P06 / Politics of Street-Level Organizations: Between Market, Mobilizations and the State

Topic : POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Chair : Jonathan Miaz (University of Lausanne)

Second Chair : Sule Tomkinson (Université Laval)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

Michael Lipsky's street-level bureaucracy theory, and the following research tradition that examined the role of implementation agents, transformed the way policy scholars examine public organizations (Portillo and Rudes, 2014). Research in diverse policy domains illustrated the importance of these agents' discretion, judgment, power and autonomy for policy implementation contrary to the lowest level policy space they are considered to occupy (Brodkin, 1997; 2011; Brodkin and Marston, 2013; Chiarello, 2015; Dubois, 1999; Evans, 2010; Hill, Hupe and Buffat 2015; Maynard-Moody and Musheno, 2003; Miaz, 2017a; Spire, 2007; Tomkinson, 2018; Watkins-Haye, 2009; Zacka, 2017).

While the street-level bureaucracy theory continues to point out to the political consequences of administrative discretion in an empirically grounded manner (Brodkin, 2012) theoretical and political transformations raise some questions regarding its explanatory power. First, some authors argue that the focus on the discretionary power of implementation agents limits the scope of analysis to the individual level and perpetuates the attention on agents' control (Maynard-Moody and Musheno, 2003 and 2012; Maynard-Moody and Portillo, 2010). Instead they suggest focusing on institutional norms, reframing of agents' judgments and actions through agency and pragmatic improvisation.

Second, with new modes of governance, non-profit and market actors have also gained the role of implementation agents (Fyall, 2017). However, as Brodkin states it well, "the world that gave rise to street-level bureaucracies has been transformed. The public sector no longer dominates policy delivery as it once did. Contracting and privatization have reshaped the organizational landscape, creating new, mixed forms of provision and complex delivery arrangements. Today, policy delivery occurs not only through public bureaucracies, but also through nonprofit organizations, for-profit firms, and mixed public–private arrangements." (Brodkin 2012, 944) Taking into account this transformation, Brodkin proposes to broaden our approach to analyze what she calls "street-level organizations" to take into account the increasing number of non-State actors are now involved in policy implementation. For instance, non-profit or activist organizations can have a policy-making role and work like street-level organizations through their participation in the process of selecting the beneficiaries of public action (Weill 2014) or through their own selecting practices in providing legal help to migrants and asylum seekers (Miaz 2017b; Pette 2014). These actors may be auxiliaries of the state to which this latter has delegated implementation tasks, but they may also be actors replacing or complementing the state (receiving funds for their action), or even contesting state practices, for example in providing legal help to claim or protect their rights.

References

- Brodkin, Evelyn Z., 1997, "Inside the welfare contract: Discretion and accountability in state welfare administration," Social Service Review, 71, pp. 1-33.
- Brodkin, Evelyn Z., 2011, "Policy Work: Street-Level Organizations Under New Managerialism," Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Supplement 2, 21, pp. 253-277.
- Brodkin, Evelyn Z., 2012, "Reflections on Street-Level Bureaucracy: Past, Present, and Future," Public Administration Review, 72, 6, pp. 940-949.
- Brodkin, Evelyn Z. and Gregory Marston (eds.), 2013, Work and the Welfare State. Street-Level Organizations and Workfare Politics, Washington, DC, Georgetown University Press.
- Chiarello, Elizabeth, 2015, "The War on Drugs Comes to the Pharmacy Counter: Frontline Work in the Shadow of Discrepant Institutional Logics," Law & Social Inquiry, 40, 1, pp. 86-122.
- Dubois, Vincent, 2010, The Bureaucrat and the Poor. Encounters in French Welfare Offices, 1st Edition, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Evans, Tony, 2010, Professional Discretion in Welfare Services: Beyond Street-Level Bureaucracy, Farnham, Ashgate.
- Fyall, Rachel, 2017, "Nonprofits as Advocates and Providers: A Conceptual Framework," Policy Studies Journal, 45, 1 pp. 121-143.

- Hupe, Peter, Michael Hill and Aurélien Buffat, 2015, Understanding Street-Level Bureaucracy, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Maynard-Moody, Steven and Michael Musheno, 2003, Cops, Teachers, Counselors. Stories from the Front Lines of Public Service, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press
- Maynard-Moody, Steven and Michael Musheno, 2012, “Social Equities and Inequities: Street-Level Workers as Agents and Pragmatists,” Public Administration Review, 72, S1, 2012, pp. 16-23.
- Maynard-Moody, Steven and Shannon Portillo, 2010, “Street-Level Bureaucracy Theory,” in Robert Durant (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of American Bureaucracy, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 252-277.
- Miaz, Jonathan, 2017a, “From the Law to the Decision: The Social and Legal Conditions of Asylum Adjudication in Switzerland,” European Policy Analysis, 3, 2, pp. 372-396.
- Miaz, Jonathan, 2017b, « Qui peut rester et qui doit partir ? Les frontières au prisme des usages sociaux du droit d’asile en Suisse », trajectoires, Hors série 3, online version, https://journals.openedition.org/trajectoires/2398.
- Pette, Mathilde, 2014, « Associations: les nouveaux guichets de l’immigration ? Du travail militant en préfecture », Sociologie, 5, 4, pp. 405-421.
- Portillo, Shannon and Danielle S. Rudes, 2014, “Construction of Justice at the Street Level,” The Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 10, pp. 321-334.
- Spire, Alexis, 2007, « L’asile au guichet. La dépolitisation du droit des étrangers par les agents de préfecture », Actes de la Recherche en sciences sociales, 169, pp. 30-47.
- Tilly, Charles, 1995, « Contentious Repertoires in Great Britain, 1758-1834”, in Mark Traugott (ed.), Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action, Durhan (N. C.), Duke University Press, pp. 15-42.
- Tomkinson, Sule, 2018, “Who are you afraid of and why? Inside the Black Box of Refugee Tribunals”, Administration publique du Canada, 61, 2, pp. 184-204.
- Watkins-Haye, Celeste, 2009, The New Welfare Bureaucrats. Entanglements of Race, Class, and Policy Reform, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Weill, Pierre-Edouard, 2014, « Quand les associations font office de street-level bureaucracy. Le travail quotidien en faveur de l’accès au droit au logement opposable », Sociologie du travail, 56, 3, pp. 298-319.
- Zacka, Bernardo, 2017, When the State Meets the Street. Public Service and Moral Agency, Harvard University Press.

CALL FOR PAPERS

This panel welcomes papers analyzing the role of street-level (but non-state) organizations in policy implementation and in policymaking, as well as in social change. These organizations and their implementation actors can have different status and relations to the state: state can delegate them tasks, they can receive state funds for their activities, they can participate in an administrative procedure, they can act as an autonomous complement to the state action, or they can contest state practices, with law, for example. In our approach, legal mobilizations contesting policy with law can play a role in the access to social delivery, to justice, or to individual rights. To that extent, they are involved in policy implementation. As a consequence, we would like to gather papers not only on SLOs directly involved in policy implementation (by delegation or mandate), but also on activist or charity organizations that have more ambiguous relationships to the State actors, because their action is constructed against, complementary to state action. For example, some associations’ action aims at filling a lack of public policies or even at “fighting” social problems arising because of certain policies. The common point of the papers gathered in this panel is that these organizations’ action is characterized by direct relationships with their target public in policy delivery. This panel welcomes papers addressing questions regarding the role, practices and the broader impact of these SLOs’ action.

This panel welcomes papers addressing questions regarding the role, practices and the broader impacts of these SLOs’ action:

- First, we are interested in the role and functioning of these SLOs. This first axis also questions how these organizations came to choose to commit themselves in certain tasks or action modes, in reference to their repertoire of contention (Tilly, 1995).

- Second, we are interested in the concrete practices of SLOs and their effects on policy delivery, the access to justice and rights. How do they select those who can benefit from their services? How do these concrete practices shape the access to the specific services or goods that these SLOs provide?

Finally, the panel intends to question the broader effects of SLOs’ action on public policy, the state, law and policy-making as well as social change. How and to what extent SLOs have a policy-making role?

P06 / Politics of Street-Level Organizations: Between Market, Mobilizations and the State

Chair : Jonathan Miaz (University of Lausanne)

Second Chair : Sule Tomkinson (Université Laval)

Session 1Street-level organizations and politics of asylum and visas

Thursday, June 27th 10:30 to 12:30 (MB S1.401)

Discussants

Sule Tomkinson (Université Laval)

Jonathan Miaz (University of Lausanne)

(Un)making public policy in a regime of enclosure: Street-level organizations and the negotiation of asylum reception In Switzerland

Camilla Alberti (University of Neuchatel)

In Switzerland, the housing and care of forced migrants are devolved to a complex array of public and private actors, who become operational agents of the state. In the process of neoliberal bureaucratization, contractual arrangements allow the state to achieve more flexibility and efficiency in providing services, but also to distance itself from a highly politicized population while still designing the parameters of asylum reception. At the same time, contracting creates complex relationships, which often challenge service organizations' independency, functioning and internal goals.

By analyzing contracting as part of a regime of "enclosure", i.e. the commodification and normalization of asylum reception but also the process of discarding alternatives for support services, this article seeks to make visible the informal practices through which street-level organizations negotiate the politics of reception in Switzerland. By drawing upon an ethnographic research conducted in three privately run reception centers, it explores the diversity of state-mandated organizations – private, NGO and parastate – and questions their self-understanding and role in the (un)making of public policy.

Considering both internal dynamics and relationships to the larger polity, the paper analyzes how negotiations vary greatly according to the organization's identity and work philosophy. The analysis of the data collected shows that differences in practices and discourses occur in three interconnected ways. First, in the use of discretion to adjust to neoliberal formalities (e.g. to meet structural demands of state-given mandates). Secondly, in the everyday work in reception centers and the concrete practices related to the support of asylum seekers. Third, in the emergence of spaces of resistance or critique vis-à-vis the standards of service delivery.

Enquiring Schengen visa industry at the street level : the case of Algiers

Juliette Dupont (Université de Montreal)

This communication tackles Schengen visa policy implementation and marketization in Algeria. Despite appearances of technicality, Schengen visa policy was designed as a restriction to free movement within the European union (EU). Since mid-1990s, it is implemented by national consulates abroad and is part of EU strategy of externalizing border management. In contrast with this idea of control and restriction, recent developments show evidence of the gradual marketization and privatization of this activity. For a decade, European consulates have outsourced visa services to private contractors that manage millions of visa applications. For many Member States, issuing visas has become a profitable policy and the European Commission seeks to develop "a smarter visa policy to serve economic growth".

While puzzling, these trends are under-estimated by existing literature. My main assumption consists in

demonstrating the strengthening of a mercantile paradigm, as well as its consequences on access to international mobility. To explore variations of the combination of control- and market-oriented logics, I compare two cases : China, where marketization of Schengen visa policy combines with low refusal rates (3%) and Algeria, where marketization goes together with a restrictive approach of visa policy (40% of denied applications).

This paper exposes first empirical results of fieldwork in Algiers in Fall 2018 and Winter 2019, where I have conducted observations and semi-directed interviews with actors and users of Schengen visa policy (n=25). Enquiring the local level provides several insights on formal and informal street-level governance of visas.

First, I identify a diversity of 'migration industry' actors, as well as their practices and discourses. They include private service providers but also facilitators from the parallel market. The latter are both present in Algiers's streets and online.Internet cafés and travel agencies sell a wide range of informal services to applicants, for instance providing appointments to visa application centers. Netnography[1] also allows observing the variety of illegal facilitations daily offered to applicants on social networks and online classified ads, for instance forging documents to complete the visa application.

Then, I focus on how such forms of marketization shape Schengen visa applicants' practices.

Finally, I analyse how it affects European consulates in charge with the implementation of Schengen visa policy. On the one hand, they capitalize on market-oriented logics, such as by developing visa facilitations to attractive profiles, sometimes at the expense of local competition between Member States. On the other hand, I give evidence of even more restrictive approach to informal practices of facilitators and applicants.

[1]Kozinets, Robert. 2009. Netnography : doing ethnographic research online. Londres : Sage.

Volunteer interpreters in association: intermediary's actors in the implementation of asylum policies?

Maureen Clappe (Sciences Po Grenoble - Université Grenoble Alpes - Laboratoire Pacte UMR 5194)

Maureen Clappe

PhD student, Grenoble Institute of Political Studies, Grenoble Alpes University, PACTE (UMR 5194) – Social sciences research laboratory

Research Fellow at French Institute Convergences Migrations

T06P06: Politics of Street-Level Organizations: Between Market, Mobilizations and the State

Volunteer interpreters in association: intermediary's actors in the implementation of asylum policies?

This proposal for communication is part of a thesis in political sociology at the Grenoble Alpes University on the role of intermediary actors in the implementation of asylum policies.

Based on an ethnographic study conducted since 2014 in Solidarité Asile - a local French voluntary association supporting asylum seekers – this contribution analyses the role and the different strategies implemented by the volunteer interpreters both within the association and with asylum seekers. Indeed, to overcome policies of budgetary restrictions, some associations providing aid and support to foreigners (Pette, 2014; Pian, 2017) solicit volunteer interpreters, often refugees or in the process of applying for asylum, to translate what is said between the associative actor and the asylum seeker. Most of them are recruited for their language skills but also for their knowledge of the asylum procedure and access to social rights. These exiles are interpreters for several ways: they participate in the refugee selection process. (D'Halluin, 2012; Giametta, 2018) through the different gatekeeping strategies (White, 1950) that they mobilize to write asylum claims stories. How some of them do to capture power that puts them in a central position between institutional actors and asylum seekers? How by acting as intermediaries (Nay and Smith, 2002), do they participate in the construction of institutional rules and shape interactions between institutions and asylum seekers?

Observing the situation of "go-between" of these exiles interpreters, allows accounting of their dual role: that of privileged interlocutor for the institutions and that of spokesperson for the asylum seekers by whom they are legitimized. Through several empirical examples and in particular the writing of asylum claim life story, we will show to what extent these interpreters integrate the framework of the asylum procedure and participate in the dissemination of its norms, values and objectives. Depending on whether they are refugees or waiting to be regularized, their postures and strategies of gatekeeping will not be the same: some pledge allegiance to the institution while others choose to devote themselves to the community of their

country of origin.

Grounded theory and ethnography of the administrative procedures of the asylum procedure, mobilized in my PhD research, seems to be a relevant methodology to report on the empirical realities of governance of minority and the implementation of public policies.

Immersed in the associative system of non-profit organizations supporting foreigners, in urban area of more than four hundred thousand inhabitants since 2012, we will mobilize qualitative data from extended observation sequences and narrative interviews with asylum seekers, volunteer interpreters and non-profit actors (n = 45).

The policy role of law intermediaries: legal defense services for asylum seekers between legal activism and street-level organizations

Jonathan Miaz (University of Lausanne)

This paper analyzes how law intermediaries – especially charity organizations and legal mobilizations providing legal advice to asylum seekers – defend individual asylum seekers' rights and at times contesting domestic asylum policy in Switzerland. Three main arguments will be developed: as they use law for the individual defense of migrants, these law intermediaries (1) participate in the implementation of asylum law and policy, (2) they contribute to the sophistication of the law, and (3) they can act as "counter-power" to the state administration, because they contest their practices and asylum policy.

All the legal defense services (LDS) observed or interviewed select the cases they accept to defend, based on legal, bureaucratic, moral and political criteria and categories. They play a role of "filter" for the state administration or the courts. In doing so, they participate in the implementation of asylum law and policy. Using law to contest bureaucratic decisions of the state administration, LDS shape a (limited) access to the law and to the rights for migrants. They also participate in the differential management of asylum as they allow some people to access to a status in Switzerland and as they select the persons who can benefit their help, or not. Thus, on the one hand, using law can limit the action of the LDS to the individual defense (Agrikoliansky 2003).

However, on the other hand, I argue that LDS action also has effects on the law and on the state administration's practices. Through the individual defense, LDS undertake a "legal guerilla" having effects on bureaucratic practices – through their anticipation of the "threat of recourse" or through the change of their guidelines – and producing, on a case-by-case basis, a jurisprudence that can be in favor of asylum seekers. Comparing LDS practices and profiles, I finally show that some of them develop strategic litigation, beside the individual legal defense. Thus, beyond the individual defense of a case, they aim at transforming law through jurisprudence: in doing so, individual legal defense can allow to contest asylum policy in courts (Kawar 2015).

This proposal is based on an ethnographic research (observations and interviews) conducted between 2010 and 2014 in the State Secretariat for Migration (administration) and in legal defense services for asylum seekers in Switzerland, as well as on interviews conducted in 2018 and 2019 in Switzerland and in the United States with lawyers, volunteers and activists providing legal services for asylum seekers.

P06 / Politics of Street-Level Organizations: Between Market, Mobilizations and the State

Chair : Jonathan Miaz (University of Lausanne)

Second Chair : Sule Tomkinson (Université Laval)

Session 2Street-level organizations and the politics of health care, welfare and urban agriculture

Thursday, June 27th 16:30 to 18:30 (MB S1.401)

Discussants

Jonathan Miaz (University of Lausanne)

Sule Tomkinson (Université Laval)

Understanding the roles of street-level bureaucrats in the delivery of home and community care services for older adults in Ontario, Canada: A comparative perspective of state and non-state organizations

Julia Ho

Fiona Miller (University of Toronto)

Karen Spalding (Ryerson University)

Kerry Kuluski (Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute, Sinai Health System and Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto)

Mixed forms of governance and delivery are a defining feature of community-based health and social care around the world (World Health Organization, 2015), with both state and non-state organizations often involved in the delivery of services and supports to enable individuals to retain their health and independence in the community. As developed countries grapple with aging populations with cross-cutting health and social care needs, there is a growing consensus that health and social services need to be better 'coordinated' in order to support older persons and contain costs. This paper examines efforts to coordinate health and social care for older adults in Ontario, Canada, among front line providers working for both state and non-state organizations, to consider how health and social care coordination practices are shaped by regulatory entitlement frameworks.

A range of health and social care services in community-based settings (including private homes and older adult centres) are available to Ontario residents. Though known collectively as home and community care (HCC), HCC is comprised of two main sub-sectors, which are differentially financed and organized: (i) **home care (HC**) involves medically-oriented services such as personal supports, nursing care, and professional therapies; as part of the publicly funded health system, home care is the responsibility of state agencies, Regional Health Authorities (RHAs), which provide the services free at point-of-care; case managers employed by the RHAs assess entitlements for care, with services delivered by contracted private providers; (ii) **community support services (CSS)** involve more socially-oriented care such as housing with supports, meal delivery, and socialization programs; though publicly subsidized, these are not health care entitlements and income-dependent user fees are often required; though partially funded by the RHAs, CSS are delivered by small and medium-sized charitable organizations, which employ case managers to assess needs and coordinate the delivery of whatever services their organizations can provide.

Ontario's HCC context gives rise to an arrangement where state (HC) and non-state (CSS) organizations are charged with the delivery of health and social services to older adults. Drawing on the literature on street-level organizations, where scholars conceptualize policy implementation as an enterprise that extends beyond formal state actors, and includes organizations such as charities (Brodkin, 2011), we aim to explore the question: what are the strategies and practices employed by HC organizations and CSS organizations to deliver supports to older adults with health and social care needs living in the community? We conducted

qualitative interviews with case managers from HC and CSS. HC case managers are classic examples of street-level bureaucrats as they make decisions about who will benefit from government services (Lipsky, 1980). Thus, they have to simultaneously address top-down pressures (from the 'government') and bottom-up pressures (from the 'client') (Hupe & Buffat, 2014). CSS case managers do not have the authority to make decisions about citizen entitlements, so seemingly the top-down pressure is 'less' prominent than HC case managers. Despite these differences, both sets of case managers use similar practices and strategies to cope with discrepancies between what their clients need and what their organizations can provide. They advocate for their clients when they see public service gaps and employ creative workarounds to provide services for clients who otherwise would not be served. This suggests both state and non-state street-level bureaucrats employ their discretion in ways that use moral reasoning to promote better social equity in society (Maynard-Moody & Musheno, 2012). This also suggests state and non-state organizations, while faced with different sets of accountabilities, do promote practices, at the front-lines of service delivery, that ultimately serve to improve the social welfare of citizens.

References

Brodkin, Evelyn Z., 2011, "Putting Street-Level Organizations First: New Directions for Social Policy and Management Research," Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Supplement 2, 21, pp. 199-201.

Hupe, Peter and Aurélien Buffat, 2014, "A Public Service Gap: Capturing contexts in a comparative approach of street-level bureaucracy," Public Management Review, 16, 4, pp. 548-569.

Lipsky, Michael, 1980, Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services, New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Maynard-Moody, Steven and Michael Musheno, 2012, "Social Equities and Inequities in Practices: Street-Level Workers as Agents and Pragmatists," Public Administration Review, Supplement 1, 72, pp. S16-S23.

World Health Organization, 2015, World Report on Ageing and Health, Geneva, WHO.

Trust, identity, and practices of street-level bureaucrats

Maayan Davidovitz (Tel Aviv University)

Nissim Cohen (University of Haifa)

Trust, identity, and practices of street-level bureaucrats

The aim of this study is to examine how the level and type of trust of street level bureaucrats (SLBs) in policy, their managers and clients, is reflected in their identity and their practices towards clients. we will also investigate whether and how these factors change in different organizational environments (public, private and non-profit).

SLBs are important players in influencing the implementation of public policy and, consequently, their outcomes (Brodkin, 2012). Lipsky (1980) explained that these bureaucrats (e.g., teachers, police officers, social workers) are implementing "bottom-up" public policies through their daily interactions with their clients, through which they provide public services. The literature provides evidence of the interaction between them and citizens and managers (e.g., Tummers et al., 2015; Destler, 2017), in public (e.g., Maynard-Moody & Musheno, 2000), private (e.g., Dias & Maynard-Moody, 2006) and non-profit (e.g., Lipsky & Smith, 1989) environments. Additionally, the practices of SLBs and managers towards clients vary depending on the organizational environment in which they operate (e.g., Cohen, Benish & Shamriz-Ilouz, 2016).

Lipsky (1980, 2010) explained the behavior of SLBs using the term "coping." Coping within public service is defined as the behavioral efforts of frontline public administration employees in their interactions with citizens. Tummers et al. (2015) divided the term "coping" into three categories that characterize the practices of SLBs with their clients: "moving toward clients," "moving away from clients" or "moving against clients." Brodkin (1997) and Dias and Maynard-Moody (2006) expanded the issue of coping and referred to the ways in which SLBs bend or break the rules for their clients. These can be linked to Maynard-Moody and Musheno's (2000) analysis of two narratives that characterize the discretion of SLBs in their work: state agents or citizen agents.

Trust is an essential element in the work of SLBs because they define their work with regard to their personal obligations to citizens (Maynard-Moody & Musheno, 2000). The literature shows that trust influences the behavior of SLBs, their positive attitudes towards the organization, and the results of their performance (e.g., Cho & Song, 2017; Destler, 2017). For example, in organizations where trust is high, SLBs are less apprehensive about exposing their weaknesses or making mistakes (Destler, 2017).

The goal of the study is to contribute to theory in the area of how the degree of trust, perceptions, and

nature of the practices of SLBs and the interactions between them differ in various organizational environments. Empirically, we will examine two classic types of SLBs in Israel: teachers and social workers. In practical terms, insights from the research will help formulate operative recommendations for decision-makers regarding the manner in which the element of trust may affect the quality of delivery of public services and, consequently, the process of implementation.

Methodologically, to learn about the participants' emotions, experiences, perceptions and personal attitudes, we will use the qualitative research paradigm with in-depth, semi-structured interviews and textual analyses of primary and secondary sources.

Roles of Street-level Organizations in the Obama Presidential Center Community Benefits Agreement (CBA)

Melean Weiner Davis Tadeo (School of Social Service Administration)

This paper tracks and analyzes the role of street-level organizations in the development of a Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) campaign in response to the proposed Obama Presidential Library (now Center). In August of 2016, it was announced that the Obama Center would be placed in Jackson Park – a stretch of public land lying between Lake Michigan and The University of Chicago in the southern part of the city. While the announcement received broad support, some community organizations and residents from neighborhoods adjacent to the planned site, alarmed by the prospect of broad resident displacement and rapid environment changes, called for a Community Benefits Agreement (CBA), a legally binding contract between, typically, a major developer and an entity more closely oriented to the affected local community. This CBA seeks to ensure that some of the initial and ongoing developments' inflow of resources will more directly benefit local residents in the way of employment, affordable housing, business opportunities, education, and transportation. These street-level organizations, now as part of the CBA Coalition, are navigating a variety of roles in relation to state (the City of Chicago) and non-state (The Obama Foundation and The University of Chicago) actors, at various times contesting, complementing, and supplementing the state. They do so firstly, through their attempts to direct resources to particular beneficiaries via a private agreement (a CBA); secondly, in contributing to a policy agenda through a Community Benefits Agreement ordinance leading up to and during politically crucial aldermanic and mayoral elections; and thirdly, by demanding to partake in the monitoring and implementation of the potential CBA ordinance and continuing development in the area. These embryonic interpretations and reflections come out of ongoing ethnographic fieldwork embedded in the organizations comprising the CBA Coalition - composed most centrally around community organizing-oriented groups, neighborhood residents, and University of Chicago students.

Collective action and the disarray between planning and policy implementation for Urban Agriculture in the south of Sao Paulo

Lya Cynthia Porto de Oliveira (HEC-Montreal)

Zilma Borges (Getulio Vargas Foundation)

Katia Abreu (Fundacao Getulio Vargas)

The municipality of Sao Paulo presents an urban and peri-urban agriculture program since 2003 and launched its 1st Food Plan in 2016. However, the implementation of municipal actions for Urban Agriculture (UA) occurs in a disjointed manner, without continuity and adequate target public. It is noted that the advances related to this theme are mainly related to the territorial dynamics generated by the collective action of civil society and the organization of local leaders and urban farmers. Territories that could organize farmers association have greater access to programs related to UA – Urban Agriculture, but still, several neighborhoods counts with individual actions, non-state public actions or street level bureaucrats action that are usually disconnected and invisible. This article presents the results of a research that seeks to understand the phenomenon of socio-institutional articulations related to Urban Agriculture in urban micro-territories that have low access to food programs. The phenomenon is investigated and analyzed through the construction of a diagnosis on urban agriculture practices, public actions of civil society and policy implementation in two districts in the south of Sao Paulo (Jardim Ângela and Jardim São Luís). The districts compose one of the most urbanized and vulnerable territories of this megalopolis, where urban agriculture presents great invisibility to the municipal government. In this urban territory, UA does not occur as a traditional implementation policy. Instead, it occurs by a territorial dynamic of street level burocrats of health and education, community leaderships, farmers and citizens that articulate non-planned actions according to quotidian local dynamic. The local demands are then mobilizing solutions and dynamics that the institutional logic of the central administration cannot perceive. Thus, analysis is constructed based on theoretical framework proposed by Pierre Muller, Daniel Cefai, Charlotte Halpern, and Alain Faure. The research has been in progress since August 2016 and its research method is the Participant Research,

where the direction and monitoring of the work has been built in collaboration with the local population. Furthermore, the team of researchers has carried out the organization of participatory forums related to the theme, articulating networks and information in the territory. The research has identified and mapped Urban Agricultures practices, actors, projects and networks. Considering practices, it was mapped(i) commercial gardens; (ii) community and social gardens; (iii) school gardens and (iv) domestic gardens. With regard to actors, projects and networks, it was identified the presence of local NGOs, associations, incubators, educators, farmers and street level bureaucrats. On the one hand the research analyzes the organizational action processes of these actors. On the other hand, it is investigated the connection between Urban Agriculture practices (commercial, social, school and domestic gardens) to food education, preventive health and local development. Empirically, this paper contributes to the analysis of elements that may support the inter-organizational construction of public policies of Urban Agriculture. Considering theoretical contribution, the article analyze adversities in the flow between territorial collective action, planning and policy implementation, adding theoretical reflections to the Sociology of Public Action and Policy Implementation Analysis.