato estadístico y decir, esto es verdad lo que está diciendo. Ya cuando el conglomerado me dice, oye, pero por qué estás haciendo esto y merece una respuesta.	Community	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
muchas de las de los de los ciudadanos nos han dicho que hay cierta información mala y obviamente procedemos a corregirlas. Nosotros procedemos a revisarla, analizarla también y nos ponemos en contacto con el respectivo Ministerio	Horizontality	1 Short term	3 Government	Overseer

Entonces temas que son políticas públicas y políticas de Estado que le afectan al ciudadano en su diario vivir todos los días, entonces es algo de la cercanía que tiene que tener el ciudadano, y una de las formas es la virtualidad	Open Government	3 Whole-life	2 Citizens	No role mentioned
Hay que tener súper claro qué es lo que se está recibiendo como un comentario y qué cosas pueden ser procesadas como tal con el debido objetivo del caso, porque hay cosas que no vienen al caso	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Para generar valor, para entender por qué es tan importante tener un dato actualizado para sus proyectos para investigaciones, etcétera	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
proceso de participación debiera ser un poco más transparente para al parecer es una tendencia que cada proceso de participación termina cuando acaba las mesas de trabajo	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
los resultados y que luego los que están involucrados puedan hacer un seguimiento y cerrar todo el ciclo de la participación,	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
mesa de trabajo controladas ósea hay invitados de ciertos sectores que bueno ellos tienen mapeados o es a través de sus organizaciones aliadas	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
no solamente estén los actores, sino que se extiende a la sociedad civil y eso recae en el en la en la problemática de que no hay una cultura de participación y como no hay una cultura de participación no me informo como ciudadano de lo que está pasando y no puedo yo participar en algo que no entiendo que no sé de qué se trata	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Ecosystem
largas que tiene que ver con la educación	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
que uno nunca sabe lo que hace los políticos es como el tener pedir algo y luego cerrar los ojos	Politics	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
un símil no a esto de ir a meterse a zambullirse en el mar de datos que tiene el portal de datos abiertos y sacar alguna información y hacer algo debe tener una motivación.	Intrinsic	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Mira entonces y habilidades no entonces si tienes motivación las habilidades las puedes suplantar las puedes cubrir porque tú propia curiosidad te va a llevar. Y mientras tengas habilidades básicas que te puedan permitir seguir explorando y desarrollando más tus habilidades y si no tienes motivación aunque tenga las habilidades o sea, no sé qué tan	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned

productivo puede hacer entonces es complejo entonces quizás implique un proceso amplio de cultura de promover la cultura de los datos abiertos de ver que cosas se pueden hacer con ellos mostrar un sinnúmero de cosas que se puede lograr con ello. Espero esos procesos largos un proceso complejo				
Tú no vas a ver ahí a un ciudadano que dice ay que chévere yo quiero ver qué puedo hacer con los datos para ver que si responden preguntas	Intrinsic	1 Short term	4 NGO	Co-creators
No eso es un nicho a mi parecer	Intrinsic	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
no se termina enterando que fue lo que sucedió o sea que se tomó que no se tomó. Qué acciones se hicieron en esta propuestas fueron descartadas y porque fueron descartadas en fin. Yo	Communications	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
proceso participativo y claro había que ceñirse a lo que decía la normativa. La	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Y entonces dijo bueno aquí lo más rápido lo más corto es cumplir con la normativa no me voy a poner creativo oh voy a innovar. Sino que voy a cumplir con la normativa porque es lo primero, es lo primario y la normativa es eso o sea es escueta.	Innovation	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
nunca se enteraron si fueron bien recibidos o no.	Communications	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
. Sí es complejo pues al sector público habría que prepararles en estas nuevas formas de participación. Repito muchos se ciñe en la normativa porque hay que hacerlo y la normativa pues no contempla todos estos estas miradas nuestros enfoques de la participación como debiera a ver. Ni siquiera hay una herramienta adecuada como para poder recogerla en el tema de la participación o una metodología establecida amplia.	Legal/mandatory	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
nosotros es poder incidir de alguna manera para mejorar las cosas no, poder incidir en una política de datos abiertos poder incidir, en el portal, poder incidir en una política de ciencia abierta por eso es digamos nuestra motivación.	Intrinsic	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
que se motive por estar gastando su tiempo en estos espacios donde lo escuchan y luego no sabes si realmente lo escucharon solamente por cumplir una normativa una política o para decir que ya hacemos un proceso de participación.	Legal/mandatory	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned

Sí bueno primero el gobierno tendría que bajarse un poco de la silla y dejar de mirar hacia abajo y ponerse un poco como a nivel del ciudadano. Lo cual es complejo porque de eso va a depender de las	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Ecosystem
autoridades y las autoridades normalmente entran por eso tema político	Politics	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Pero las organizaciones civil también un poco se encierra en casi lo mismo no. ya no hay una continuidad de lo qué está haciendo	Continuity	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Cambiaste mañana ya no se puede depender del gobierno de turno es y lo único que no va a cambiar son las motivaciones de los ciudadanos no entonces yo creo que es vital.	Politics	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
No nos podemos esperar en que el gobierno de turno abra los ojos y haga bien las cosas. Es necesario que las comunidades estén organizadas, que las comunidades estén informadas y que puedan trabajar conjuntamente es vital que y claro en el tema de datos abiertos	Community	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	Ecosystem
pues hablemos de un gobierno que trabaja muy de la mano con comunidades con organización de la sociedad civil en para dar solución a algún problema en conjunto no y que si esto como algo medio lo instalaste si esto pudiera ser retribuido	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	Ecosystem
Que puedan zambullirse en la piscina de datos abiertos del portal nacional de datos abiertos o el portal de datos abiertos del municipio de Quito y que puedan ver los datos.	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Y que ellos puedan decir ok aquí hay una falla en la meta data aquí a los datos están incompleto esto no se entiende	Horizontality	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Overseer
Yo me acuerdo tú solo por poner un ejemplo, hace como diez años yo colaboraba con mi papá en los cursos de actuación que él daba y le ayudaba en los talleres en los cursos también involucra un poco y también daba clases. Y decíamos con mi papá este de el ochenta por ciento de los estudiantes que llegaban este no van a ser actores no van a trabajar en un canal de televisión probablemente jamás en su vida. Quizás un veinte por ciento, un diez por ciento, siendo optimista. Pero seguramente sí serán público.	Education	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	Ecosystem
a alguien ve aquí hay este portal de datos alguien que si está motivado y	Community	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned

que si está interesado de asistir a los eventos de datos abiertos.				
Basada en la evidencia que tenemos en la información en que también se pueda crear proyectos que estén basados justamente en datos que tenemos en para que nos vuelva mucho más competitivos a nivel de industrias de conocimiento.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
No sé o sea me estoy inventando no debiera estar normado, pero tal manera que sea flexible y poder seguir modelos internacionales o estándares internacionales. P	Legal/mandat ory	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
De alguna manera tendrá que regular para que los ciudadanos hagan las cosas bien como debe ser. Que no vaya uno encima sobre otro, es una función que tiene el estado. Pero debiera ser horizontal el estado del futuro deberá ser bueno aquí vamos a regular en conjunto o sea aquí hay una normativa que se han hecho para poder beneficiar al a la gente	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Facilitator
Yo que pensaba que era esa como el estado del futuro, un estado que regula pero que regula con los ciudadanos.	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	Facilitator
Entonces no sé quizás por ahí no está horizontal está donde todos puedan participar de alguna manera.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Ecosyste m
estuvo haciendo lobby para poder llegar a un tipo de normativa que terminaba excluyendo a la gran mayoría	Intrinsic	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Entonces por eso el tema de la horizontalidad es importante porque si no estos nichos de participación terminan incidiendo y el que tiene más poder pues lo logra.	Intrinsic	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Ecosyste m
profundizar temas como las tecnologías para socializar datos abiertos, ver no abiertos, participación, transparencia, e innovación cívica.	Intrinsic	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
abierto no existe si no está sociedad civil involucrada o la academia entonces por cada compromiso	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
predicando sobre la importancia	Education	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
ponerle a ciudadano como el centro o en el eje del desarrollo de política pública	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Pero no es lo mismo, datos abiertos es un medio para un fin y el fin es el gobierno abierto. El fin es transparentar dar colaboración participación e innovación ciudadana	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned

los datos abiertos son un medio para este fin.				
lo que busca el indicador es incorporar a más funciones del Estado a más instituciones públicas que se vinculen a trabajar con este nuevo modelo de gestión y sobre eso se va a medir.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
lógica de visualización, el ejercicio que hemos hecho algunos	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Mediator
ejercicio como para tener esos casos locales y tratar de inspirar y motivar a que se hagan cosas.	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
con esta fama o este espacio que vimos porque ya nos identificaban que estábamos en este juego, me invitaron a formar parte del grupo Núcleo de Gobierno abierto	Intrinsic	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
. Hay que recordar que el Ecuador tiene esa particularidad de que tiene cinco poderes del Estado, funciones del estado que es: el ejecutivo, el legislativo, electoral la función de transparencia y control social, y si mal no estoy que se me escapa, el judicial exacto el judicial. Entonces muchos también en la parte de la sociedad civil se ve limitada al accionar en el ejecutivo no quiere decir que no lo han hecho lo han hecho.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
no había, digamos, una estructura legal normativa que habilite a las entidades públicas, es decir solo publicaban, digamos por porque a uno le cae bien, o sea una cosa así sin formalidad.	Legal/mandatory	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Entonces de nuestro lado sí estamos buscando la manera de facilitarle el camino a la ciudadanía para darles todas las herramientas que pueden seguir fomentando y potenciar el tema de cocreación	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
muchas de esas herramientas están destinadas a desaparecer o a no seguir potenciando mejorándose	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
planificación e hicimos un diagnóstico que te puedo compartir el documento.	Intrinsic	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
esta nueva ola de gobernanza, no una ola que digamos tiene un enfoque nuevo, fresco y que busca algo que le está haciendo falta, digamos, no sólo Ecuador, sino a los países de toda la región de América Latina.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned

Gobierno sin duda alguna también le interesa eso porque sin la información no podemos tomar decisiones de políticas públicas, que es lo que busca un Gobierno en sí a través de sus diferentes ministerios.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Pero si hay algunos elementos que no están rindiendo o no están funcionando en la medida de lo necesario, pues yo creería que la participación se va a haber sesgada a un criterio negativo. Entonces el tema de que sea bueno o malo en realidad depende mucho de cómo se constituye esta. Y	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Sino que también cuando estuvimos en reuniones con el Gobierno por el tema del portal de datos abiertos, el presidente resaltaba mucho eso, él decía, bueno, si me van a cuestionar si yo le voy a dar la información al pueblo para que me cuestione, pues que me cuestione, está bien. Porque la idea es esa, la idea es saber qué es lo que no estoy haciendo	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Overseer
Estamos generando esta conciencia de que transparentar las acciones públicas es lo fundamental y ¿cómo transparentamos? A través de la disponibilidad de la información para poder hacer todos los análisis que necesitamos.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Porque hay que tener primero, claro hacia dónde queremos encaminar el país y esa es la política pública. Primero definamos la política y después definamos hacia dónde vamos a destinar los recursos. Entonces ese es el orden, cómo se genera. Y todo eso parte de la Secretaría, nosotros generamos el plan, tenemos un tiempo.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
a promocionar la cultura libre en la ciencia abierta software libre.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
proceso me ha dado una grata sorpresa, obviamente. Es difícil o ha sido usualmente difícil con el actual trabajo del sector público Que encuentres una apertura	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Y digamos una Disponibilidad de conversar de igual a igual, con alguien no gubernamental y esto lo rescató, digamos, de los dos gobiernos,	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
El equipo que quiere implementar esto actualmente es de Una persona, era él. Y eso quizás facilitó a que haya esa apertura a que desde sociedad civil.	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned

Se pueda proponer, puede acompañarse, pueda, digamos, buscar y sugerir y decirles ¿Qué podrían hacer esto por este lado? O no por acá activar conversaciones o conversaciones con con unos cooperantes.	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
habido toda la apertura de interés, una conversación bastante directa a nivel whatsapp, realmente con los funcionarios que en el tema, o sea, sin formalidades.	Communications	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
realmente quiere que algo pase, que algo cambie, no simplemente seguir un guión o para una foto.	Communications	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Pienso que sí a nivel de norma se pone tanta minucia tanto detalle de cómo debiera ser un proceso participativo. Podríamos pecar de errar, mañana hay una innovación en el tema y se ve que es mejor resultado haciéndolo de esta otra manera y lo cerraste mucho en una norma pues está jodido.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
siempre como un medio para un fin y no como un fin	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
es en esta lógica de impulsar, a inspirar, y medir cómo se implementará el tema de datos abiertos a nivel de gobiernos locales, municipios, y prefecturas.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
depende mucho de esa visibilidad que puedan tener los compromisos	Communications	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
días están poniendo algún tweet, alguna publicación en redes	Continuity	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
microeconomía la transparencia fiscal, la publicación de datos presupuestarios.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
identificar intereses. Como te comenté durante el proceso del portal. Y luego hicimos otro posteriormente y lo que veíamos es que el tipo de datos que la gente necesitaba, que decía que necesitaba eran datos relacionados a entender los territorios de mercados,	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
partíamos del problema que quieres resolver. Qué datos tienen y quien los produce. Porque también Otro error común, es cómo sabes, comenzar por los datos.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
suponte que siempre te queda el caso extremo, que viene un un Gobierno de tendencia y como este proceso ha sido elaborado en Gobierno de Moreno, Lasso viene anti Moreno y Lasso y dice esa vaina se va porque era de ellos no, yo soy otra cosa, siempre hay ese riesgo final, pero yo	Politics	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned

creo que como te digo yo no veo al momento.				
Y de sociedad civil A nosotros nos interesa que el que el tema se sostenga, es irrelevante quienes estén	Politics	2 Medium/Long	4 NGO	No role mentioned
creo que también tiene que ver con un cambio cultural,	Education	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Gobierno que sea sincera y dice yo no puedo todo, no puedo resolverlo.	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	Facilitator
habrá espacio para ver quién tenga una idea y cree que podrá subir los, proponga	Intrinsic	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
todo este estos eventos se escuchaban tú proponías, entusiaste todo el tema y no pasaba nada.Entonces esa confianza de convocar a la gente, por eso creación y vas a sufrir, poner. Se rompió un poco con el proceso abierto.	Intrinsic	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
el Gobierno sea sinceré el actual, el que venga quien sea.? Yo no puedo todo	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Entonces todos estos ecosistemas que tú ves en la en la región de datos para innovación. En Ecuador si tú eres emprendedor o eres un ciudadano que quiere proponer algo para el Gobierno, lo haga, tienes que traer la lógica del problema	Innovation	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
O quizás necesito pensar como fuera de la caja, no estoy aquí en estas cuatro paredes todo el día con esta gente que me adule que me dice que esto es lo máximo. ¿Volver a afuera a quien me propone algo, no?	Horizontality	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Primera si realmente esto sirve para algo	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
luego otra es que se sostenga en el tiempo, no que un Gobierno	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Entonces yo Creo que Es un panorama incierto. No hay una certeza de que avance con el mando no	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Entonces el rol de los gobiernos, tanto en ese como en este tema de acá. No es crear. Es asegurarse que existan las condiciones para que suba. Entonces, no es que el Gobierno debe crear las visualizaciones no es que el Gobierno debe crear los proyectos, no es el Gobierno, debe hacer los emprendimientos	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Facilitator
. Con un cambio cultural, principalmente	Education	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned

Asegurarse de identificar siempre la demanda de forma permanente para que estén disponibles los datos que las necesita. Ese es el rol que debe tener, o sea, no desde mi punto de vista.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
oiga, aquí hace falta un parque que pongan el presupuesto y tienen que ponerlo porque eso está normado en la ley de participación ciudadana, pero eso se desconoce.	Education	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
no te difunde cuando va hacer esta asamblea donde la ciudadanía puede expresarse, puede sugerir lo que necesita. Sino que difunde cuando ya fue	Communications	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Y básicamente eran los saludos y aplausos al alcalde.	Communications	1 Short term	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Entonces creo que tiene que haber una conciencia de que participar es un derecho y que existen mecanismos.	Education	4 Capacity	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Entonces, en ese sentido, digamos, el ciudadano común, la gente no técnica, por decirlo, así que no tiene una, no tiene un acercamiento al tema de datos. Inicia a hacer dos cosas, la primera participar, o sea, sí, bueno okay, yo quiero usar esto como lo uso, no soy técnico ya okay o aprendo o busco alguien que lo sepa. Lo segundo, no están los datos que necesito okay los pido. Esto no se da o no se suele dar, por la desconfianza.	Intrinsic	4 Capacity	4 NGO	Mediator
¿Qué es la participación ciudadana? La gente usualmente te responde votar en elecciones. Pero en el	Open Government	5 Societal Value	4 NGO	No role mentioned
Yo creo que va a ser muy difícil que haya una activación realmente amplia ciudadana el tema y esto se va a va a permanecer siendo algo que sólo lo aprovecha el círculo que que conoce o que por que sabe del tema en lo técnico y lo conocer, dónde pedirlo.	Intrinsic	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	Co-creators
Pero necesita articular varias acciones y que la institucionalidad que corresponde al al ejercicio de aplicación de la ley de participación ciudadana.	Legal/mandatory	3 Whole-life	4 NGO	No role mentioned
datos abiertos como una parte de gobierno electrónico	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
básicos fueron cocreados y articulamos con la secretaría nacional de planificación. Porque es esta entidad la que gestiona la plataforma de datos abiertos y viéndolo como un todo no solamente la normativa, la parte de rectoría y regulación que tiene el MINTEL sino también la	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned

parte de poner a disposición esos conjuntos de datos para que tengan libre acceso				
del gobierno abierto que es la transparencia, participación y colaboración	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
Porque el plan de acción de gobierno abierto lo coordina se gestiona desde la presidencia de la república se puso responsables y contrapartes en cada uno de estos compromisos. El responsable desde el sector gobierno y el corresponsable o la contraparte es de sociedad civil	Horizontality	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
se han establecido nexos y seguimos trabajando porque a la final es un trabajo que inicia y que tú quieres ver qué avances que vaya alcanzando cierta madurez este vínculo se siguen manteniendo.	Continuity	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Ecosystem
de datos abiertos, realmente sí ha sido una sinergia como decimos. Al actuar por cada uno por su lado a veces te lo lleva un poco más de trabajo. El tener esta vinculación sí nos ha permitido llegar a más aún tener una mayor cobertura tanto de participación como de invitación de eventos de cosas que ya haya acciones específicas que hemos llevado a cabo	Horizontality	1 Short term	3 Government	Ecosystem
Desde la experiencia con lo del compromiso de la política de guía de datos abiertos realmente ha sido se ha multiplicado. Podías ponerle como un objetivo a seis meses por ejemplo hemos sacado antes gracias a este apoyo.	Efficiency	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
Al final seguimos apoyándonos, porque los proyectos se siguen vinculando porque estamos trabajando en la misma área, en las mismas líneas. Es como el uno y empuja el otro y vamos tratando de salir de manera solidaria si se puede llamar se puede poner término.	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
Si emites algo tienes que tener un cierto proceso participativo, independiente del que sea por que existen varios. Si al menos del que menciones que es lo que se hizo previó. Entonces me parece eso es como una buena práctica que si se está en la mente en la institución	Continuity	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Pero la mayoría yo creo que sí es como una buena costumbre tanto desde el gobierno como de sociedad civil tú ya sabes que se va a emitir cierto normativa y estás pendiente	Legal/mandatory	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned

Ahora con las plataformas también que te facilitan participar y conocimientos de diferentes tipos de instrumentos y poder opinar pero que si se va creando esta cultura de lado y lado.	Communications	1 Short term	3 Government	Ecosystem
Sí bueno vamos avanzando, la guía este planteada en un ciclo de mejora continua.	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
sabemos que nos hace falta énfasis en difusión en procesos de reutilización en mostrar a la ciudadanía la utilidad del potencial que tiene y eso tenemos previsto hacer en este año	Horizontality	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
sabemos que tenemos que ir mejorando y la secretaría nacional de planificación está consciente de esto y está recogiendo observaciones para poner más funcionalidad	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
Para que la ciudadanía se le haga más fácil poder encontrar buscar e incluso también para que a nosotros nos permita tener las autorizaciones	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
Al momento existe el menú dónde hay un centro de aprendizaje, están puestos los cursos virtuales y están los manuales y los lineamientos de como subir datos al portal.	Education	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
Hay cursos virtuales para funcionarios públicos y también para ciudadanos sobre datos abiertos	Education	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
Estamos recopilando información está previsto, está previsto hacer estas mejoras y desde la parte normativa también está previsto actualizar su política y si es cabe también la guía	Open Government	2 Medium/Long	3 Government	No role mentioned
nuestro aprendizaje también porque ya tenemos la iniciativa ahora sí ya podemos juntar en base a la experiencia a la realidad que nos pasó, que aprendimos, que vamos a ir mejorando.	Open Government	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned
DATALAT también tiene previsto formar un observatorio crear un observatorio, irle	Horizontality	4 Capacity	3 Government	Observatories
enriqueciendo todo el proceso ir sumando al ecosistema hay bastantes cosas ahí que se puede probar.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
El funcionario público también es el que utiliza los datos pero si hay que conocer lo que tienes. Nosotros iniciamos un proceso de que cada una de las entidades te cuente cuáles son los datos que tiene porque a veces ni siquiera en la misma entiendo sabemos qué datos estás publicando	Open Government	4 Capacity	3 Government	Co-creators
Obviamente hace falta un proceso de desarrollo de capacidades	Open Government	4 Capacity	3 Government	No role mentioned

permanente del sector público, la rotación de personal es alta. Iniciamos con un equipo al cabo de dos meses nos han cambiado todo el equipo no toca volver sobre la marcha.				
Aún así tenemos muchas metas propuestas, involucrar seguir incentivando de todos los ámbitos no de todos los sectores no solamente te digo de fuera pero bien funcionarios públicos que conozcan sus propios datos.	Open Government	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
. Incluso ahí medir el impacto es limitado, hablamos del impacto en general, estás hablando de valor social	Open Government	5 Societal Value	3 Government	No role mentioned
Yo voy a que si se genera un valor público, se llega a impactar a tener un cambio o algo no importa si solamente eso me da más una categorización.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	3 Government	No role mentioned
Como referencia en la primera edición en la medición sacamos 0 y en el 2020 llegamos a 5. Esperamos que nos des la pauta la receta.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	3 Government	No role mentioned
Nosotros hacemos el esfuerzo estamos dándote información cuéntanos qué hiciste igual que tú necesitas información quieres conocer un poco mas comparte lo que haces, es como un ganar – ganar	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	3 Government	Ecosystem
Cómo mantener a la ciudadanía involucrados. Que es la única manera, que hay que obtener ventajas de parte y parte. No seriamente tiene que ser retribución económica, puede tener ventajas, o ventajas competitivas puedes obtener algo que te ayude	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	3 Government	Co-creators
Sabemos que un dato que no responde a la realidad, que no está completo no sirve	Open Government	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
O sea yo pienso que sí es complejo todavía dejar una total descentralización podemos decirlo así o pasarlo a administración de sociedad civil.	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
O sea es como todos tú no puedes como tú dices de pronto existe este civismo este patriotismo del ciudadano en participar sin tener nada a cambio pero igual o sea si ya tienes como un tipo de actividad le vas a dedicar tiempo esfuerzo y recursos	Intrinsic	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Cuáles son las responsabilidades hasta dónde llega a cierto alcance porque incluso la razón de ser no estamos hablando de servicio público	Horizontality	5 Societal Value	3 Government	No role mentioned

no entonces está enfocado a la sociedad el servicio al bienestar al menos en teoría tu lo vez así				
entendimiento unas reglas claras de negociación, es una negociación a la final y como te digo a ver quien llega hasta qué punto. Y se va a perder, se pierde un poco la línea entre la ventaja de obtener beneficios para ti, a que el beneficio sea para el ciudadano un bien social.	Open Government	5 Societal Value	3 Government	No role mentioned
Ahí te compartir la guía y la política de datos abiertos ahí puedes ver al final de está en la lista de todos quienes formaron parte de las mesas. Esta en la política como en la guía con nombres y apellidos.	Communications	1 Short term	3 Government	No role mentioned
. Y cuando son participación electrónica hemos que se ha hecho. Hay un análisis de trazabilidad se acoge no se acoge tal razón así.	Communications	3 Whole-life	3 Government	No role mentioned
Saber apoyarse y aprovechar el expertise del uno y del otro. Y sacarle provecho que es lo que esperamos	Horizontality	3 Whole-life	3 Government	Ecosystem