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During the last five years design has been recognized as a powerful innovation driver. Design methods and tools have also been applied in new fields. One of them is social innovation which is aimed at developing new ideas and solutions as response to social needs. While different initiatives have demonstrated how design can be a powerful approach in social innovation, especially when it comes to systemic thinking, prototyping and visualizing, some concerns have been raised regarding the limitations of applying design in this field. Through a specific case this paper will discuss and suggests some approaches and concepts related to design for social innovation. Coming from a participatory design tradition we focus on the idea of infrastructuring as a way to approach social innovation that differs from project-based design. The activities that are carried out are aimed at building long term relationships with stakeholders in order to create networks from which design opportunities can emerge. We also discuss the role of prototyping as a way to explore opportunities but also highlight dilemmas.

Keywords: design for social innovation; participatory design; prototyping; infrastructuring; Thing; agonistic space

1. Introduction

Since the beginning of the 21st century there has been a global awakening about the complexity of the social, economical and ecological challenges we have to face. It has also been clear that old models do not meet those challenges in an adequate way. Therefore both politicians and business leaders are now looking to social innovation as a way to develop new solutions. During the last five years also designers have increasingly started to be engaged in this field. The design approach based on user centered perspective, involvement of stakeholders through participatory design and rapid prototyping has proven to be useful in social innovation (Murray et al 2010). However a number of failed projects have also highlighted that designers need to develop new approaches to be able to contribute in this new field (Mulgan 2009).

With a background in participatory design we have been engaged in setting up Medea Living Labs, an innovation environment at Malmö University. The aim with these labs is to collaborate with diverse stakeholders (NGOs, municipalities, business
partners) in the city of Malmö to explore how new services to tackle social issues could be developed. In our activities we are using the knowledge we gained from our previous experiences in participatory design projects and elaborate them to fit the context of social innovation.

In this paper we would like to discuss some of the concept and approaches that have emerged through our research. We will introduce and discuss the concepts of “Things” and “Agonistic Space” (Björgvinsson et al. 2010) to stress how prototyping could be seen as vehicle that reveal both opportunities and dilemmas. We will also present the concept of “Infrastructuring” (Björgvinsson et al. 2010) to highlight how design could move beyond the “design project” towards a more open-ended long term process where diverse stakeholders can innovate together. We will then connect these concepts to a case and finally discuss how they relate to other ideas from the field of social innovation.

2. Social innovation and design

According to the Young Foundation (one of the most prominent organizations in promoting social innovation) existing structures and policies lack of solutions to some of today’s most pressing issues, such as climate change or chronic diseases (Murray et al. 2010). Therefore more and more actors (non-profit organisations, politicians and business leaders) turn to social innovation for new solutions. The Young Foundation defines social innovation as:

new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations. In other words, they are innovations that are both good for society and enhance society’s capacity to act (p.3 Murray et al. 2010).

At the core of social innovation is openness and participation:

involving users at every stage as well as experts, bureaucrats and professionals;
designing platforms which make it easy to assemble project teams or virtual organisations (p.7 in Murray et al. 2010).

Examples of social innovation range from The Open University, Wikipedia, micro loans, hospice, fair trade to magazines for homeless people like The Big Issue (Mulgan 2006).

Social innovation is not a new idea but it has gained increased attention in recent years from both political and economic leaders. In the USA president Obama have created the Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation as a recognition that the ‘best solutions to our challenges will be found in communities across the country’ (SICP 2010). Social innovation has also become a key priority in the European Union’s latest innovation policy and considered to be a new field which should be nurtured:

It is about tapping into the ingenuity of charities, associations and social entrepreneurs to find new ways of meeting social needs which are not adequately met by the market or the public sector (p.21 in European Commission 2010).

Among the many hundreds of methods and tools from different fields that are used in social innovation, design approaches have been recognized as important instruments
(Murray et al 2010, The Rockefeller Foundation and Continuum 2008). The director of the Young Foundation, Geoff Mulgan, has listed, starting from experiences on the field, strengths and weaknesses in applying design in social innovation. Some of the strengths are: visualization techniques that support the involvement of diverse stakeholders in the process, user-centred approach as a complement to top down methods, fast prototyping to rapidly test models in practice, systemic approach to reflect around food-, energy- or care systems (Mulgan 2009).

One early example of professional designers starting to ‘tackle social and economic issues through design led innovation’ (Design Council RED 2004) was the British Design Council’s RED unit which was active between 2004-06 (Design Council RED 2004). The members of the RED unit (with backgrounds in design, social sciences and policy) have contributed to the theory of a new social focus in design, mainly through the reports Health: Co-creating services (Cottam et al. 2004) and Transformation design (Burns et al. 2006), as they have named the new emerging design discipline. The transformation design approach includes involving heterogeneous stakeholders from the beginning through participatory design. With the statement ‘design is never done’ (p.26 Burns et al. 2006) they mean that the professional designer should transfer capacities among the actors to enable them to ‘continually responding, adapting and innovating’ (p.21 Burns et al. 2006). The RED unit state that transformation design is aimed at leaving behind ‘the tools, skills and organisational capacity for ongoing change’ (p. 21 Burns et al. 2006).

In 2007 the RED unit developed into the social enterprise Participle, who together with service design companies like live|work, Think Public and Engine have made UK a leading scene in design for social innovation. There are several reasons for this development in the UK. First, the Design Council has actively supported the use of design in responding to social challenges through projects like the RED unit and demonstrative programmes like Designs of the time (Dott 2010) and Public services by design (Design Council 2010). Secondly, in the UK there are close links between social responsive designers and leading organisations for social innovation like The Young Foundation, the think-tank DEMOS and the innovation organisation Nesta that has highlighted that today’s challenges need new kinds of responses and new kinds of public policies and services. Thirdly, the public sector has collaborated with, mainly, service designers to develop better health services (ThinkPublic 2010) or new platforms for co-creation like the Social Innovation Lab for Kent (SILK 2010). Furthermore, design for social innovation has also acquired a political role because of the government’s Big Society policy which aims at increasing the possibilities for citizens to participate and co-create public services. This policy has clear parallels to the ideas that drive both social innovation and designers involved in this field, for instance the Dott programme (Dott Cornwall 2010).

Another important centre in the development of design for social innovation has been Politecnico di Milano where Ezio Manzini and François Jégou have been leading an international network of design researchers and design schools interested in design for social innovation and sustainability. For many years these network activities have been manifested through the platform The Sustainable Everyday Project (SEP 2010). Also based at the Politecnico is the international network DESIS (Design for Social Innovation and Sustainability) that works to promote and support social innovation developed through design (DESIS 2010). The DESIS network vision states that the professional design community has a major role to play in facing social innovation and the new emerging designing networks. A designing network is:
a complex system of interwoven design processes that involves individuals, enterprises, non-profit organizations, local and global institutions who imagine and put into practice solutions to a variety of individual and social problems (p.40 in Jégou et al. 2008).

One interesting example of how design can contribute to social innovation is represented by the French organisation La 27e Région (La 27e Région 2010) that supports regional governments in developing collaborative projects to respond to local issues by establishing temporary laboratories where multidisciplinary team of civil servants, designers and citizens co-design new solutions in response to issues like health, employment, education or obesity.

Also in the USA there is a growing interest in design for social innovation: it is among the expertise areas offered by companies like IDEO, Continuum and Frog Design. However design for social innovation in the USA is often related to projects in developing countries (Brown and Wyatt 2010) and in that way differs from Europe where design for social innovation means co-designing with public servants or communities to develop solutions for local needs (Design Council 2008, Jégou and Manzini eds. 2008). Working more in a European way is the DESIS Research Lab at Parsons The New School for Design in New York that works with local creative communities in the Lower East Side to develop collaborative services and sustainable life styles (New School’s DESIS Lab 2010). Also Project H Design is working with a local community in rural USA and they bring design skills into public education (Project H Design 2010).

2.1 Limits of design for social innovation

Some actors working with social innovation have recently expressed concerns about the role of design in this field, pointing out the weaknesses of designers and the limits of design methods. These reflections made it clear that design must be adapted to this new landscape in order to avoid naive and superficial approaches. Going back to Geoff Mulgans (2009) list (which was also highlighted and commented in a blog by Stéphane Vincent (Vincent 2009), the director of La 27e Région) the weaknesses concern: lack of economical and organizational skills, inabilities in driving the implementation process, the high cost of design consultants that often do not have a long term commitment in the projects and the superficiality of some proposals due to the fact that by ignoring the evidence and field experiences designers tend to “reinvent the wheel”.

Critique are also coming from the design community: the studio InWithFor questions the ‘design thinking’ approach in social innovation and underlines the necessity of moving beyond scenarios and isolated cases towards large scale interventions able to foster long term change:

if we want to solve big social problem we need more than design thinking. Big social problems have many causes; involve real tradeoffs; and require solutions that can work with multiple user groups across multiple levels. We need the critical questioning of social policy alongside the creative freshness of design. Indeed if we want to achieve long-term social transformation, we must be equipped to develop, test and spread robust theories of change (Schulman 2010).
These and other concerns are driving the attention to the competences and the skills designers are missing in the project development but also in the implementation process, when the proposed scenarios and prototypes should be developed in concrete services and solutions. And finally some of them are also highlighting the need to find strategies for scaling up social innovations in order to reach systemic change.

To respond to these challenges, as Geoff Mulgan (2009) suggested, design needs to collaborate closer with other disciplines involved in social innovation as well as importing tools and methods that could support the development of robust proposals and their implementation in real contexts. This relates to the idea that designers have to acknowledge that other disciplines are creative and need to define a role and position for themselves within a designing network (Jégou et al. 2008).

From these experiences from both design and social innovation we will below relate the ideas of long term design process and designing networks to the concepts “Thing”, “Agonistic Space” and “Infrastructuring”. First we will look at the role of prototyping in social innovation.

3. Prototyping for social innovation

Prototyping is at the core of design and it has been stressed in design thinking and transformation design as a way to ‘fail early to succeed sooner’, especially when it is conducted in the actual context of use (Brown and Wyatt 2010, Burns et al. 2006). According to Murray et al. (2010) refining and testing ideas is important in the social economy:

because it’s through iteration, and trial and error, that coalitions gather strength (for example, linking users to professionals) and conflicts are resolved (including battles with entrenched interests) (p.12 in Murray et al. 2010)

There are different types of prototypes used in social innovation. For example Fast prototyping, originally from software development, has spread into service prototyping and the social field where it often is important to move quickly into practice.

In contrast a more long term approach to prototyping has been suggested from both social innovation practitioners and the participatory design community.

For example the Young Foundation refers to slow prototyping as a process that can be used in situations where new capacities are necessary for a new model to succeed and where a more organic evolution is preferred:

Slow prototyping takes an idea and refines it slowly throughout extensive user testing before a final version is delivered. Slow prototyping can accommodate a gradual scaling up process – making sure that the final version can be adaptable to accommodate the nuances of specific geographical areas or communities of need (The Young Foundation 2011).

A similar approach has emerged in the participatory design community where researchers have stressed how design work and prototyping should be performed through co-creation on long term basis in the actual context. (Dittrich 2002, Björgvinsson and Hillgren 2004). Also Sarah Schulman, replying to the article Design Thinking for Social Innovation (Brown and Wyatt 2010), argued that, when dealing with
social innovation, prototyping needs to move beyond rapid prototyping (that mainly focus on testing the user experience of a future service) into a more long term exploration that includes future roles and resource flows within the public systems. She also describes how prototypes can be a way of creating good teams and to build capacity, which 'means enabling policy people, practitioners, and users to run parts of the prototype' (Schulman 2010).

From our experience prototyping can also be seen as “Things”. “Things” in ancient Nordic and Germanic societies were originally assemblies, rituals and places where disputes were dealt with and political decisions made. The concept stress that a prototype not only can be viewed as a thing (an object) but rather as socio-material relations where matters of concerns can be dealt with (Björgvinsson et al 2010).

Another related perspective is to consider prototypes as vehicles able to rise questions as well as highlighting controversies and dilemmas. The importance of allowing controversies side by side, instead of negotiating them into consensus has been stressed by Chantal Mouffe as “Agnostic Spaces”. For her, “Agnostic Spaces” allow a polyphony of conflicting voices, which, despite of the oppositions are respecting each other and are united by passionate engagement (Mouffe 2000).

We argue that these concepts are important because social innovation deals with complex problems that intertwine with and affect so many different systems and actors in society. We also think that prototype can support to for-see how a radical change can affect power relations or different political views. These concepts may be seen as abstract but we will soon try to elaborate them through the case with Herrgårds women association. First we will give a brief background to our work environment and research setting.

4. Malmö Living Labs and the NGO Herrgårds Kvinnoförening (HKF)

Malmö Living Labs consist of three environments (The Scene, The Neighborhood and The Factory) which are part of MEDEA an academic initiative at Malmö University exploring new media and collaborative processes. In recent years Living Lab environments have spread considerably in Europe developing slightly different identities. However most of them define themselves as user-driven innovation milieus aimed at developing new technological services and products in real world environments by fostering the collaboration between researchers, companies, public and civic sector (Stålbroșt 2008). The activities of Malmö Living Labs are focusing on supporting local actors in developing grass-root social innovation, through processes aimed at exploring possibilities and at building win-win connections between heterogeneous stakeholders. This way of working implies the creation of robust and long term relationships between the involved actors and an on-going investigation aimed at identify new possible partners. This continuous research led us to meet Herrgårds Kvinnoförening in 2009.

Herrgårds Kvinnoförening (HKF) is an NGO of immigrant women, founded by five women eight years ago in Rosengård, Malmö as a response to them feeling excluded from the Swedish society. The organization counts approximately 400 members (200 of them are children) with different nationality background: Iranian, Iraqi, Bosnian and, most of them, Afghan. Most of them are living on social security funding, have limited skills in Swedish, many are illiterates and generally lack higher education. The activities of the NGO are focusing on cooking, textile design, traditional clothing and carpet
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production. They have also an important role in the neighborhood dealing with social issues (e.g. honour-related violence) and organizing educational events in collaboration with the city around health issues (e.g. sexual health). The core group of 5 women meets regularly and depending of what kind of activities are carried on other members participate.

During the first meetings with the women they expressed their desire of being more integrated in the Swedish society by finding opportunities where their abilities and skills could be valued. Proving that HKF activities (considered to be ‘leisure’ by the authorities) can be viewed as more ‘professional’, would demonstrate how an immigrant NGO could be a socio-economical resource for the swedish society.

Together with HKF we started to map their qualities and to look for possible partners (companies, civil servants, NGOs) by arranging workshops and meetings. This initial explorations allowed to identify actors who were interested in “trying out” some activities by collaborating in different prototypes.

4.1 Prototype 1, the catering service

After a suggestion from HKF we started to develop some prototypes around their cooking activities. Initially we tried to understand how their cooking skills could be developed into a service including knowledge about the food ingredients and the original cultural context. We also explored if the women could have an active role when delivering the food and not just handing over it on the door. Facilitated by us the women produced leaflets about the food (see picture x) to be distributed to the clients and we supported them in getting some catering orders.

Once we put them in contact with an architect firm and we accompanied them to the pitch where the women provided some tastes of afghan and iraqi food to the CEOs of the company. The architects clearly expressed their enthusiasm about the additional cultural experience and quickly adopted the afghan terminology: “Could you please bring me one more Kobbe?”. It seemed that both of the stakeholders were satisfied and that the studio would place the order, so, as designers, we stepped back leaving the women doing their business. Unfortunately few days later HKF informed us that the architects turned down their offer, apparently because they thought that HKF were suddenly too expensive. We phoned the studio and discover that some miscommunication happened: the company was asking the women to provide them with a formal offer stating the menu and the quantity of food they would deliver. The women were not used to these kind of request, and something went wrong in the communication between the actors: the architects thought that the quantity of food HKF would deliver would not be fair for the price they were charging them.

Looking back we should have helped the women to structure their offer in a clear way (we are about to do it now). However during the prototyping with HKF it has always been problematic to find a balance between the support we should provide them and making the women feel weak, fragile and to much dependent on us.

4.2 Prototype 2, the cultural intermediation

The women early on expressed that they would like to try to do some activities for the refugee children hosted in Malmö. These kids, mainly between 13 and 17, are in Sweden without their families escaping from countries at war. In the last years the city of Malmö...
has welcomed a lot of afghan and iraqi orphans and, since they are sharing the same cultural background, the women felt they could offer something to them. However working with refuge orphans is a sensitive issue and we needed to facilitate the creation of trust between HKF and the responsible department at the Malmö municipality. The women together with us proposed to the city to organize some meetings with the kids through which explore a possible intercultural mediation service that HKF could offer to the public agencies. The municipality was positive about the initiative but they did not want to have an active role and suggested us, instead, to contact the health care company Attendo who provides accommodation to the children hosted in Malmö. Attendo were much more interested and we set up some trials. An issue we were particularly concerned with was the emotional impact that this prototyping activities could have on the women and the children: could the encounter evoke some of their memories in a undesirable way?

Therefore we decide to start out carefully and the first step was simply to invite the kids to the HKF’s premises for an afghan meal. They came there together with an Attendo employee and it quick turned out that most of them did not have been eating home made Afghan food for several years (since they left their families). It became clear that the food could play a really important role and the kids wished that there would be other occasions for meeting the women and eating together (the importance of food from the native country for refugee children has also been highlighted by Kohli et al 2010). According to the women several of the children were quite depressed and to some degree the women were emotionally stirred, but the experience was definitely compensated by the joy of feeling helpful.

The next step was to offer a cooking class to the children, which was done in collaboration with one of MEDEA’s business partner: the media company Good World who provided access to its kitchen to HKF and the kids. During this encounter the children could alternate cooking with the women with using Good Worlds computers to explore social media together with some employees. The experience was quite positive for all the involved actors (the CEO of Good World said: “I feel extremely inspired by meeting the women”) and it revealed the opportunity for a mixed service where the kids could get the possibility to learn cooking afghan food and to explore more Internet resources. It also emerged the chance of establishing a solid connection between HKF and Good world which could open up for new scenarios based, for example, on a mutual exchange of services.

4.3 Next prototypes

So far these experiments have demonstrated how HKF has the potential of playing a new role in the swedish socio-economic context. Regarding the activities with the refugee children some municipality representatives stated that the women’s engagement is valuable “ because they relate to the orphans in a different way than a Swedish civil servant would do”. The care company Attendo similarly recognized that the women, given the shared background, have a unique position in providing temporary support to the kids and discuss with them what it means to live in Sweden. However, despite of the positive feedback, it seems that the service of “intercultural mediation” needs to be further refined: none of the involved actors was ready to pay the women for the services (during the prototypes Malmö University has covered HKF expenses for the ingredients and for the preparation of the cooking class): the local manager at Attendo expressed
the need for a more structured offer that he could use to convince the central direction to allot resources.

Another aspect that we would like to explore more is if, and how, new media could play a role in the relation between HKF and the refugee children. For example if video-recorded material from the women (cooking instructions, advices, encouragements...) could be valuable for the kids and if it could be worthwhile to use social media to reinforce the relation between the women and the children.

Both prototypes revealed that HKF is lacking some skills and that they will need a more stable network of stakeholders that could support them (beside our interventions). To answer to this deficiency some opportunities emerged to connect HKF with Göran Network, a huge network of women in the south of Sweden, and to further elaborate a possible partnership with Good World. Both these actors have expressed interest in developing their contacts with HKF, however since they were too busy for a long time, we had to wait for several months before we could start to explore how the three stakeholders could establish balanced relationships based on mutual exchange of services and resources.

These trials, sometimes positive sometimes less, have been quite effective in revealing to the participants the potential and the limits of the different activities and relationships. At the same time they also allow us to understand the importance of being able to step back and wait for the availability of a specific actor. There is also some value in trusting the power of serendipity by keeping the process as open as possible and being ready to develop opportunities that suddenly emerge.

5. Discussion

5.1 Prototyping to reveal opportunities and dilemmas
For us, coming from a participatory design background, much is still to be explored about how prototyping could be done and how it could be considered not only as a way to test potential solutions but also as “Agonistic Spaces”, where the different stakeholders do not necessarily reach a consensus but rather create an arena that reveals dilemmas and makes them more tangible.

For example, during the prototyping process with HKF some trade union representatives responded very negatively to the idea of a non-commercial NGO doing business and accused the women to compete under unfair conditions and “stealing” regular jobs. Another dilemma, revealed through the prototyping, concerned power relations within their families. The women stated that their position within the family is complex. In some sense, they are strong, but upholding patriarchal traditions are also common in many Afghan and Iraqi families. The husband is seen as the family provider: he earns money and deals with politics and societal issues or similar matters of concern. However, most of these men have lost their authority arriving to Sweden since many of them are unemployed. If HKF develops into a successful business, it will give to the women a position in society that their husbands lack. The women are not sure how to handle this and traditionally their strategy has been to keep quiet about what they do to avoid trouble at home.

Doing prototyping in social innovation evokes dilemmas that can not be easily solved. In these sense, even if these activities do not always evolve into a concrete product or service, we believe that acting these “Things” out reveals questions,
5.2 Design as long term infrastructuring

What we have described in the case above is a process quite different than the more traditional project-based approach used in design that is characterized by a defined time span during which designers have to respond to a given brief, that eventually could be reframed, by involving actors and different kind of materials (Dubberly, 2005). Although a more structured approach also is being considered suitable for social innovation (Brown and Wyatt 2010), as we have seen earlier a more long term engagement could contribute differently, especially when it comes to the implementation phase and to reach a real impact (Mulgan, 2009, Schulman 2010).

The design work outlined in the case has been driven by what we define as “Infrastructuring”. This process, in line with Mulgan and Schulman, focus on long term commitment, but it also provides an open-ended design structure without predefined goals or fixed time lines. Infrastructuring is characterised by a continuous process of building relations with diverse actors and by a quite flexible allotment of time and resources. This more organic approach facilitates the emergence of possibilities along the way and new design opportunities can evolve through a continuous match-making process (Björgvinsson et al 2010). For example the connection between HKF and Good World was not planned, it emerged by chance when we were looking for a facility with a kitchen where the women could cook together with the refugee children (see 3.2), and it revealed new opportunities that we could not imagine beforehand. The longer time span and a more open ended approach has been especially valuable because, as we have seen above, a lot of the design opportunities have related on how new networks and resources step by step have been able to connect and align to the women. We have had preliminary deadlines (such as aiming for a workshop with organisation x before time z) and we early on had ideas about who could be relevant stakeholders. However, quite often, we had to adapt and re-arrange the design direction depending on emerging circumstances. Also, the complexity has been of such level that it has been really hard to know in advance which stakeholders or goals would be the most interesting to achieve.

Infrastructuring also provides the ground for building ‘relational qualities’ that Jégou and Manzini (2008) stress as a pre-condition for collaborative organisations: ‘Peer-to-peer collaboration calls for trust, and trust calls for relational qualities: no relational qualities means no trust and no collaboration’(p. 33). Indeed in the HKF case ‘trust’ has often been a key element in the design process: the women were committed in the prototypes because they felt they could rely on us. At the same time the established actors, such as the city or the health care company, joined the prototypes because we act as a ‘trust mediators’ by ‘lending’ some of our credibility as university researchers to the women. The infrastructuring process allows the stakeholders to do things together on a long-term base and fosters the creation of trust between them.

Mutual trust relationships are critical to achieve social change because:

whereas in business the firm is the key agent of innovation, in the social innovation field the drive is more likely to come from a wider network, perhaps linking commissioners in public sector, providers in social enterprises, advocates in social movements, and entrepreneurs in business (p.7 in Murray et al. 2010).
Jégou and Manzini describe these complex stakeholders systems as ‘Designing Networks’ (Jégou et al. 2008) and we think that infrastructuring can be considered a process of generating and supporting these networks in a long term open ended way.

Another important issue regards the interplay between bottom up and top down as well as different scales of intervention. Social innovation practitioners have stressed the need to develop new approaches to connect grass-root initiatives with more established actors:

linking up the ‘bees’ – the individuals and small organisations that are buzzing with ideas and imagination – and the ‘trees’, the bigger institutions that have power and money but are usually not so good at thinking creatively. On their own, the bees can’t achieve impact. On their own, the trees find it hard to adapt (p.125 in Murray et al. 2010).

This metaphor fits well with our infrastructuring process where we apply a conscious strategy of constantly looking for opportunities to connect larger institutions and businesses with smaller initiatives.

Although the infrastructuring process has proved to be valuable in revealing possibilities that could not emerge with a more structured project approach, it also has its disadvantages: being flexible means that we need to continuously plan and re-plan the activities according to the situation which sometimes could be quite complex with several opportunities emerging at the same time or in a moment in which we are lacking of resources to develop them.

6. Conclusion

We have proposed some strategies that could contribute to the development of the practice and theory of design for social innovation. The first concerns with how to set up the design process by moving from a project-based approach to long-term open-ended infrastructuring. The second is exploring the potential of prototyping in this field as a tool to try out proposals but also to evoke dilemmas. This seems to meet some of the contemporary discussions about the use of design in social innovation. However we have also seen some disadvantages in this approach such as managing the flexible and open-ended process.
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