



**3rd International Conference
on Public Policy (ICPP3)
June 28-30, 2017 – Singapore**

Panel T03P01 Session 2 Local Governance
Innovative Governance and the Governance of Change

Title of the paper
**THE DEVELOPMENT PACTS IN ITALY: HOW MULTI-LEVEL GOVERNANCE CAN
INCREASE DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

Author
ALDA ANNA MARIA SALOMONE, INAPP, ITALY, a.salomone@inapp.org

Date of presentation
Thursday, June 29th 10:30 to 12:30

ABSTRACT

During the last reforms period, the Italian Government launched a new multi-level governance instrument called “Pacts for Development”: a two-way standard agreement between central and local governments. The Pacts aim at enhancing the economic development selecting a set of actions to be implemented within specific areas. Those actions integrate European, national and local resources, adopting a collaborative inter-institutional approach to manage them. According to the institutional analysis approach in this paper, a preliminary application based on the action situation model will be presented. Some crucial governance conditions, key-factors, capabilities and trade-offs that can enhance or inhibit the achievement of planned results are discussed.

Keywords: *policy instrument, multi-level governance, development agreement, institutional analysis; action situation examples.*

THE DEVELOPMENT PACT AS INSTRUMENT OF POLICY

The Italian Government decided to frame a multilevel-governance instrument to address the public problem of development as a collaborative inter-institutional approach. The Pacts for Development- “*Patti per lo Sviluppo*” –Pacts combine public authorities of different government levels, carrying out investments for local development and the Italian growth. Each Pact adds different funds, goals, and acts, mastering “a host of different “technologies” of public action, each with its own decision rules, rhythms, agents, and challenges” (Salamon 2002, p.6).

The Pacts, as an instrument for public action, are composed of three components: a technical substrate, a schematic representation of the organization, and a management philosophy. Like policy instrument, they are a particular type of institution (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2005). The institutions-as-tools approach includes specific forms of organization as policy instruments as well as different modes of collecting information and shaping behaviour (Hood 2007, p.133). Each Pact, structured in a standard format, covers political visions, administrative capabilities and specific interventions linked to the national context and the local needs. We try to present what are the

methods the pact actors use to gather information and change behaviour (Hood 1986), how they articulate interventions and projects into a multi-level development strategy, and how they represent local needs in a national development programs. The challenge is to find the right combination among laws, funds, regulatory, practices, with a uniform approach and greater flexibility to implement rules and outcomes on the ground.

The central government launched the policy program with a strategic act for the south of Italy called “*Masterplan per il Mezzogiorno*”¹-Masterplan. From these political guidelines, the Pacts for the South were born. Thereafter, the government also signed Pacts with some Centre-North territories. With the common name of Pacts for Development they should set up a new working method with local authorities to cover the lack of subsidiarity and community participation in programming and the choice of priority points for development.

The Masterplan, as public policy instrumentation, orients relations between political society (via the administrative executive) and civil society, through intermediaries in the form of devices that mix technical components (measuring, calculating, the rule of law, procedure) and social components (representation, symbol). In this instrumentation Pacts, with a prevalent standardized form, combine obligations, financial relations and local needs (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007, p.7).

The Pacts move from local communities' needs, to unify territorial visions, to co-ordinate funding sources, to simplify bureaucratic processes, to maximize synergies between institutions, and to enhance monitoring of implementation, with a commitment to transparency. Each Pact “constitutes a device that is both political, technical and social, that organizes specific social relations between the state and those it is addressed to, according to the representations and meanings it carries” (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007, p.4) combines generic purpose of carrying a concrete concept of the politics/society relationship and sustained by a concept of regulation and investment in plan actions. The Pact’s actors, policymakers, had somehow to find ways to make sense of the disparate

¹ It was launched by the Italian Government in November 2015 and updated in May 2016.

actions, “weigh a far more elaborate set of considerations in deciding not just whether, but how to act, and then how to achieve some accountability for the results” (Salamon 2002, p.6).

Each Pact is a two-way agreement between the central government and the Region or between the central government and the Metropolitan City-MC² with a third hidden actor who is just the European Commission. The governance agreement starts from cohesion strategies and policies to act in additional and subsidiary level with European funds and programs. If we consider Pacts at the Italian level of exchange, they are polycentric agreements. However, each Pact nests local, national and European funds and rules that strictly link to European policy (more in strategic policy than in amount). For this, we prefer to consider them multi-level governance agreements. We can put the Pact in the three-dimensional conceptual space of multi-level governance (Piattoni 2008) in which each dimension involves changes that occur at three analytical levels: “that of political mobilization (politics), that of policy-making arrangements (policy), and that of state structures (polity), and across different governmental levels” (Piattoni 2008, p.5).

Multi-level governance initially described a “system of continuous negotiation among nested governments at several territorial tiers – supranational, national, regional and local” that was distinctive of EU structural policy (Marks 1993, p.392; Hooghe 1996). “Governance - according to European governance model - means rules, processes, and behaviour that affect the way in which powers exercise at European level”, particularly as regards to openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness and coherence (Commission 2001, p.6). As a multi-level governance instrument, in the Pact the decision-makers “adjust” the system to reflect the heterogeneity of the ends and means of a public policy (Hooghe and Marks 2003).

² The Metropolitan City (*città metropolitana*) is an administrative division, operative since 2015. As defined by the Law 5 May 2009 n. 42, it includes a large core town and the smaller surrounding towns (*comuni*), members of the same former Provinces related with economic activities and essential public services, as well as to cultural relations and to territorial features. The Italian metropolitan cities are 14. Each metropolitan city is headed by a Metropolitan Mayor (*sindaco metropolitano*) who is the mayor of the biggest town, by a legislative body, the Metropolitan council (*consiglio metropolitano*) with members elected and chosen by mayors and councillors of each municipality, and by a non-legislative assembly, the metropolitan conference (*conferenza metropolitana*) composed by the mayors of all the municipalities. The main functions devolved to the new metropolitan cities are local planning and zoning; provision of local police services; transport and city services regulation.

The Development Pact, as instrument of multi-level governance, arranges European programs, national and local development priorities, with a strong, dialectic and constructive dialogue and mutual respect with all administrations. The needs and priorities come up from the territories (local politicians as interpreters of the needs of local communities and citizens). Consequently, the political capabilities of each territory became a key factor. In this multi-level system, the challenge is establishing clear rules, goals and resources, shared competences with a common vision to assure the best interests of development policies.

The resulting framework is a tendency towards an innovation in policy-design, based on national strategic sectors and interventions for specific territorial areas. It is deeply concerned with programming of results, governance to implement a national strategy of integrated synergic national and local actions that could be the base for new and specific development policies.

THE “POLICY WINDOWS”

According to Kingdon’s “window of opportunities”, the Masterplan and the Pacts come under the push of a stream-convergence: problem stream, policy stream to address the problem, and political stream (Kingdon 1984).

At the end of 2015, the main policy factors that shaped the Masterplan were internal and external (mostly linked to European Union). After a long crisis period, and still very weak economic growth, even in comparison to other European States, the aim was to invest according to the European debt limits. The need of financial sources rationalization and a framework for structural reforms (school reform; labour reform -Job Act; reform of the Constitution Title V in order to overcome the overlapping of competences between levels of government, then rejected by the popular referendum on December 2016, the partial abolition of the provinces and the departure of the fourteen metropolitan cities). During the same period, the European funds programs 2007-2013 were closing and they needed to speed up the resources spending, above all in Southern Italy. The new 2014-2020 European Programs were starting with a reinforced coordination of the four European

Investment and Structural Funds - EISF, and a greater strategic finalization supported by the National Partnership Agreement, which integrates lines of action and the national additional funds. Therefore, Italy needed to answer to European push regarding infringement procedures (e.g. in the case of watercourses) and the investment clause. Finally, yet importantly, the southern territorial communities were loudly calling for dedicated policies.

The Prime Minister, considering the increasing production and income gap between the Italian Southern territories and Centre-Northern ones in 2001-2013 and some early positive signs in 2015 (Svimez 2016), decided to start from the strengths and vitality signs that can reverse the trend and recover the gap. The Masterplan has a consistent economic endowment of about 98 million Euros, until 2023. These funds are devoted to the development of the Southern territories, with collaborative and negotiating activities and resources. The governance path enhances local entrepreneurial and working skills in promoting autonomous production lines and the use of the vast resources available for the next seven years. It presents as "a living process of shared processing with institutions, economic and social forces, researchers, citizens" (Masterplan 2016, p.1).

The Masterplan is a national development policy for the Southern Italy; the political idea is that Italy does not grow without the south. The framework is a one supporting synergy national-local on negotiated priorities and sharing resources, with a national strategy and specific territorial needs.

The Masterplan consists of the guidelines for the territorial Pacts in the Southern Italy. The challenge is on the activation of a convergence dynamic. The approach is to coordinate available financial sources (EISF, FSC, other national sources plus local ones³) and to draw together how to use them with priority interventions and defined outcomes. Activities with achievable results at established times were one of the first strong selection factors (first deadline 2017, now switched to 2019). A policy made of concrete objectives, of active tools, co-ordination of funding sources (European, national, and local ones), bureaucratic simplification, maximum synergies between

³ The total national contribution is over two thirds of the total Pacts' amount.

institutions, enhanced monitoring of implementation, commitment to transparency. Similarly, some Northern and Central Administrations have been asked to sign the pact with few and more targeted priorities (less development of more specific innovative interventions). The actors signed the first Pacts in April 2016. On December 2016 the first related finance document assigned the Development and Cohesion Fund (*Fondo Sviluppo e Coesione*) 2014-2020 - FSC⁴ (a third of the total Italian amount). In the same month, the Italian Government changed and the new one defined a Minister for Territorial Cohesion and the South.

The Masterplan and Pacts sets up a change in Italian policy instruments. These transformations of public action may help to change, if well managed, the sense, cognitive and normative framework and outcomes of Italian development policy (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007).

According to the Kingdon's "policy window", the problem stream was to support national growth, starting by addressing territories' needs. To govern the policy stream addressing the problem, the Italian Government proposed a collaborative governance framework with technical supports, few interventions on negotiated sectors, nested resources and additional funds, outcomes reliable in strict time. The political stream of policy was to activate a convergence dynamic in investment with the various European "flexibility clauses" using European, national and local funds on development interventions, alongside a national and European general policy.

For the first time in Italy, the Pacts are a development policy instrument promoting effective governance in the policy-choice and policy-design.

⁴ The FSC introduced by Legislative Decree no. 88 of 2011, aims of providing programmatic and financial units to all of the additional national financing measures: economic and social re-balancing across the different areas of the country. The FSC has a multiannual character, consistent with the timing of the programming of the EU's Structural Funds, and is intended to finance strategic projects, both of an infrastructural and intangible nature, of national, interregional and regional importance. The FSC 2014-2020 allocation among the thematic areas (for 38,716.10 M€) by CIPE Resolution n. 25 of 10 August 2016 also provided "The elaboration of the Operational Plans may also take the form of institutional Agreements or Instruments" (art. 1). The Steering Cabin consists of: the Minister for Territorial Cohesion and the South (the chairperson), Undersecretary to the Presidency of the Council, the Minister for Regional Affairs, the Minister for Implementation of the Government Program, the Minister for Infrastructure, three Region's Presidents; one Metropolitan City Mayor.

THE INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE PACTS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The development of policy analysis and design prompts, “a wide assortment of issues that are important aspects of a particular policy problem” (Polski and Ostrom 1999, p.6), and in multi-level governance programme of interventions, it needs to include key institutional and governance issues. The institutional analysis can contribute in generating new and specific form of intervention to understand the previous strategies. It can also perform part of the supervision, monitoring, and evaluation of on-going projects. In the last case, where this contribution is based, the analysis focuses on specific sets of issues or problems in the implementation phase, the coordination of results and up-stream institutional issues, the “trouble-shooters”, and finally, the mechanisms behind successful interventions for the institutional change. The analysis, in the territorial contexts, aims to understand the standard and choices, specific issues/actions/outcomes interconnections and how they can affect the achievement of policy outcomes, delivery and governance results on how the local Pacts might contribute to wider policy-change and institutional dialogue.

First of all, we present the Pact’s standard scheme. Each Pact presents the strategic choices and the chart-flows of priority interventions. The governance assumption is to engage local and national institutions in a shared programming framework supported by adequate tools. The Pact’s actors share the will to implement a strategy of synergistic and integrated actions aimed at the realization of the necessary infrastructures’ interventions of the territories, industrial investments, and any functional action for the work and social development of the local territories.

To date, the signed Pacts are twenty-one (plus one): fifteen Pacts for the South, one for each of the eight Regions (Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Basilicata, Puglia, Calabria, Sicilia, and Sardegna), one for each of the seven Metropolitan Cities (Napoli, Bari, Reggio Calabria, Messina, Catania, Palermo, and Cagliari). The plus one is the Institutional Development Agreement for the Taranto area (*Contratto Istituzionale per lo Sviluppo* - CIS). The Centre-North Pacts signed so far are six: two Regions (Lazio, Lombardia) and four Metropolitan Cities (Firenze, Genova, Milano, and Venezia). Each Pact is committed to specific priority interventions and integrates the responsibility

framework and the regulatory sources. It has a strengthened and parity governance to push acceleration in the quantity and quality of public investment, and to favour the private sector as well. The financial sources (Tab.1) include EISF (Regional Operational Programs-ROP, National Operational Programs -NOP⁵), FSC⁶, other national resources (program contracts, thematic ministries plans, and general programs for roads, railways, and ports), other regional and local ones.

Tab. 1. The financial resources of the Pacts

PACTS TOTAL AMMOUNT AND THE FSC SUPPORT		
Pacts	Total Interventions amount (M€)	FSC 2014-2020 (M€)
South Pact		
Abruzzo	1.505,62	753,40
Basilicata	3.829,28	565,20
Calabria	4.933,56	1.198,70
Reggio Calabria	410,10	133,00
Campania	9.558,24	2.780,20
Napoli	629,62	308,00
Molise	727,70	378,00
Puglia	5740,19	2.071,50
Bari	657,23	230,00
Sardegna	2.905,19	1.509,60
Cagliari	313,16	168,00
Sicilia	5745,92	2.320,40
Catania	739,11	332,00
Messina	777,89	332,00
Palermo	770,89	332,00
Total South Pacts	39.243,72	13.412,00
Centre-North Pacts		
Lazio	3.512,94	723,55
Lombardia	1.0745,72	718,70
Milano	644,20	110,00
Firenze	680,30	110,00
Genova	499,55	110,00
Venezia	457,00	110,00
Total Centre-North Pacts	1.6539,71	1.882,25

Fonts: Presidency of the Council of Ministers PCoe- Presentation at Forum PA 23th May 2017, Rome

Each Pact has got four main chapters: the vision and specific goals (linked to local Strategic Plans⁷), the tools and resources available (local, national and European ones), the priority actions, the outcomes, the process of governance, and the involvement of all stakeholders.

⁵ For more details: Turrini, O. Salomone, A. Uliano, M. (2016) Guida ai Fondi strutturali e di investimento europei 2014-2020, Roma, Edizioni Lavoro.

⁶ The FSC is shared in 80% to the South and 20% to Centre-North

⁷ Each Region has produced a strategic plan to set-up the European Operation Programs even the Metropolitan Cities must produce a strategic plan.

The strategic approach follows the European cohesion policy 2014-2020 and the governance is flexible and integrated in accordance with the Italian Partnership Agreement. The ESIF are concentrated on the strengthening and development of the business system, and attention to people: jobs, human capital and social inclusion. The FSC (with more financial resources for the 2014-2020 period) supports large complex infrastructures and environmental interventions whose temporal location can overcome the programming cycle and improved coordination of the four ESIF. Each Pact is structured in interventions (shared in operational projects), linked to the various resources of funding (already attributed or reinforced), results and their deadlines. The political choice is to design a logical frame of using combined resource for enlarging investments in time and outcomes.

The strategy of synergic and integrated actions considers four main thematic areas/sectors:

1. Infrastructures (on average 35%)⁸ (e.g. to improve mobility, roads and railways and intermodal nodes, to regional or closer inter-regional levels, new industrial investments, reclamation and reindustrialization of industrial areas, and every functional action for the economic, productive and occupational development of the local territory).
2. Environment (on average 29%) (e.g. interventions to resolve the European infringement procedure on watercourses, management of waste and the disposal of stored waste, the reclamation of contaminated soils; integrated water system - distribution and quality, optimization of sewage systems also in industrial settlement areas, irrigation systems, measures to mitigate hydrogeological disruption).
3. Economic and production development (on average 18%) (e.g. to promote productive development, attracting new enterprise, mid cap investment, supporting SMEs for national and international growth, eco-sustainable productive industrial areas, digital agenda, bureaucracy simplification for citizens and businesses, fiscal incentives for investment and employment, financial and credit instruments, sustainable growth, specific programs for crisis areas and the establishment of special economic zones).

⁸ The average is on South Pacts, the only available data and which are more in line with the standard sectors.

4. Tourism and culture (on average 7%) (E.g. to improve accessibility to areas; works of maintenance, valorisation of the cultural and artistic buildings, sustainable tourism).

In some Pacts, the local administration added other thematic areas which are strictly linked to their territorial needs (e.g. school, legality, security, health etc.). The development choice points differ from Regions and Metropolitan Cities linked to their regulatory functions and strategic choices. The Pact has an attached table with sectors, list of strategic interventions with their amounts and funds' reference, the financial impact on 2016-2017 (just shifted to 2019) and in the last column the short time outcomes (start/progression/completion of intervention, shipyard opening, feasibility study).

Each Pact has an Advice Committee⁹ - the Committee constituted by: one representative of the Department for Cohesion Policies (DPCoe); one representative of the Department for Programming and Coordination of Economic Policy (DIPE); one representative of the Agency for Territorial Cohesion; (ACT) and one representative of the local Administration. The representative of the ACT chairs the Committee. Each Pact has two reference coordinators of the implementation who report to the Committee and the agreement actors (one of local administration and one of ACT). The ACT co-ordinates and oversees the implementation of the Pacts, carries out the monitoring and evaluation of the objectives achieved and facilitates the dialogue with the different national ministries and institutions.

The disclosure of the mutual responsibilities between the National government and the Pact's administrations is the provision of acceleration resources. The powers of substitution are in the political chair (Ministry/Region President/Mayor).

The central government is setting up a single collection system of data (Unitary Database of Pacts) where each administration provides planning and implementation data. The ACT implements a "dashboard" to manage them.

⁹ The Committee decides directly for amendments less than 5 million Euros among the thematic areas, or for the at maximum 2% of the FSC amount. Otherwise, the modification proposals are submitted to the DPCoe for the General Committee with surveillance functions (*Comitato di Sorveglianza* -CDS) decision.

Therefore, to make resources available, the governance model has structured institutional meetings to regularly oversee the allocation of resources, monitor interventions on the timeline, efficiency and efficacy, and identify breakdown parameters with the aim of ensuring the same rights and equal responsibilities.

The Trade Unions therefore, observe that, in line with government guidelines, the Pacts do not identify all the strategic lines, but above all "prevalent planning" emerges, driven primarily by the status of the projects themselves, their feasibility and needs indicated by the territories. The bilateral approach underlines the need for over-regional development vision to limit the risk of the fragmentation of the interventions (Confindustria et al. 2017, p. 2).

The Italian Minister for Territorial Cohesion and the South in the last Press release presented the governance-flow of the Pacts¹⁰.

Fig. 1 Innovation in the Pacts' governance



¹⁰ Press release Rome, 16th May 2017:
http://www.agenziacoessione.gov.it/opencms/export/sites/dps/it/Notizie_e_documenti/news/2017/maggio/Masterplan_Patti_per_il_Sud_-_Conferenza_Stampa.pdf

THE ACTION SITUATION ANALYSIS

“Whenever two or more individuals are faced with a set of potential actions that jointly produce outcomes, these individuals can be said to be “in” an action situation” (Ostrom 2007, p.32).

We started our research asking how and if Pacts could overcome regulatory and institutional differences between local and national governance in policymaking in a reform period.

Following the institutional analysis approach, we look inside the Pacts to shed some light on their implementation process.

The governance process is the main topic of Pacts. It has a weight role in affecting the relationship between the patterns of the interactions involved in the process (local context, funds, organization, position/roles, capabilities) and outcomes. The governance measure in literature is often link to government system (The World Bank-Worldwide Governance Indicators) or on topics (good governance Fukuyama 2013; actor policy capacity Ramesh & al. 2016).

In this paper, which takes place in the early stages of our research project, we propose a first set of variables to observe on the field that can affect the governance instrument of Development Pacts. The viability of a governance instrument can be influenced by many different kinds of factors. For instance, variables considered in literature are: number and composition of participants/positions/roles; sets of operating decision rules followed in some arena; actions allowed or constrained; patterns of interaction (communication, consultation, cooperation,); outcomes recognized; technicalities, capabilities and skills. Many variables and specific combination of them affect the patterns of interactions and outcomes. The experimental field analysis aims at observing how the multi-level governance can improve or inhibit the common effort toward the outcome, the efficacy of the decision-making and the management processes, and finally the local assets (all factors whose meaning we couldn't ascertain from formal documents and official scripts) and the specific outcomes to pursue in the social, economic, and political setting (Ostrom 2007, pp.15182-15183). To identify the first range of variables we applied the action situation model of the Institutional Analysis Development - IAD framework, observing: the set of participants and their

positions, the set of allowable actions and the function that maps actions into realized outcomes and their linkage, the tools of collaborative governance in efficiency, effectiveness and accountability, the standard tools for shared management, methods of preventive analysis of risk implementation, the level of control, the information exchanges, the costs and benefits associated with actions performed.

Focusing on rules we try to understand how the Pact's instrument has been modifying the national regulatory system (constitutional rules), strengthening its coherence with the European system, the decision-making process in a standard design policy (collective choice rules), and the answer given by local actors in order to implement the development policy instrument (operational rules) (Ostrom 2007, p.63).

We propose a first selection of variable with a conceptual partition of them in level of meaning linked to Pact:

- the development of the multi-level governance arrangements (such as political dialogue, robust and sustainable configuration of participant/positions, national frame and local context, governance of external and internal disturbances);
- the patterns of interactions and outcomes (such as goals/actions/outcomes, actions/outcomes with external financial inducements, standard rules and rules in uses; planning and decision-making and , collaborative problem-solving, conflict, and facilitating tools);
- The endogenous/local development of governance arrangements (capacity building, political commitment and administrative actions, technicalities, skills and capabilities) .

At the time we are writing, the Pacts are just starting and we decided to interview a Ministry referent, and two Pacts referents (a region and a metropolitan city, which are two pivot examples).

We used the interview tool to understand what happened and what has been happening (rules-in-action) in (1) designing and (2) implementing in the starting phase, and to identify (3) the main

variables to detect. The interview scheme is organized in three sections (the three major topics), divided in several sub-topics, as follows:

1. The multi-level governance:

- i. the political dialogue (e.g. selection of: intervention sectors; priorities and driving actions to enhance territorial capacity, political visions, political commitment, etc.);
- ii. participants, positions, roles and the regulatory framework (e.g. links between national and local strategic plans, laws and regulations, European directives and recommendations, the dialogue with technical ministries, the financial sources coordination, mutual responsibilities, etc.);
- iii. the key institutional factors which can facilitate or hinder multi-level governance (e.g. Committees, work groups, roles and responsibilities, technical support addresses, comparison with other regions, bureaucratic processes and policy exchanges).

2. The governance in the Pact's decision-making process:

- i. the shared program's design (e.g. local needs and strategic choices, mapping of interventions/projects and the weight of the financial sources, rationalization of interventions, the interaction of interventions and outcomes, timeliness, participation models, e re-programming modes, tracking plan, contingency planning and control, etc.);
- ii. the standard and the collaborative governance tools (e.g. standard for shared efficiency, effectiveness and accountability, planning and management, preventive risk assessment methods, control and monitoring, information exchange).

3. The local organization and tools for the Pact implementation:

- i. the capacity building (e.g. organizational structure, sharing meetings, standards and worksheets, supporting information system, links between different interventions, dialogue with the territories, forms of direct participation of citizens etc.);

- ii. the technicalities put in place to achieve the expected results (e.g. in terms of organization, communication flow among offices/services, coordination tools, management information and control tools etc...);
- iii. the skills/capabilities that are developing and may be useful to design development policies (e.g; negotiate national political standard and local priorities, select solutions, problem solving and propose solutions; coordinate collaborations, communication skills)

The examples we used to clarify the variables are a first step to also define the conceptual variables' partitioning¹¹. In the first experimental phase, we administered three interviews,¹² and the interviewees were working at three different institutional levels (national, regional, and local). It is important to specify that Regions have clear regulatory systems and a consolidated experience in managing both European and national funds and programs. Instead, at the local level, the Metropolitan Cities are a new administrative form, with many on-going regulatory definition process, linked to national but also regional laws, and therefore, this is the first time the Italian Government engages directly with the metropolitan level on national programs.

In the next section, we present some of the information collected in the interviews, in eight chart-flows, making visible and comparable, for each dimension under investigation, the three points of view expressed by witnesses working in three different institutional settings

¹¹ For skills and capabilities we started by the framework of policy capacity developed by Wu, X., Ramesh, M., & Howlett, M. (2015) but for the first interviews we used only some examples functions

¹² The interviewees have been Bianca Maria Scalet Ministry for Territorial Cohesion and the South; Monica Staibano Development Pact of Campania Region; Davide F. Pellegrino and Luigi Ranieri Development Pact of the Metropolitan City of Bari.

1. The multi-level governance	Ministry	Campania Region	Metropolitan City of Bari
<i>i. The political dialogue</i>	<p>We started by the Masterplan as a policy for the South with the vision of sharing resources by responding to local needs and national strategies. The goal was to improve the efficiency of the South, in a national framework, a necessary condition for the growth of Italy. In order to have improvements, it is important to support country synergy, alongside the territories, by focusing on priorities in relation to projects of specific territorial interests, including additional funding to local funds when needed (e.g. water system considering European drive; interests in nearby territories interventions). The bottom line is how to use resources in the better way (often the law used rain loans but with modest results). The Development Pacts instrument idea is to bet on strategic interventions in the territory, according to interventions with national value (e.g. support in infrastructure on connecting arteries, last mile ports railroad and roads, etc.). The strategic intervention areas had a standard definition, but if needed other lines were added (e.g. social, legality).</p>	<p>There had been continuous contact between the Region President and the Prime Minister with the aim to propose a unified development policy in the South. Pacts have been a response to Italy's criticism of delayed and poor quality European spending. The Pacts' goal was economic development to consolidate existing businesses, not direct work-related measures, but indirectly with the yards, attention to entrepreneurial policy (rather than industrial policy). The Pact is a targeted instrument for simplifying, preventing and dismantling critical issues</p>	<p>The Pact started by the political wish of the Mayor who is Mayor of Bari and Mayor of the Metropolitan City (MC). It was the pivot MC Pact. The MC level is new in the national regulatory context and full of unknowns. After the political impulse, it still plays a random role, not always clear for government structures.</p>

1. The multi-level governance	Ministry	Campania Region	Metropolitan City of Bari
<i>ii. Participants, positions, roles and the regulatory framework</i>	<p>The governmental design was to select few and macro-interventions, to give national answers at local level. The agreement with regions and the MC individually was a choice. Priorities and monitoring system are constraints and each intervention has a project code to enter in a national unitary monitoring database. The governance effort is to simplify procedures to facilitate the transfer of resources, institutional decisions and reprogramming. The Pact Committee is the place to solve problems together by the different institutional competences. The last reference is the political level: Minister and Region President/Mayor. The ACT supports monitoring and multi-level dialogue. If necessary Invitalia helps for public notices.</p>	<p>The Pact is a tool to pool resources of the various programs (ERDF, ESF, NOPs, Regional Infrastructure Plan, etc.) on specific strategic interventions. With a joint national and regional choice making, a resource interconnection was established. The Committee solves problems through dialogue. Governance has required interfering with various ministerial levels (bilateral tables, direct dialogue not only by competent directorates) supported by the AC. The attempt is to go beyond the procedures with the management dialogue. The Pact started the implementation phase with the Cohesion Agency and the DPCOE (mainly through the FSC management authority) support</p>	<p>The MC regulatory competences are not uniform depending on national and regional laws (for the Apulia Region they are the same of the national law). However, MCs never had a programmatic vocation, not all the Pact sectors are in the direct MCs competences (e.g. Culture) and often there is confusion between city urban level and the metropolitan one. It is still not easy to break this knot and proceed with Pact. It needs to go beyond the main functions and to involve directly the municipalities' management that makes up the MC. This process-required dialogue, negotiation, agreement with the various municipalities and therefore a strong political role of the mayor.</p>

1. The multi-level governance	Ministry	Campania Region	Metropolitan City of Bari
<i>iii. The key institutional factors which can facilitate or hinder multi-level governance</i>	The role of the Government is to move towards more strategic and viable interventions with a cross-border exchange between national and local. The governance process among and between political levels and administrative ones is the main key institutional factors to unlock development policies.	The pact has highlighted connection points and criticality. It is definitely an experimental tool; perhaps it will not achieve all performance goals in relation to spending but certainly a tool to help policy action. It requires a set of skills that work together, a continuous bilateral exchange. The culture was growing but it has been developing by Pact. The top-down flow is important to draw the Italian system, but in a continuous dialogue with and from the territory and political collaboration. The local organization is an effort.	The Pact's design, therefore, required a political process and an administrative process to overcome unclear MC competences. The Pact's process helped territorial dialogue, to build process solutions, to share capabilities above all on design (design funds).

2. The governance in the decision-making process	Ministry	Campania Region	Metropolitan City of Bari
<i>i. The shared program's design</i>	<p>To spend resources (often slow on technical interventions, such as infrastructures, and in the South) it needs a good policy and interventions design. The Pact is a tool for design process: national standards, specific territorial needs (e.g. methane gas to Sardinia island needs technicians and specific national choices) commitments required by territories (e.g. Special Economic Zones need regulatory support, political mediation among ministries) additional funds (e.g. schools upgrading), and simpler implementation procedures, using facilitators (e.g. Cohesion Agency, Invitalia). The aim is to identify territories' needs on the spot, to accompany and unlock the obstacles that slow down, to reduce decision levels (e.g. in the Pact Committee there are DPCOE with role of FSC; DIPE with role on allocations funds, ACT with a role on monitoring and facilitating dialogue with ministries.</p>	<p>Starting with political confrontation at regional level (Presidents and Assessors involved), sharing with Government and the selection criteria were established. The first choice criterion was the executable interventions, operationally verifiable within a defined timeframe to support development investments linked to the Italian investment clauses. The Unitary Programming Service (UPS) - in staff to Regional President - collected proposals on the political addresses, like a masterplan, then translated them into Pacts' standard. The dialogue was also inside regional and prefectural directorates (the two additional areas safety and youth emerged by them), with ministries (on environment bilateral/trilateral managed by ACT). Through a discernment among long-term interventions, the choice was for executable projects and some new long-term ones (e.g. subway), which a state of progress sufficiently forwarded during the period. There was a dialogue (improved also by national level) with the Pact of Metropolitan City of Naples and an exchange on programming and interventions.</p>	<p>The mayor was the mediator to animate the territory and suggest the possible lines of interventions: still municipality interventions in metropolitan logic. The Pact design required political and administrative negotiation process to overcome unclear competences. The first step was to organize the financial aspects and strategic choices: one single step for the strategic plan and the budget document (to link council and conference of the mayors, more interested in the decision) and Pact. The City of Bari was a sort of head of condominium among all the municipalities. Specific workshops organized to support the negotiation process on co-design, choosing strategies and priorities for interventions, addressed to both politicians and administrators.</p>

2. The governance in the decision-making process	Ministry	Campania Region	Metropolitan City of Bari
<i>ii. The standard and the collaborative governance tools</i>	<p>The collaborative governance on resources: the funding economies, speeding up who goes faster in spending but without penalizing the other who can recover. A specific attention to the Metropolitan Cities, new institutions, who signed Pact if they did not yet define the metropolitan government. Some Metropolitan City Pacts involve municipalities others focus on large infrastructures of the big town (e.g. subway) with great impact on the territories. The needs of MC are closer to the citizens. The input for them was to listen to the territories but they answer in different ways also linked to territorial structure. The North MC Pacts have bigger towns and even less funds, so they concentrated more on them. The Centre-North Pacts are more focused, less on productive development (more acting on ROPs) and more on new initiatives (e.g., research centres, Piedmont University campus). Attention to integrating NOP's carried by specific Ministries that sometimes oblige more than listening to them. It would give additional tools such as a design fund and monitoring as a tool for accompanying.</p>	<p>By the Pact, the top-down collaboration changed more on solving problems than procedures, direct collaboration and management dialogue. (E.g. Bilateral tables) first technical and long formal contacts (generally 5 steps) between directorates. ACT helped in speeding up relationships. In planning, the dialogue with technical ministries was useful to share the choice criteria (e.g. environment, water service to remedy European infringement procedures) then, at local level, considering programs funds, the projects were selected and put on financial and interventions packages. The Pact is a tool to pool resources of the various programs on specific interventions, with a joint resolution, technical and organisation interconnections (Managing Authorities of ESF/FSC ERDF/Complementary funds; UPS, ONPs, etc.). The Pact helps to simplify, prevent and dismantle critical issues. The Committee solves problems through dialogue.</p>	<p>Using co-planning and participation the first result were few lines. With the Strategic Plan, they decided 4-5 points per town calibrated on available funding, but it was dragged by projects and correct by common interventions The result was 11 themes: 5 shared: sea, culture, rural landscape, smart city services, mobility and 6 complementary including projects. (e.g. rural landscape/ Agriculture/ cycling linked to both mobility and tourism). The project themes are Mobility, Old Town, Waterfront, innovative job/ culture hub Porta Futuro /Academy of Fine Arts, Agriculture 4.0, Industry 4.0, Welfare Active Inclusion/ Poverty/housing (linked with NOPs METRO and INCLUSION), Digital Agenda, Sustainable energy plan, Land of Bari Guest-Art, Suburbs. The projects collected are works in progress, executive projects and future wishes. The team group offers supports to develop ideas, technical and administrative to help municipalities with no skills. There was a shortage of projects (used in 2007-2013) and delay the spending. The Pact negotiated with Ministry a design fund, multiplier of resources (5M€ driving more 100M€ works) and a rotation tool (they come back when projects are submitted to other funds (regional national, European) (e.g. nurseries for region funds).</p>

3. The organization at the local level and the tools for the implementation	Ministry	Campania Region	Metropolitan City of Bari
<i>i. The capacity building</i>	The goal of Italian Government was to deal with territories, by planning support in administration (procurement, design, supports) creating an equal structure between the national and local level and direct dialogue (political and technicians refers).	Unitary planning service carries out coordination and monitoring activities while the specific managers are responsible for implementation. The Campania Pact has 1200 interventions and each intervention has more projects within it. The Internal governance move from Regional President and the Programming Service (member of the Committee), the Pact Manager, FSC and ESF Management Authority; ERDF and POC (complementary operational plans with national funds to support European funds) Management Authority, general managers or in some specific OD cases responsible for the implementation processes. There are no exchanges with other regional Pacts (not even foreseen an exchange times). Listening to the territory is not yet structured, it is more informal and political (the President's strong role). However, there is no awareness of the listening instrument.	In the Pact's design, personal administrative skills and working groups were used to overcome the regulatory obstacles. One of MC Pact's resources, the NOP Metro managed by Bari City. Working together is a tool to solve the problems but not an easy to do. Bari is a particular MC with 41 municipalities and many of them large ones (Bari 320.000 and MC 1.200.000 of inhabitants) and different from others, such as Naples, which has an economic and population consistency that makes it the centrepiece. The problem is that there are two different administrations and one mayor.

3. The organization at the local level and the tools for the implementation	Ministry	Campania Region	Metropolitan City of Bari
<i>ii. The technicalities put in place to achieve the expected results</i>	<p>The programming phase was fast and some reprogramming is already underway for up-to date, better funds allocation and outcomes definitions. The rescheduling is directly controlled by the DIPE, to lighten the steps with the government Steering Cabin and regulatory documents. It is starting the unique database (used directly by Pact referents and a better dialogue with local systems). The ACT is implementing a dashboard to monitor the Pacts. It would be a better-shared tool for governance.</p>	<p>For resource misalignment with the times (signature on April 2016, FSC assignment on December and 10% advances payment on April 2017) we decided to link more and more funds to each other in order to speed up procedures and spending. A monitoring system (SURF) is being developed (interfaces with Pact's central Databank) to over-connect the funds database linked to the European OTs (the E. Programs 2014-2020, are more structured with homogeneous information bases-except for the EAFRD). Each intervention follows its own fund rules interoperating by Pact outcomes, by a directional dashboard, to monitor differentiated policies and actions. Technical skills are useful to simplify procedures and check design proposals or make them (linking technical support structures of ESIF). Strict collaboration between technicians and politics. The communication is very close to the presidency such as territories listening (not yet structured and no awareness).</p>	<p>The Pact let individual municipalities' direct implementation through various forms of collaboration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • network operations directed to the MC (a unique metropolitan design MC coordinated by a disciplinary document for municipalities executive implement interventions (e.g. cycle ways) • metropolitan level network operations: followed by a single entity in agreement with specific technical institutions - ministries, institutions, laws etc.- (e.g. the palace of justice) • network intervention bottom-up conventions among MC with single or more municipalities. • incentives to the beneficiary (e.g. digital agenda, housing, design fund) The monitor tool is the national database; MC has not many resources to feed website. The Pact is running (in one year 10 open yards and 70 projects in progress or in design stage) without great reprogramming needs. Little co-participation with the citizens because there was too much in the last time.

3. The organization at the local level and the tools for the implementation	Ministry	Campania Region	Metropolitan City of Bari
<p><i>iii. The skills/capabilities that have been developing and can be useful for designing development policies</i></p>	<p>The model is to link country needs, supranational and territorial ones. The future development is a dialogue between Pacts-benchmark, to spread good experiences also financed by local funds and between MC and regions. The Pacts are tools to support reform measures.</p>	<p>The Pact is desirable for public administrator skills renewal and applies transversal competencies. For an integrated policy approach, it needs activating and implementing political address. This applies specific skills to improve, starting with politicians. There is a need to do multiple actions and integrate tools to transform product activity into the territory (e.g. the Campania's tourism vocation, pronounced but not spread on territories).</p>	<p>The skills/capabilities developed can be useful for designing development policies (professional work with the different municipalities, clear programming role of MC. Bari city is making substitute). The capabilities are territories' relationship, collaborative strategic planning, and design competences even to present for other funds. The institutional issue for MC is to have strategic functions and planning, but with a suitable organization and adequate resources. The dialogue with other MC Pacts is constant by the Municipality Association ANCI (the mayor of Bari is the President) for other projects such as suburbs. There is currently no dialogue with the regional Pact (it runs later). It is not easy to capitalize competences, if the organization is still unclear.</p>

The first selection of variables provides more information and suggestions in understanding the ongoing process. The narrative in the interviews required a re-mapping of the information with the variables. The three levels of variables helped to better specify the interactions, the choices linked to the Pact's instrument and those of each administration to manage the Pact. The specific and common factors discovered can be the base for building better interconnections among variables and sub-variables. In order to proceed with a more structured variables set, additional interviews are needed. Furthermore, the results of the interviews allow us to summarize the first "force of action" of the instrument of Development Pacts, on remembering that the "instrument at work is not a neutral device" (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007, p.3). From the first complementary analysis of the three different institutional levels of the interviews, we propose some first specific effects, underlining strengths and critical points in the governance and implementation process of the Pact.

1. **The multi-level governance.** The instrument of Pacts was born to improve the South efficiency, in a national framework, as a necessary condition for the Italian growth. It links the national investment policy with local interventions. The political drive and the multi-level political dialogue facilitate the policy-decision and push management styles in the administrative levels. It promotes a strategic vision to the policy agenda linking intervention choices and outcomes and the financial resources become an opportunity to reach the political goals. Pacts push for a collaborative decision-making and develop new flexible procedures for management implementation. The Pact is a tool to pool resources of the various programs on specific interventions. The governance effort is to simplify procedures, problem-solving and collaborative management. The Committee and the support agencies are useful in this process. The political dialogue directly helps in the multi-level governance. The Regional experience on European funds helps whilst the MC uncertain regulatory context is a limit to overcome. The national regulatory system is however, a bottleneck, not easy to solve. The governance process among and between political levels and administrative ones are key institutional factors to unlock development policies. However, Pacts are an experimental tool, in need to become a

consolidated policy instrument to be suitable to achieve all the performance goals it is expected to achieve.

2. **The Pact's governance in the decision-making process.** Pacts are a support tool to learn how to make a policy design, to foster the adoption of national standards, and to focus initiatives on specific territorial needs. The Pacts started to spend resources financing interventions that were, following a pragmatic choice criterion, “executable”, that means interventions which are operationally verifiable, having a well-defined timeframe, to support development investments. Lots of intervention and project proposals were spontaneously addressed to the Pact. However, to be able to evaluate those proposals, the Pact leaders need to systematize their action schemes: mapping the links between needs and interventions, promoting co-design and planning for more arena participation. A collaborative governance tool supports effective problem-solving more than sheer compliance in formal procedures, and direct cooperation helps to overcome regulatory obstacles that frustrate legitimate action. The Pact (thanks also to the Committee and technical supports) is a targeted instrument for simplifying, preventing and dismantling critical issues. To develop policies it needs some additional tools such as an implementing design fund, monitoring as a tool for accompanying management, communication actions.
3. **The organization at the local level and the tools for the Pact implementation:** the Pacts goal is to create an equal structure between the national and local level (political and technicians refers) and by direct dialogue. At the regional level, the planning experience modelled in unitary way is a key factor. There is no exchange among regional Pacts. At MC level the professional capabilities and working together is a tool to solve the regulatory problems, but this is not easy to do. The MC Pacts convene mostly in institutional occasions. One problem to solve is the dialogue between MC and Regions. The central Pact's databank and the dashboard to monitor the Pacts are used. The technical skills help to simplify procedures and to check design proposals, or make them (linking technical support structures of EF). However Pacts need a strict collaboration between the technical sphere and the political sphere. The rescheduling

phase is becoming: the first step in checking the feasibility of choices and outcomes. The creative MC process to use shared implementation with municipalities was useful but it needs tools and more resources to manage, monitor, and communication. The Pact helps to structure by interventions all the funds, linking national investments to local needs. This instrument is desirable for public administrator skills renewal. It leverages on transversal competencies in managing multiple actions, and integrate tools. It applies specific skills to improve policy commitment at all institutional levels. The developing skills/capabilities can be useful to design the development policies at the local level. The multilevel governance process strengthens the policy-making capabilities and pushes towards reform policies, but it needs a continuous revitalization process of exchange and control. For an integrated policy is important to activate the political commitment, to implement it in the better way and to transfer and share with the territory choices, actions, and values.

CONCLUSIONS

The interviews interestingly offered information otherwise not easily available and it was a way to reflect on the on-going process for the Pact referents (as they said). In the agenda-setting Pacts can be a tool to switch on overcoming the gap between the central and local governance of policies in a reforms period but it needs to reinforce them with some factors. The quick design and the standard frame did not allow for perfect issue analysis, but it was a push to act. The action arena is the focus of issue analysis and a more attention to the arena involvement in designing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation could be a push towards development policies.

The Pacts help to mobilize more resources towards a design capability but they need a better polycentric strategic vision to go from projects to policies. The multi-level governance, generated by them, is modifying the flux of political communication among the institutions involved in the agreement, re-shaping both the decision-making process and the activities performed by the administrative structures toward a managerial model outcomes oriented. The interplay between

governance and implementation processes innovation is a crucial challenge. Viable communication channels and formats (i.e. benchmarking) among Pacts could enhance mutual learning. A more structured social accountability (in the diagonal accountability scheme) with regular information and communication supports (not at all allowed in Pacts) may help to identify trade-offs between quick-term interventions and long-term programs, and to focus consistently on achieving desirable societal outcomes (Bovens 2007).

The resulting framework is a trend to implement a strategy of synergistic and integrated actions for new and shared policies culture based on strategic local interventions in a standard scheme on multi-level governance. It would be necessary to strengthen the evaluation system to link actions and outcomes, to understand the impact on territories and on Italian growth, and to increase the evolution of the instrument in the policy cycle (Howled and Ramesh 2013).

We can end saying that the “Pacts for Development” is certainly an experimenting policy instrument and it could serve to produce changes in public policy starting by its meaning, in its cognitive and regulatory framework and in its results (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007, p.17).

The Institutional analysis as a part of the supervision, monitoring, and evaluation of on-going Pacts might also help policy-makers to identify the trade-off between the short-term interventions, and long-term impact of programs, to inform and support the institutional structures to develop both shared intervention programmes or policies, and also to design incremental policies that may favour a better deployment of people’s attention toward and awareness about medium and long term results. In fact, one of the primary purposes of institutional analysis (Ostrom, Cox, Schlager 2015, p.269) is to understand how people use institutional arrangements to address shared problems and challenges and, in understanding the logic of institutional designs, in making informed proposals to improve institutional performance.

The process for a policy approach to support reforms, overcoming the gap among the different level of government in policy-making, is starting and we wish that all Pacts’ actors follow the Mark

Moore's (Moore 1995, p.20) advice to become "explorers who, with others, seek to discover, define, and produce public value".

Note:

We are sincerely grateful to: Bianca Maria Scalet, Managing Director of Development Pacts-Cabinet Office Minister for Territorial Cohesion and the South, Roma; Monica Staibano, Coordinator of the Development Pact of Campania Region, Executive Director of Unitary Programming Service-Office VII Campania Region, Napoli; Davide F. Pellegrino, Coordinator of Development Pact of the Metropolitan City of Bari and General Manager of the city of Bari; Luigi Ranieri, Member of the Pact Committee and Executive Director of the City of Bari.

Special thanks to Andrea Vecchia, Coordinator of Development Pacts, Agency for Territorial Cohesion, Roma for the help in understanding all Pacts' frame and the regulatory scheme, and choosing interviews referents.

REFERENCES:

For more information about Pacts: <http://www.governo.it/approfondimento/patti-territoriali/6540>; http://www.agenziacoessione.gov.it/it/politiche_e_attivita/programmazione_2014-2020/patti_per_lo_sviluppo/index.html

Bovens, M. (2007) Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework, European Law Journal, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 447-468, July.

Commission of the European Communities (2001) "European Governance, a White Paper" COM (2001), 428.

Confindustria Cgil Cisl Uil (2017) *Impresa e lavoro nei patti regionali dei Masterplan*, Roma, Febbraio

Fukuyama, F. (2013) "What Is Governance?", Governance, Vol. 26, No. 3, (pp. 347–368).

Hood, C. (1986) *The Tools of Government*, Chatham, Chatham House.

Hood, C. (2007) Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions, Vol. 20, No. 1, January.

- Hood, C. Margetts, H. Z. (2007) *The Tools of Government in the Digital Age*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hooghe, L. Marks, G. (2003) *Unraveling the Central State, But How? Types of Multi-Level Governance* Reihe Politikwissenschaft n.87 Political Science Series – Institute for advanced studies, Vienna.
- Howlett, M.P. and Ramesh, M. (2003) *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*, Toronto, Oxford University Press.
- Kingdon, J. W. (1995) *Agenda, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd edition), New York, Harper Collins.
- Lascoumes, P. Le Galès, P. (2005) *Gouverner par les instruments*, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po.
- Lascoumes, P. Le Galès, P. (2007) “Understanding Public Policy through Its Instruments—From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation”, *Governance*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp 1–21.
- Masterplan per il Mezzogiorno
http://presidenza.governo.it/GovernoInforma/documenti/masterplan_mezzogiorno.pdf.
- Moore, M. (1995) *Creating Public Value – Strategic Management in Government*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (1990) *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge, University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (2005) *Understanding Institutional Diversity*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (2007) “A diagnostic approach for going beyond panaceas” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* PNAS September 25 vol. 104 no. 39 pp. 15181–15187.
- Ostrom, E. with Cox, M. Schlager, E. (2015) “Institutional Rational Choice: An Assessment of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework” in Sabatier, P. A. *Theories of the Policy Process*, 3rd ed, 21–64. Boulder CO, Westview Press.
- Turrini, O. Salomone, A. Uliano, M. (2016) *Guida ai Fondi strutturali e di investimento europei 2014-2020*, Roma, Edizioni Lavoro.
- Piattoni, S. (2008) “Multi-level governance. A conceptual analysis”, Presentation at the Fourth TransAtlantic Dialogue (4TAD) 12-14 June, Milano, Università Bocconi.
- Polski, M. M. Ostrom, E. (1999) “An institutional framework for policy analysis and design workshop in political theory and policy analysis” Department of Political Science Indiana University ©1999 by authors
- Ramesh, M. Howlett, M.P. Saguin, K. (2016) “Measuring Individual-Level Analytical, Managerial and Political Policy Capacity: A Survey Instrument”, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy Research Paper No. 16-07.
- Ramesh, M., Saguin, K., Howlett, M. P., & Wu, X. (2016) “Rethinking Governance Capacity As Organizational and Systemic Resources”, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy Research Paper No. 16-12

Salamon, L.M. ed. (2002) *The Tools of Government. A Guide to the New Governance*, New York, Oxford University Press.

SVIMEZ (2016) *Rapporto SVIMEZ 2016 sull'economia del mezzogiorno*, Bologna, Il Mulino.

Wu, X., Ramesh, M., Howlett, M.P. (2015) "Blending skill and resources across multiple levels of activity: Competences, capabilities and the policy capacities of government" *Policy and Society*, n. 34 pp. 173–182