

**Tilburg School of Politics and Public Administration  
Tilburg University - The Netherlands**

## **INNOVATIONS IN SUB-NATIONAL GOVERNMENT IN EUROPE**

### **A quick scan**

*Commissioned by the Netherlands' Council for Public Administration*

**Linze Schaap  
Casper Geurtz  
Laurens de Graaf  
Niels Karsten**

[l.schaap@uvt.nl](mailto:l.schaap@uvt.nl)

October 2009

## CONTENTS

Preface	3
1. Problematic yet dynamic sub-national government	4
2. Government, civil society and citizens	8
3. Sub-national government between structure and performance	12
4. Discussion	19
Appendices	20
A. References	21
B. Examples regarding government, civil society and citizens	25
C. Examples regarding sub-national government between structure and performance	36

## PREFACE

Governments all over Europe and beyond face dramatic problems resulting from the international economic and ecologic crises. Financial issues, budget cuts, unemployment, neighbourhood deprivation and climate change demand serious attention. These issues not only appear on international and national agendas but they also require sub-national actions. Looking at the history of many democratic countries, sub-national authorities may be best suited for the job, since many innovations stem from local initiatives.

Dramatic as these economic and ecologic developments may be, they are not the only reasons to search for innovations on a sub-national level. Even without them, democratic government is being challenged. The mere fabric of sub-national government is under discussion, as is the quality of democracy as we know it.

In this report we aim to discuss a number of general trends in European sub-national government. The focus is on trends such as governance and renewal of democracy. The authors' ambition is to give a comprehensive overview of interesting innovations that aim to solve some of the problems in Europe's sub-national government; an ambition the Netherlands' Council for Public Administration shares. There are, however, two caveats. First, the report is the result of a quick scan. It is based on the available body of knowledge - mainly academic literature. The ambition is by no means to provide an all-encompassing overview. Instead, the authors describe general trends and interesting, challenging, cases from various European countries. Secondly, we pay slightly more attention to developments and innovations in traditional democracies in the west of the European continent. This is not an intended overexposure, but simply results from the use of available sources. Furthermore, many innovations in Central and Eastern Europe are innovations furthering the establishment and strengthening of democratic government as such. The debates regarding Central and Eastern Europe often regard the current results of the transition towards a solid and stable democracy. Specific innovations, unfortunately, are not yet well documented in the international literature.

The authors hope that this report will serve as an inspiring source for transnational debate and learning.

*On behalf of the authors,*

*Linze Schaap  
Tilburg, The Netherlands*

# **1. PROBLEMATIC YET DYNAMIC SUB-NATIONAL GOVERNMENT**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

European sub-national authorities differ in their responses to challenges. Much depends on the way national governments deal with them and, on the importance of sub-national authorities in the total organisation of government. The way the general public as well as civil society and business react to these challenges could be additional factors that need to be taken into consideration. At the same time, we might expect surprising innovative ideas. History in many countries teaches us that improvement in government is often rooted in local or regional innovations.

In this report we discuss innovations in sub-national government in Europe. The focus is on general trends and developments. The cases are not best practices, nor are they worst practices; they are above all interesting practices or developments. In this first chapter we argue that significant differences among European countries exist but that these tend to become smaller (section 2). We will then present three general trends and approaches. The first is 'governance'. Governance is a theoretical approach to public administration as well as administrative practice. Second, we will discuss the contested nature of traditional representative democracy. Third, the issue of government scale will be addressed. The next chapters will focus on various innovations. Chapter two is about the changing relations between government, civil society and citizens. Chapter three focuses on the organisation of sub-national government as such. In both chapters we distinguish on the one hand structural and institutional reforms and, on the other changing performance within existing government structures. In the final chapter we summarise our findings, reflect on these and formulate some challenges to sub-national government.

## **2. CONVERGENCE IN EUROPEAN SUB-NATIONAL GOVERNMENT**

It is quite challenging to discuss general developments in countries as different as European countries. It is even rather hazardous to state that countries can learn from experiences in other countries, considering that no two countries work according to the same system. There are various state traditions and local government systems in Western Europe, each with its own implications for the structure and mechanisms of local government. Differences exist, among others, in the number of tiers of government, the degree of local and regional autonomy, the governmental tasks and competencies, the size of authorities, the political and governance set-up at every government level and the form of democracy.

Significant as those differences may be, recent comparative studies regarding local and regional governance and democracy teach us, that the gaps between the various government systems have narrowed in recent decades, partly because of some general developments which have affected all the countries and therefore sub-national governments too. These developments are partly economic. Some have been prompted by new policy challenges in connection with, amongst others, the environment, ageing populations, migration and integration. The threat of political apathy is another universal phenomenon, as is the increasing involvement of the private sector, including the local business community and

groups of ordinary citizens. There are some striking similarities in the way municipalities and regional governments (at least in Western Europe!) deal with these questions. Terms like governance, new public management, contracting out, privatisation, public private partnership, community partnerships, and multi-level and multi-actor governance are “but a few of the neologisms that pervade current publications on local politics and government” (Denters and Rose 2005). Such similarities should not, of course, obscure what are still distinct differences between sub-national governments and between countries. Nevertheless, similar challenges tend to produce similar trends despite the existence of differences in structural (size, rural-urban areas cleavages), individual (leadership) or cultural (collectivist vs. individualist attitudes) features. We may conclude that increasing similarities among European countries do improve the prospects for comparative analysis and learning.

### **3. GOVERNANCE**

Thinking in terms of governance in particular is a very important development in international public administration.

Sub-national authorities lose more and more their autonomy and capabilities to independent problem solving. To address the growing societal problems, they increasingly depend on co-operation with other actors. Public actors from European institutions, national governments, regional government and other local authorities are progressively intervening in local policy and decision-making networks. In addition to these actors, the private sector is also increasingly becoming important. Not only local business, but also civil society and individual citizens are growing in relevance to local governance. However, on the other hand, individual authorities are obliged to be accountable for the performance, decisions and actions of the multi-actor networks they participate in. Both trends appear to be contradictory in their demands to local authorities. Authorities have to co-operate and be accountable for joint performance at the same time.

This contradiction also exists with regard to the functional side of local government - service delivery. Local authorities are responsible for service deliveries, but these are being carried out to an increasing degree by other local actors in civil society and the market. This may lead to role confusion and, potentially, to new forms of management. This is especially the case in countries in transition, where the system change might be too fast. Role confusion can also be observed in traditional democracies, particularly in those countries where trust in privatisation and outsourcing has been vested.

The generally observed movement from government to governance reflects state adaptation to a challenging external environment and serves to conceptualise the elaborate interplay of changing spatial and social systems. On the one hand, governance is providing greater opportunities for citizen involvement, not only because of its openness to various forms of democracy, but also because of the multiplicity of mechanisms such as partnerships, networks and quangos which facilitate public and private involvement in the local governance process. On the other hand, governance is predicated on a number of democratic prerequisites such as participation, representativeness, responsiveness, legitimacy and effectiveness.

#### 4. CONTESTED DEMOCRACY

The way local government, and local democracy in particular, functions is one of the problems facing many, if not all local governments in Europe. Many authors stress the problems of local democracy just as we have known them up to now: on the one hand, the low rates of voter turnout, that oscillate in Europe between the 20 per cent and just above 60 per cent in the best of the cases, reflect the degree of citizen disaffection with local politics; on the other hand, the progressive presence of stakeholders in the policy-making processes makes it even more difficult for councils and civil society to assess the results of public action and feeds the harmful spiral of disinterested citizens and irresponsible governments. The public is realigning itself. People are bonding less with the local community and becoming more individualistic. They are demanding more and better services from the government. At the same time, they are more willing to participate, debate and act. The importance of traditional representative democracy is declining. These trends are creating a tension between representative democracy and trust in an elected body on the one hand, and public input and participation on the other. All of this is taking place against a background of increasing social fragmentation.

Four strategies – some more interventionist than others – are being deployed to address these trends. The first strategy aims to *strengthen the existing model of representation* by, for example, reforming the electoral system, simplifying the voting procedures, improving the performance of the municipal councils, establishing district councils, or reinforcing the role of the executive by a power separation between executives and councils. The second attempts to *broaden the concept of representation* by inviting people to participate in dialog while maintaining representation as the only source of legitimate authority. Many countries have thus created non-binding mechanisms of citizen consultation such as opinion polls, panel discussions and advisory boards.

The third strategy sees the *citizen as a customer*. In this vision the core concept is ‘customer democracy’, which is sometimes put into practice by defining the quality of services that citizens are entitled to expect, and sometimes by allowing citizens a say in the decisions on services. The fourth strategy likewise adds *another form of democracy* to electoral representation: direct and participative democracy, which embraces referenda, elected mayors, co-produced policy, and self-governance by citizens. In this strategy, the power to make binding decisions moves, in part, from the representative council to civil society or even to individuals or groups of ordinary citizens.

The implementation of participatory tools (referenda, "political markets", citizen's juries, etc.) draws direct links between the citizenry and the policy-makers bypassing councillors, the traditional representatives of the community, who are compelled to sacrifice their role and reinvent themselves for the sake of citizens' participation. We may understand citizens' participation as a learning process where the general aim is to achieve an optimal political participation, without erasing the representative democratic system but rather enriching it. Government may fulfil the role of an arbiter in cases of conflicts between different actors, since there is a necessary premise of balanced forces within a governance system characterized by plurality and deliberation.

## 5. GOVERNMENT SCALE

Finally, we need to say something about scale. All over Europe we observe governments' struggles with the scale and size of government units such as municipalities and regions.

In traditional 'government' analyses, there is a causal link between the geographical scale and size of governmental units and their problem-solving performance. In this kind of analysis, failing policies result from inadequacies in the fabric of government, particularly its size. Small wonder solutions are sought in reforming the scale of government, sometimes in reducing the scale, more often in enlarging the territorial scale. The basic assumption being that three different scales need to be congruent, that is the scale of government, the scale of the societal issue at hand, and the scale of public involvement. It is the search for the right scale.

However, this search is problematic. Two concepts are relevant in this respect: system capacity (governments' abilities to formulate and execute policies and thus solve societal problems) and, citizen effectiveness (the extent to which local governments succeed in letting citizens participate effectively in the decision-making processes). For both, scale is not the most important factor. In theory and practice, no clear relations exist between government scale on the one hand, and system capacity and citizen effectiveness on the other. Larger authorities are not by definition more effective, efficient or democratic.

## **2. GOVERNMENT, CIVIL SOCIETY AND CITIZENS**

### **1. DEMOCRATIC REFORM**

Reforms in the relationships between government, citizens and civil society are mainly connected with the improvement of transparency and the strengthening of local democracy. These issues refer to citizen effectiveness, which was mentioned in the previous chapter.

#### **A. Citizen participation and citizen initiatives**

Political scientists highly discussed the concept of participatory democracy in the 1960s and 1970s. It is a relatively modern notion of democracy, but it is based on classic democratic principles. Currently, participatory democracy is still under discussion. We describe participatory democracy as ‘any form of democracy which emphasizes or enables extensive participation in decision-making by members of the whole group concerned’, simply as ‘bottom up democracy’. The democratic process is driven by participants from the public domain. It is a process of social interaction. Participatory democracy is linked with the more classical model of direct democracy and it is pluralistic. Some authors stress the local practise of participatory democracy, “participation is most likely to take place at the local level where people live and work and socialize, raise their families, and draw upon the services and benefits of the state” (Lowndes 1995) It often depends on the receptiveness of the local government how participatory democracy is institutionalised in its daily practice.

In many European countries, there is a loud call to invite and involve citizens in decision making. There is an increasing variety of instruments that local governments are using, such as citizens’ juries, citizens’ panels, district budgets and so on. Citizens’ participation has traditionally been used in urban and regional planning, but is increasingly used in social and safety policies as well.

In this respect, there are big differences between European local democracies. There is a long, at least twenty years, tradition with citizen participation in local democracies in North and Western Europe, for instance in the United Kingdom, in the Scandinavian countries, in Germany and in The Netherlands (see appendix B) where new experimental techniques are being developed and tested and applied. In Southern European countries, such as Spain, Portugal, France and Italy, governments recognise the urgency of an additional democratic approach besides representative democracy. However, citizens’ participation is not yet systematically applied and is rather experimental (see appendix B). In Central and Eastern Europe democracy is mainly based on representation and citizens’ participation has a formal basis and the participation practise is growing slowly (see appendix B). Experiences with citizens’ participation in northern and western countries are often considered as examples.

From a more normative point of view, it is debatable whether more citizens’ participation or a broader participation practice is better for local governance and democracy. The quality of local democracy should be approached from different democratic angles. There is a greater urgency for more participation whenever the functioning of representative democracy is lacking. We see an increase in the use of citizens’ participation in Europe, but this is highly dependent on the democratic tradition (and national culture) of these countries. The



European Union has initiated all sorts of networks, for instance, the 5th, 6th and 7th research frameworks of the European Commission and the European Research Council, to stimulate the exchange of experiences between countries and cities (see appendix B). This helps countries to learn from each other and to widely share knowledge.

## **B. Referenda**

There are other instruments to strengthen and to broaden representative democracy besides citizens' participation, such as changes in the electoral system in some German Länder and the introduction of a directly elected mayor. A referendum is a well-known instrument that is based on direct democracy. It is one of the oldest democratic instruments and is applied in many countries. Referenda aim at obtaining legitimacy for a concrete decision or intended policy. The referenda experience in Europe differs (appendix B). Switzerland has a long and wide tradition of referenda. In other countries, like The Netherlands, referenda are selectively used. Referenda are used more on a local level than on a national level and have a legal basis (for instance in national law or a local by-law). Local governments are more often the initiators of a referendum than citizens.

## **C. Directly elected mayors**

In many countries governments have decided to introduce direct mayoral elections. We can link the direct election of mayors to the need to restore legitimacy and to the emergence of stronger local leadership in relation to the challenges of the complex setting of local governance. Selection procedures do play a role, whether direct or indirect. Direct election provides a sound basis for negotiation, both at the local level and in intergovernmental relations. This can be observed in Greater London and in some of the English municipalities that have directly elected mayors. Selection procedures can have a number of indirect effects. Direct election of the mayor indirectly increases the importance of a charismatic personality. In addition, directly elected mayors tend to become the focal point for citizens, who increasingly turn to the mayor with their demands, complaints and other contacts with local government. Another indirect effect that direct elections can have on mayoral performance is that they may accelerate the tendency of mayors to become local leaders. Directly elected mayors in municipalities in the German Land Hessen as well as a number of English municipalities, provide clear examples of how mayors are becoming powerful local leaders, despite their limited statutory positions.

## **2. NEW WAYS OF WORKING**

Based on the challenging practices mentioned in the previous section, we observe some new ways of working. On the one hand, (local) governments are finding new ways to involve citizens and stakeholders in policymaking. They are becoming more creative by using ICT or experiments which have appeared to be successful in other contexts. At the same time, citizens' initiatives are increasing and third sector organisations are becoming more aware of the importance of investing in social cohesion and social capital. For instance, there are more citizens who make use of district budgets (see appendix B). The fundamental change in the relationship between government, civil society and citizens is becoming more and more horizontal. This has consequences for the way governments have to interact. It requires civil

servants to be more responsive and to develop more communicative skills. It also has consequences for community leadership and responsibilities (appendix B).

### **A. Coproduction and innovations between the public sector and the third sector**

The citizen has been at the heart of politics since the emergence of the ancient city states. Social, economic and political change has altered the nature and functioning of government and has affected the position of citizens and third sector (also called community and voluntary sector, or civil society). The changing role and perception of the state has led to new modes of policy-making and implementation as well as the involvement of a wide range of non-state actors in the processes of governing. In any given EU Member State, the reasons for third sector involvement will vary and may be more specific; however, taken together, they imply a major legitimacy crisis for the public sector as a provider of welfare services. Involvement of civil society in the structures and processes of governance has serious implications for politicians, systems and citizens. The expanding role of civil society raises questions about accountability and the representativeness of the civil society organisations.

We see changing relationships between civil society and governments. The relationship can be characterised by an increasing horizontalisation, which might be a consequence of New Public Management. These civil society organisations are more distant from local governments (through privatisations, contract and so on) and therefore the voluntary sector is being put under more and more pressure. Obviously, government is not (anymore) the only one that is responsible for social developments and society, but responsibilities are broadly shared by partnerships and networks. We see an increasing complexity to govern these social problems. There are big differences between Northern and Southern Europe. Many countries in Europe, especially Nordic and West European countries, are searching for new ways to involve the third sector in the provision and governance of social services.

Managing this involvement poses challenges at the local level. Ireland shows an interesting way of involving the civil society in *strategic policy-making* (see appendix B). It has a strongly centralised political system with functions such as health, education and policing being carried out by central government departments. The involvement of civil society is institutionalised. As part of its reform strategy, central government sought to integrate local government and local development. To achieve these aims, new structures were created, based on a partnership approach. Each local authority established 4-5 Strategic Policy Committees (SPCs), mirroring the authority's major functions and formally involving non-governmental actors in local authority policy-making. A key element of the reform was the creation of the County Development Boards (CDBs) which are charged with the social, cultural and economic development of their particular local authority area. Since 2004 the role which CDBs play in efforts to promote social inclusion has been strengthened by central government as they have been mandated "to consider and endorse work plans prepared by community and local development agencies" (Quinn, 2010).

Another development is the third sector's return to the spotlight as a provider of public services in welfare states where it traditionally did not have a major role. An example is the involvement of co-producers, like parent participation in schools and day care; this promises to empower consumers and reduce the gap between the professionals and their clientele. There has been some recent empirical work to explore the effects of citizen participation in service delivery. The European research TSFEPS Project ('Transformation des structures familiales et évolution des politiques sociales') examined the relationship between parent

participation in the provision and governance of childcare in eight EU countries. It found different levels of parent participation in different countries and in different forms of provision, i.e., public, private for-profit and third sector childcare. The highest levels of parent participation were found in third sector providers, like parent associations in France, parent initiatives in Germany, and parent cooperatives in Sweden. There were different kinds of parent participation, i.e., economic, political and social. All three kinds of participation were readily evident in third sector providers of childcare services, while both economic and political participation were highly restricted in municipal and private for-profit services.

There is no systematic evidence to indicate that third sector organisations are necessarily greater innovators than other types of providers. However, there is some recent material that indicates how they can redefine their core tasks and, in doing so, question the paradigm underlying their traditional strategies.

### **3. DISCUSSION**

When we look at the results of mentioned studies and see that representative democracy has its limitations, one may want to strengthen the quality of local democracy. This is based on the idea of combining several democratic approaches.

First, the third sector's potential is to provide public service delivery. Co-production is a new way of working in these fields. Second, there is wide experience with referenda in Europe, especially in Switzerland. Research shows that direct democracy can be used to complement representative democracy. Third, community involvement matters in terms of improving the quality of decision making and the capacity of leaders to reflect and respond to locally generated demands. However, the political and institutional learning gained from special community initiatives needs to be incorporated into sustainable processes and procedures of government and the organisations of community. It was shown that the relation between government and communities can still be better bridged (appendix B). Finally, participatory policy making often leads to high expectations among stakeholders and citizens to influence decision making. The practice of participatory policymaking is showing that many groups (ethnic minorities, young people, and people with a low income) are underrepresented, but the question is whether this is a problem or not (and if so, it is even a bigger problem in representative democracy). Our final conclusion with regard to participatory policy-making, is that inviting citizens and clients to participate is not enough, and that governments must respond to citizens' input.

### 3. SUB-NATIONAL GOVERNMENT BETWEEN STRUCTURE AND PERFORMANCE

#### 1. GOVERNMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

When it comes to institutional reform as a way of solving problems in sub-national government through innovation, changing authorities' scale (the territorial size) is an often used instrument. Many of Europe's administrative reforms are grafted upon changes of administrative entities' scales. The underlying thought is that scale reforms are needed to (re)establish the fit between the scale of government, the scale of societal issues, and the scale of public involvement. Basically, two main reform strategies can be distinguished in the territorial reorganisation of sub-national government: scale enlargement (up-scaling) and scale reduction (down-scaling). Of these two scale enlargement is much more common throughout Europe, based on the belief that the scale of societal issues has gradually become larger (as the result of globalisation for instance). Table 1 uses the two criteria of citizen capacity and citizen effectiveness discussed earlier to develop a typology of scale reforms that will be used to categorise the scale reforms discussed below. Note, however, that the categories are not entirely mutually exclusive. Some government reforms fall under more than one category, because they aim at increasing system capacity as well as increasing citizen effectiveness. Intra-municipal decentralisation is such an example.

		Measure	
		Scale enlargement	Scale reduction
Goal	System capacity	A	B
	Citizen effectiveness	C	D

Table 1: Typology of scale reform

#### A. Scale enlargement to enhance system capacity

Many institutional reforms aim at an enhancement of system capacity through scale enlargement. It is generally believed that up-scaling will lead to more efficient government. The argument is twofold. First, larger government units would better fit the scale and complexity of current societal issues. Second, scale enlargement would lead to economies of scale. One of the interesting examples of this reform strategy is Denmark's 2007 Structural Reform (see appendix C), which amounted to the merger of the 271 municipalities into larger units creating 98 new municipalities, the abolishment of the counties and the creation of five large regions. With this structural reform, Denmark has displayed a remarkable ability to implement comprehensive structural administrative innovations.

Municipal amalgamations as such, be they incremental (e.g. The Netherlands) or intermittently (e.g. Belgium, Denmark) and compulsory (e.g. United Kingdom) or voluntarily (e.g. Estonia), have been one of Europe's most widespread institutional reform strategies, hoping to increase system capacity. But, with varying results, both in terms of system capacity and in terms of citizen effectiveness. Europe has also witnessed the recent creation of regional political-administrative entities (either fully fledged regional governments or forms of inter-municipal cooperation), such as the Czech Republic's provincial governments (which was accompanied by the abolishment of district offices in 2003), Madrid's Ilex (Spain), the

Hannover Region (Germany), the Greater Lyon Urban Community (France), and the Greater London Authority (United Kingdom; see appendix C), especially in metropolitan areas. System capacity seems to be the main consideration behind these innovations.

## **B. Scale reduction to enhance system capacity**

Increases of system capacity can also be obtained through scale reduction. According to the argument for effective management, smaller government units are both more effective and more efficient because they incorporate local needs better and are also better at taking the local context into account. Also, smaller units are believed to make more comprehensive, integrative policies. Consequently, smaller government units would make and implement more effective policies and thus deal with societal issues more adequately. According to this argument, scale enlargement would lead to *diseconomies* of scale, rather than to economies of scale. Therefore, scale reduction would be a viable reform strategy. Looking at Europe's reform strategies, devolution and decentralisation are the main forms of down-scaling. There are numerous examples such as in 1998, when several powers were devolved from the centre to sub-national units in the United Kingdom in the form of a legal, institutional reform. The UK system of devolution is often called asymmetric because different sub-national units have very different devolved responsibilities. On the other hand, the UK devolution can be said to display a considerable amount of flexibility because it managed to take into account different sub-national contexts.

France's *Loi constitutionnelle* n°2003-276 is an interesting example of decentralisation by way of constitutional reform because it not only aimed at an increase in system capacity (through further administrative subdivision, agreements on local tax revenues and decentralisation of tasks), but also included measures on citizen effectiveness (e.g. by establishing conditions for local referenda).

## **C. Scale enlargement to enhance citizen effectiveness**

There is a considerable amount of scientific evidence for the proposition that citizens are more involved with those issues that are closer to them in a geographical sense (the argument of proximity). Nevertheless, scale enlargement may enhance citizen effectiveness, since larger government units *ceteris paribus* are more capable of organising and facilitating citizen involvement in policy making. Studies from countries with a high level of municipal fragmentation support this observation. Still, the number of examples of administrative reforms that aim at increasing citizen effectiveness through scale enlargement is rather limited.

Whereas citizen effectiveness generally is not one of the main considerations in scale enlargement, such reform initiatives often do include (additional) measures that aim at an increase in citizen effectiveness. An interesting example is the introduction of the directly elected Mayor of London that accompanied the establishment of the Greater London Authority (see appendix C), which aimed at an increase in the democratic legitimacy of the metropolitan government and of metropolitan policies. Admittedly, the results in this respect are not unambiguous, mainly because institutional reform alone does not guarantee success.

When it comes to citizen effectiveness, an additional advantage of regionalisation, which is a common form of scale enlargement, is that it may relieve local authorities of the burden of addressing societal needs that they are unable to fulfil. The relation between societal expectations and local government powers may consequently become less asymmetrical.

## **D. Scale reduction to enhance citizen effectiveness**

Scale reduction is a much more common measure when trying to increase citizen effectiveness. It is believed that scale reduction generally brings government and policy making in particular, closer to the people and therefore makes it more recognisable and more accessible. In addition, citizens would be more inclined to participate in policy-making processes at lower administrative levels. Citizen effectiveness would consequently increase (furthermore, there may be an additional bonus of increased policy effectiveness). This makes scale reduction a promising reform strategy.

Reforms of this nature can be found throughout Europe. One of the main examples is intra-municipal decentralisation which is the establishment of more or less autonomous political-executive entities at the sub-municipal level. Interesting cases can be found in Italy (Bologna), the United Kingdom (Birmingham), Slovakia (see appendix C) and, in a number of Scandinavian countries. It is rare to see, however, the actual splitting up of European municipalities as we have seen in Sweden in the early 20th century and more recently in Central and Eastern Europe.

In addition, federalisation is increasingly common in Europe. The issue of citizen effectiveness plays an important role here. For example, democratic improvement through institutional adjustment is one of the main drives behind the Italian *federalismo* -especially since 2001, which includes the constitutionalisation of the subsidiarity principle and further recognition of local and regional governments' autonomy vis-à-vis the state. Likewise, the creation of 'Comunidades Autónomas' in Spain aims to (re)establish a fit between the self-identification of Spaniards and the administrative structure.

## **2. GOVERNMENT AND NEW WAYS OF WORKING**

New ways of working within government are, to some extent, perhaps the least visible types of development to the general public. However, they can often lead to a great deal of debating within governments. Furthermore, even though these types of responses are restricted to arrangements between governments, there are certainly aspects that could or should be evident to citizens. For example, the main goal of the 'Neues Steuerungsmodell' (NSM), a German version of New Public Management (NPM), is to increase citizen 'customer' satisfaction.

In terms of new ways of working within government we can distinguish two broad trends. One relates to the incorporation of different and improved management techniques in the organisation of public administration which can lead to performance measurement. These also include instruments to promote good governance, for example fiscal measures in many post-Soviet countries. The second trend relates to the scale on which governments are operating and has been extensively discussed above. Throughout Europe we see more or less successful attempts of dealing with boundary issues. However, in many cases structure reform may not be viable. The main goals of the specific responses for both trends include better economic performance through, for instance, more efficiency and better general performance. We will discuss several noteworthy examples of these trends in the following sections.

## **A. Management of the public sector**

Various types of management reforms have dominated public administration debate over the past twenty years. A large number of these responses have been dubbed New Public Management (NPM) reforms. However, the term NPM can be somewhat ambiguous because there are several 'managerial' reforms that are not addressed by NPM and therefore NPM is too general to refer to specific responses. In the broad trend of implementation of new managerial techniques, we see responses focused on measurable performance and marketisation – through contracting, privatisation, or quango-isation, and on customer orientation. We have chosen below two specific cases of new ways of working between different government layers. The first case focuses on the measurement of performance of local government, whereas the second focuses on fiscal developments in Central and Eastern Europe.

### **The UK's comprehensive area & Dutch government capacity assessment**

The UK has long been a forerunner in the implementation of New Public Management instruments. Thus, at the local level they built on early NPM experiences to introduce Comprehensive Performance Assessment in 2001, which was based on a large set of quantitative measurable indicators. Because of this there was considerable criticism on the functioning of the assessment, such as the claim that it promotes strategic behaviour. Recently, the UK changed the assessment to a Comprehensive Area Assessment which includes other local assessments from an area and makes use of self-assessments. Furthermore, it is focussed on outcomes and it will not give an overall score but only 'flag' exceptionally positive and negative cases. As previously was the case, positive assessments lead to a less tight grip from central government, whereas a negative assessment will lead to tighter control by the central government.

In the Netherlands, Government Capacity Assessments have been less frequent and broader (including legitimacy and robustness as assessment categories). However, there was also critique on these assessments. They were too focussed on internal government issues and they had a double agenda promoting municipal amalgamations. In 2008, work on a new way to measure performance started after several municipalities expressed interest in using a better method. This new method is an initiative of several municipalities and has not been implemented on a national level. A group of municipalities is needed for an assessment and it starts by these municipalities making a self-assessment which includes several fixed items. This is followed by further research carried out by a team of researchers. The third step is a site visit by a committee made up out of experts from all the participating municipalities under guidance of a neutral (researcher) chairperson. Finally a report with an inter-authority comparison, conclusions and recommendations is presented.

### **Fiscal developments in Central and Eastern Europe**

Many of the academic contributions regarding the development of (local) government in Central and Eastern Europe take a fundamental stance: it revolves around countries working to create a set of solid and stable functioning democratic institutions. In recently published academic literature we can gradually see examples of experiences of democracy from Central and Eastern Europe (see examples of government-citizen relations in appendix B). An interesting development in Central and Eastern Europe is the level of fiscal (but also political) decentralisation, with countries such as Poland and Hungary considered to be more decentralised than countries such as Romania and Slovakia. Sub-nationalisation is especially interesting because it differs from the former centralized ways of working. Nowadays in

Poland, for instance, sub-national investment spending equals about 68% of total government investment spending. In contrast, even though the share of own revenues on total revenues may be high in Romania, there is still uncertainty about the exact level of autonomy at the local level. Fiscal and political decentralisation are often seen as ways to provide better services and combat corruption, although there are people that question this assertion. The level of sub-national autonomy is thus linked in an important way to the development of democracies as a whole in Central and Eastern Europe. Considering the wide variety of differences in Central and Eastern Europe this provides a very interesting case to study and debate.

## **B. Governance across boundaries**

The search for the right scale of government has led to heavy debates regarding 'rescaling'. Sometimes large-scale reforms of the territorial layering of states are not a viable alternative but some arrangements are necessary. The issues of finding a right scale for a problem can be placed clearly in the debate around governance. Seen from a governance perspective, authorities are often no longer capable of acting individually to achieve the desired results. We see examples of these types of developments all across Europe, from cities in Spain to cities in Slovakia.

### **Denmark and Sweden's Öresund region**

It is in these situations that types of arrangements such as the Öresund Committee come into play. This Committee was erected in 1993 and is built up out of both Danish and Swedish representatives. These representatives are 32 politicians (from local but also regional authorities) and there are 32 substitute representatives. The Committee does not have a formal task. Instead it is a 'loose' cooperation for a transnational region that encompasses cities such as Copenhagen in Denmark, and Malmö and Helsingborg in Sweden. The cooperation is loose in the sense that it is not a governing body, but that made agreements have to be executed elsewhere, on a local level or in another form. However, the Committee does have a commission of civil servants who work on issues the Committee engages itself with. In general, the Öresund Committee's goal can be taken quite broadly: to promote economic growth and the integration of the region as a whole. This is the main goal from which all sorts of lower order goals follow. The first big project undertaken was to build a (very long and costly) bridge between Denmark and Sweden (opened in 1999) in order to integrate the region further and stimulate (economic) cooperation and development. Several other bodies have been erected as part of this bigger regional project, such as a joint statistical bureau and medical and harbour co-operations. In this sense the Öresund Committee is a promoter of different sorts of regional cooperation and development.

### **Swiss regional co-operations**

Another example of these types of regional cooperation can be found in Switzerland. One could argue that the issues are perhaps somewhat simpler than in the Öresund region because there is no cross-border component, but there is still a considerable variety of levels with different jurisdictions that need to cooperate. The basic issues confronting Swiss municipalities are the same. These are on the one hand, finding the right level to appeal to citizens at an appropriate level and, on the other hand, providing different services (waste disposal, water management etc.) in the most effective and efficient manner. A major cause of the governance-focused approach taken by the Swiss is the inability (or unwillingness) to



create a singular authority to deal with the problems on the 'right' scale level. In Switzerland territorial reform is not popular, and often citizen agreement through referenda is needed to transfer powers. In order to be able to cope with the problem of a need for scale advantages, several types of cooperation have emerged in and around the bigger cities. To stick to the previous examples: in the Zurich region other municipalities buy services from the Zurich water management public enterprise, whilst in the Bern region a joint water management stock company owned by the central city and eleven suburbs provides these services. The Swiss case is in this sense remarkable because it shows a wide variety of different arrangements to provide services on a local-regional level to deal with local wishes and sensitivities.

### **3. DISCUSSION**

The geographical scale of government units plays an undeniable role in debates about the institutional redesign of Europe's sub-national government. However, whether the scale reforms being implemented also produce the intended results is questionable, especially since each societal issue has its own scale. Institutional reform grafted upon changes in geographical scale is not always able to incorporate this variety of scales of societal issues. The territorial organisation of political-executive units offers very little room for the differentiation required in a complex and plural society. In addition, there is no clear relation between the scale of government units on the one hand and system capacity and citizen effectiveness on the other.

This may explain why many of the scale reforms that have been implemented in the past, have failed to reach their goals. Furthermore, these reforms very often have negative unintended effects. The unmistakable trend in Europe at present towards scale enlargement, for example, has quite often negative effects in terms of democratic legitimacy and citizen involvement. Although admittedly, not all international evidence on the effects of size point in the same direction. At the same time the envisioned advantages in terms of system capacity are not being realised. The effects of municipal amalgamations, for example, generally are not what was intended; certainly no indisputable economies of scale exist and transaction costs are high.

Furthermore, institutional reform alone does not guarantee success. One of the main problems of Copenhagen's Hovedstadens Udviklingsråd (a metropolitan regional government body), for example, was that it remained a weak authority vis-à-vis local and national government. Likewise, the Greater London Authority case (see appendix C) shows that institutional design indeed can be an important aspect of innovation, but that ways of working also deserve a substantial amount of attention because they influence how institutional changes work in practice. The question is therefore, whether the importance of scale is not being overestimated when it comes to redesigning and reforming Europe's sub-national government, because other factors (such as the institutional design of government-government and government-citizen relations and political-administrative embeddedness) are more important. Scale as such, is therefore less suitable as a starting point for institutional reform.

Finding the right scale can take a different route. Co-operation between authorities may serve as an alternative to institutional reform. The two examples regarding scale (see section 2B) give rise to two other issues. The first is, does a city have a future as a purely national entity – especially in boarder-areas – in the light of European regional developments (see the Öresund case). What does this mean for the relationship between a city and (supra)national

governments? The second concerns transparency (see the Swiss regional co-operations). It is good to see that there are solutions for problems without having to carry out large-scale reforms. However, to what extent does a wide variety of different institutions and regional co-operations lead to a lack of transparency, not only for citizens but also for politicians? Furthermore, what are the implications of this lack of transparency for the accountability of those politicians?

With the latter questions, we enter the realm of government performance. The issues regarding performance give rise to two debates. The first regards the way to measure performance: is this to be something involuntarily and based on highly quantitative indicators (as in the UK), or are there better ways of working that can prevent strategic behaviour by government actors and give more balanced accounts that are also relevant for citizens (see the Dutch approach)? The next issue regards the right level of (fiscal) autonomy of sub-national democracy. To what extent should national actors dominate local democracy and what are the effects of this relation and the amount of local autonomy on the democratic development of countries as a whole?

## 4. DISCUSSION

- a. Improvements are possible and necessary in the relationships between citizens and government. One major problem is the overestimated value of the representative democracy model as the way of dealing with all issues. Political primacy is not the prerogative of elected politicians, but of society as a whole. Within the context of representation as the backbone of democracy, additional democratic models (participative, associational, or direct democracy) may provide challenging possibilities to innovate sub-national democracy, alongside the enhancement of representative democracy as such.
- b. However, the practices of such innovations do not convincingly result in the desired effects. We observe positive effects of direct mayoral elections and referenda, such as enhanced leadership and accountability. Changes in the electoral system (as in many German Länder) somewhat disappointingly do not lead to the intended higher voter turnouts. Citizens' participation is a developing and challenging practice in many countries, with varying results. It seems to function better in a context of a democratic tradition, provided that the authorities thoroughly considered and understood the changing roles of elected bodies such as local councils.
- c. Institutional reforms of sub-national government are not as effective as assumed, especially scale enlargements such as amalgamations. Many factors affect governmental performance and efficiency, among which 'scale' is only a minor one. Scale enlargement does affect democratic legitimacy but mainly in a negative way.
- d. The search for alternative ways to solve scale difficulties promises more results. Serious decentralisation and co-operation between sub-national authorities really strengthens governing capabilities and provides more flexible structures and ways of working. Here too there is a caveat; authorities need to seriously pay attention to the democratic quality and transparency of co-operative bodies, as well as to their own capacities to deal with many different bodies with different jurisdictions. Attention should be paid to new ways of evaluating performance measurement.
- e. The interplay of various developments and requirements of modern government may be rather daunting for some public officials. Governing nowadays means networking with different kinds of citizens, working with organisations from the civil society, local and sometimes even global enterprises, various kinds of authorities, in an uncertain context. This poses a challenge, a challenge which is best perceived as a joint challenge for governments and academic scholars alike.

## **APPENDICES**

A. References	21
B. Examples regarding government, civil society and citizens	25
C. Examples regarding sub-national government between structure and performance	36

## APPENDIX A. REFERENCES

- Andersen, H. T., Hansen, F., & Jørgensen, J. (2002). The fall and rise of metropolitan government in Copenhagen. *GeoJournal*, 58(1), 43-52.
- Andersen, J., & Hovgaard, G. (2003). *Welfare and Urban planning in transition – a Copenhagen case study*. Research Paper no. 8/03, Roskilde University.
- Audit Commission. (2009). *Comprehensive Area Assessment*. Framework Document, February 2009.
- Bäck, H., Gjelstrup, G., Helgesen, M., Klausen, J. E., & Johansson, F. (2004). *Urban political decentralisation: six Scandinavian cities*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Bäck, H., Heinelt, H., & Magnier, A. (Eds.). (2006). *The European Mayor. Political Leaders in the Changing Context of Local Democracy*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.)
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong Democracy. Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Benz, A., & Zimmer, C. (2010). Germany: Varieties of Democracy in a Federal System. In: Loughlin, J., Hendriks, F. & Lidström, A. (eds) (2010), *The Oxford Handbook of Subnational Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (forthcoming).
- Blatter, J. (2007). *Governance – Theoretische Formen und historische Transformationen*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Bogumil, J. (2001). *Modernisierung lokaler Politik*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Bogumil, J., & Heinelt, H. (2005). *Bürgermeister in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Boogers, M. J. G. J. A., & Graaf, L. J. de. (2008). *Een ongewenst preferendum: Een evaluatie van het Arnhemse preferendum van 6 juni 2007 over Rijnboog-Havenkwartier*. Tilburg: Tilburgse School voor Politiek en Bestuur.
- Borraz, O., & John, P. (2004). The Transformation of Urban Political Leadership in Western Europe. *International Journal of Urban and regional Research*, 28(1), 107-120.
- Brenner, N. (1998). Global cities, glocal states: global city formation and state territorial restructuring in Europe. *Review of International Political Economy*, 5(1), 1–37.
- Brenner, N. (1999a). *Global cities, glocal states: state re-scaling and the remaking of urban governance in the European Union*. Ann Arbor: UMI dissertation services.
- Brenner, N. (1999b). Beyond state-centrism? Space, territoriality, and geographic scale in globalization studies. *Theory & Society*, 28(1), 39–78.
- Brueckner, J. (2000). Fiscal decentralization in developing countries. *Annals of Economics and Finance*, 1, 1–18.
- Buček, J. (1998). Decentralisation in the Slovak big cities' self-government after 1990. *Slovak Sociological Review*, 30(4), 345-362.
- Buček, J. (2000). Sublocal decentralisation — the case of Slovak big cities. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 18(1), 57–78.
- Bundsgaard, U., & Vrangbaek, K. (2007). Reform by coincidence?: explaining the policy process of structural reform in Denmark. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(4), 491-520.
- Caulfield, J., & Larsen, H.O. (Eds.). (2002). *Local Government at the Millennium*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Commission on Administrative Structure. (2004). *Recommendation of the commission on administrative structure*. Recommendation no. 1434, Danish Ministry of the Interior and Health.
- Council of Europe. (1995). *The size of municipalities, efficiency and citizens participation*. Local and regional authorities in Europe, No. 56. Strasbourg: Council of Europe press.
- Daemen, H., & Schaap, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Citizen and City. Developments in Fifteen Local Democracies in Europe*. Delft: Eburon.
- Dahl, R. A., & Tufte, E. R. (1973). *Size and democracy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dall Schmidt, T. (2005). Cross-border regional enlargement in Oresund. *GeoJournal*, 64, 249-258.
- Denters, B., Rose, L.E. (Eds.). (2005). *Comparing Local Governance -Trends and developments*. Houndmills Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dobre, A. M. (2010). Romania: From Historical Regions to Local Decentralization via the Unitary State. In Loughlin, J., Hendriks, F. & Lidström, A. (eds) (2010), *The Oxford Handbook of Subnational Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (forthcoming).
- Dool, L. van de, Hulst, M. van, & Schaap, L. (2009). *Not just a friendly visit*. EGPA 2009 conference paper.
- Dowley, K. M. (2006). Local Government Transparency in East Central Europe. *Local Government Studies*, 32(5), 563-583.
- Duivenboden, H. van, Hout, E. van, Montfort, C. van, & Vermaas, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Verbonden verantwoordelijkheden in het publieke domein*. The Hague: Lemma.

- Evers, A. (2006). Complementary and Conflicting: The different meaning of 'user involvement' in social services. In A. Matthies (Ed.), *Nordic civic society organizations and the future of welfare services. a model for Europe?* (pp. 255-276). Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers, TemaNord.
- Frandsen, A. G. (2002). Size and electoral participation in local elections. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 20(6), 853–869.
- Franzke, J., Boogers, M., Ruano, J.M. & Schaap, L. (eds) (2007). *Tensions between local governance and local democracy*, The Hague: Reed Business.
- Gallagher, M., & Uleri, P. V. (1996). *The Referendum Experience in Europe*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Gastil, J., & Levine, P. (Eds.). (2005). *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook*. San Francisco: Josey Bass.
- Greater London Authority –GLA- (2002), *Behind Closed Doors: Scrutiny of the Mayor's Planning Decisions*. Planning Advisory Committee, London: GLA
- Goldsmith, M. (2005). Intergovernmentalism?. In: B. Denters & L.E. Rose (Eds.). *Comparing Local Governance -Trends and developments*. (pp. 228-245). Houndmills Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- González Medina, M. (2007), Participation: the Necessary Condition for the Administration and the Democracy Reform in the Political Sphere. In: J.Franzke, M. Boogers, J.M. Ruano & L. Schaap (Eds.), *Local Governance and Democracy. Tensions between Local Governance and Local Democracy*. (pp. 93-113). The Hague: Reed Elsevier.
- Graaf, L. J. de. (2007). Stakeholders Support in Urban Governance. In J. Franzke, M. J. G. J. Boogers, J. Ruano & L. Schaap (Eds.), *Local Governance and Democracy (volume 1); Tensions between Local Governance and Local Democracy* (pp. 179-198). The Hague: Reed Elsevier.
- Graaf, L. J. de, Klimovsky, D., Iancu, D. C., & Pinteric, U. (2009). *From Doorstep to City Hall and Back: Participatory practices in Bucharest, Eindhoven, Košice, and Ljubljana*. Conference paper, NISPA, May 2009, Budva, Montenegro.
- Greater London Authority. (2002). *Behind closed doors: scrutiny of the mayor's planning decisions*. Planning Advisory Committee. London: GLA.
- Greer, S. L., & Sandford, M. (2006). The GLA and Whitehall. *Local Government Studies*, 32(3), 239-253.
- Greve, B., & Rydbjerg, M. (2003). Cross border commuting in the EU: obstacles and barriers. Research Paper no. 11/03, Roskilde University.
- Hall, J. (2006). The role of business in London local and regional government: how it became recognised as a significant player. *Local Government Studies*, 32(3), 311-340.
- Hall, P., & Pain, K. (Eds.). (2006). *The Polycentric Metropolis: Learning from Mega-City Regions in Europe*. London: Earthscan.
- Hendriks, F. (2006). *Vitale democratie. Theorie van democratie in actie*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Herweijer, M. (1998). Schaal en gemeente. In A. F. A. Korsten & P. W. Tops (Eds.), *Lokaal Bestuur in Nederland*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samson.
- Hesse, J.J. & Sharpe, L.J. (1991), Local Government in International Perspective: Some Comparative Observations. In: J.J. Hesse (ed.), *Local Government and Urban Affairs in International Perspective*,. (pp. 603-621). Baden-Baden.
- Hoffmann-Martinot, V., Rallings, C., & Trasher, M. (1996). Comparing local electoral turnout in Great Britain and France: more similarities than differences?. *European Journal of Political Research*, 30(2), 242-257.
- Hospers, G. J. (2004). Place Marketing in Europe: the branding of the Oresund Region. *Intereconomics*, 39(5), 271-279.
- Iancu, D. C., & Ostaijen, J. van. (2007). Centralization is dead! Long Live Centralization! The Cases of Intra-Municipal Decentralisation in Bucharest (Romania) and Rotterdam The Netherlands). In J. Franzke, M. J. G. J. Boogers, J. Ruano and L. Schaap (Eds.), *Tensions between Local Governance and Democracy* (271-291). The Hague: Reed Elsevier.
- Illner, M. (1999). Territorial decentralization: an obstacle to democratic reform in Central and Eastern Europe?. In J. D. Kimball (Ed.), *The transfer of power: decentralization in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 7-42). Budapest: The Local Government and Public Service.
- Illner, M. (2003). The Czech Republic 1990-2001: successful reform at the municipal level and a difficult birth of the intermediary government. In H. Baldersheim, M. Illner & H. Wollmann (Eds.), *Local democracy in post-communist Europe* (pp. 61-90). Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- John, P. (2001). *Local governance in Western Europe*. London: Sage.
- Jørgensen, J. (2004). Reform of Denmark's local authority structure. *Journal of Nordregio*, 4(1), 7-12.
- Kersting, N., & Vetter, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Reforming Local Government in Europe - Closing the Gap between Democracy and Efficiency*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Kickert, W.J.M., Klijn, E.H., & Koppenjan, J.F.M. (Eds) (1997). *Managing Complex Networks. Strategies for the Public Sector*. London: Sage.
- Kjær, A.M. (2004). *Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Kübler, D., Sager, F., & Schwab, B. (2005). Governing without government. Metropolitan governance in Switzerland. In H. Heinelt & D. Kübler (Eds.), *Metropolitan Governance. Capacity, democracy and the dynamics of place* (pp. 169-188). London & New York: Routledge.
- Kübler, D., & Scheuss, U. (2005). Metropolitanization and political change in Switzerland. In V. Hoffmann-Martinot & J. Sellers (Eds.), *Metropolitanization and political change* (pp. 211-231). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Kübler, D., Joye, D., & Schwab, B. (2001). Identity, Community and Institutional Reform in Swiss Agglomerations. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 7, 126-134.
- Kübler, D., & Schwab, B. (2007). New regionalism in five Swiss metropolitan areas: An assessment of inclusiveness, deliberation and democratic accountability. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46, 473-502.
- Ladner, A. (2002). Size and direct democracy at the local level: the case of Switzerland. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 20(6), 813-828.
- Larsen, C. A. (2002). Municipal size and democracy: a critical analysis of the argument of proximity based on the case of Denmark. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 25(4), 317-332.
- Leeke, M., Sear, C., & Gay, O. (2003). *An introduction to devolution in the UK*, research paper 03/84 Parliament and Constitution Centre. London: House of Commons Library.
- Loughlin, J., Hendriks, F. & Lidström, A. (eds) (2010), *The Oxford Handbook of Subnational Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (forthcoming)
- Loughlin, J. & Peters, B.G. (1997). State Traditions, Administrative Reform and Regionalisation. In: M. Keating & R.J. Loughlin (eds). *The Political Economy of Regionalism*. (pp. 41-61), London: Cass.
- Lowndes, V., & Sullivan, H. (2004). Like a horse and carriage or a fish on a bicycle: how well do local partnerships and public participation go together?. *Local Government Studies*, 30(1), 51-73.
- Martins, M. R. (1995). Size of municipalities, efficiency, and citizen participation: a cross-European perspective. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 13(4), 441-458.
- Michels, A. M. B. (2006). Citizen participation and democracy in the Netherlands. *Democratization*, 13(2), 323-339.
- Michels, A., & Graaf, L., de. (2009). Maatschappelijke verantwoordelijkheid in de wijk. In: H. van Duivenboden, E. van Hout, C. van Montfort & J. Vermaas (Eds.), *Verbonden verantwoordelijkheden in het publieke domein* (pp.301-312). The Hague: Lemma.
- Moreno, L. (2002). Decentralization in Spain. *Regional Studies*, 36(4), 399-408.
- Norton, A. (1994). *International Handbook of Local and regional Government: a comparative analysis of advanced democracies*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Ostaaijen, J. van, Gianoli, A., Coulson, A., & Smith, M. (forthcoming). The added value of intra-municipal decentralisation: a comparison of Bologna, Rotterdam and Birmingham. In L. Schaap, T. Bergström, M. Boogers & J. Franzke (Eds.), *Problems of scale, amalgamation and alternatives*. (forthcoming).
- Pestoff, V. 2006 & 2008; "Citizens as Co-Producers of Welfare Services: Childcare in eight European countries", *Public Management Review*; vol. 8/4: 503-520 and reprinted in *Co-production. The Third Sector and the Delivery of Public Services*; Pestoff, V. & T. Brandsen (eds); London & New York: Routledge.
- Pestoff, V., & Brandsen, T. (2009). *Public governance and the third sector: opportunities for coproduction and innovation?* Paper presented at the conference of the International Research Society for Public Management, 6-8 April 2009, Copenhagen.
- Pierre, J. & Peters, B.G. (2000). *Governance, Politics and the State*, London: MacMillan.
- Pilgrim, M. (2006). London regional governance and the London boroughs. *Local Government Studies*, 32(3), 223-238.
- Pimlott, B., & Rao, N. (2002). *Governing London*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollit, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2004). *Public Management Reform. A comparative analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pop, D. (2005). Municipality size and citizens' effectiveness: Hungary, Poland and Romania. In G. Soós & V. Zentai (Eds.), *Faces of local democracy: comparative papers from Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 169-206). Budapest: Open Society Institute.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Quinn, B. (2003). Irish Local Government in a Comparative Context. In: M. Callanan & J. Keogan, *Local Government in Ireland. Inside Out*. (pp. 447-460). Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.
- Quinn, B. (2010). A New Position for Civil Society and Citizens. In: L. Schaap, & H. H. F. M. Daemen (eds). *Renewal in European Local Democracies* (forthcoming).
- Rao, N. (2006). Introducing the new government of London. *Local Government Studies*, 32(3), 215-221.
- Revue Politix, (2002), *Démocratie et délibération*, 15 (57).
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997). *Understanding governance*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Rose, L. E. (2002). Municipal size and local nonelectoral participation: findings from Denmark, the Netherlands and Norway. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 20(6), 829–851.
- Roux, C. (2008). Italy's path to federalism: origins and paradoxes. *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 13(3), 325-339.
- Schaap, L., Daemen, H. H. F. M., & Ringeling, A.B. (2009a). Mayors in seven European countries. Part I. Selection and statutory position. *Local Government Studies*, 35 (1), 95-107.
- Schaap, L., Daemen, H. H. F. M., & Ringeling, A.B. (2009b). Mayors in seven European countries. Part II. Performance and analysis. *Local Government Studies*, 35(2), 235-251.
- Schaap, L. & Daemen, H. H. F. M. (Eds.). *Renewal in European Local Democracies* (forthcoming).
- Schaap, L., & Karsten, N. (forthcoming). Problems in Dutch local and regional government? Then, amalgamate?, In L. Schaap, T. Bergström, M. Boogers & J. Franzke, (2010) (Eds.). *Problems of scale, amalgamation and alternatives*. (forthcoming).
- Schutgens, J. L. M. R., Maessen, A. J. C., & Korsten, A. F. A. (2009). *Beoordeling van Gemeenten*. Delft: Eburon.
- Scientific Council for Government Policy (1995). *Orde in het binnenlands bestuur*, The Hague: SDU
- Setälä, M., & Schiller, T. (Eds.). (2009). *Referendums and Representative Democracy. Responsiveness, accountability and deliberation*. London: Routledge.
- Sootla, G. & Küngas, K. (2007). Effects of Institutionalization of Politics on Local Policymaking. A Comparison of Latvia, Hungary, Estonia and Slovakia. In: J. Franzke, M. Boogers, J.M. Ruano & L. Schaap (Eds). *Tensions between local governance and local democracy*, The Hague: Reed Business.
- Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Swianiewicz, P. (2003). How beautiful is bigger?: in search of the optimal size for local democracy. In H. Baldersheim, M. Illner & H. Wollmann (Eds.), *Local democracy in post-communist Europe* (pp. 289-301). Urban Research International Series. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Swianiewicz, P. (2010). Europeanization of Polish Subnational Governments. In Loughlin, J., Hendriks, F. & Lidström, A. (Eds.) (2010), *The Oxford Handbook of Subnational Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (forthcoming)
- Titmuss, R.M. (1974). *Social Policy: An Introduction*, George Allen and Unwin.
- Travers, T. (2004). *The politics of London: governing an ungovernable city*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Verhulst, J., & Nijboer, A. (2007). Directe democratie in Zwitserland. In *Directe democratie: feiten, argumenten en ervaringen omtrent de invoering van het referendum*. Een uitgave van Democracy International in samenwerking met Democratie.nu (België) en het Referendum Platform (Nederland).
- Vetter, A. & Kersting, N. (2003). Reforming local government - Heading for efficiency and democracy. In: N. Kersting, & A. Vetter (Eds.). *Reforming Local Government in Europe - Closing the Gap between Democracy and Efficiency*. (p p. 333-349). Opladen, Leske + Budrich.
- Wijdeven, T. M. F. van de, & Graaf, L. J. de. (2008). *Met vertrouwen van start in het Gronings Nieuw Lokaal Akkoord*. ("Vertrouwen in de buurt": evaluatierapporten Deventer, Groningen, Hoogeveen en Enschede, 2). The Hague: SEV.
- Young, K. (2006). Postscript: back to the past?. *Local Government Studies*, 32(3), 373-380.

## WEBSITES

- <http://english.vfm.dk/MUNICIPALITIES-AND-REGIONS/STRUCTURALREFORM/Sider/Start.aspx> (Danish Ministry of the Interior and Social Affairs (2009); Structural reform - retrieved 06-10-2009)
- <http://www.cinefogo.com/>
- [http://www.im.dk/publikationer/government reform in brief/kap01.htm](http://www.im.dk/publikationer/government%20reform%20in%20brief/kap01.htm) (Danish Ministry of Welfare (2009); Government reform in brief - retrieved 06-10-2009)
- [http://www.im.dk/publikationer/struktur\\_uk/index.html](http://www.im.dk/publikationer/struktur_uk/index.html) (Commission on administrative structure (2009); Recommendation of the commission on administrative structure – retrieved 06-10-2009)
- <http://www.INTEGAIRE.org>
- <http://www.london.gov.uk/> (GLA (2009); website – home; retrieved 06-10-2009)
- <http://www.plus-eura.org/>
- <http://www.referendumplatform.nl>



## APPENDIX B. GOVERNMENT, CIVIL SOCIETY AND CITIZENS

### GOVERNMENT, CIVIL SOCIETY AND CITIZENS – INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Referenda</b> (local and national) and <b>Initiatives</b> (In Germany 'initiative'; Volksbegehren, Volksentscheid, Volksinitiative).
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	In cities and countries across Europe, with specific attention to Germany (several Länder), Switzerland and The Netherlands.
<b>Period</b>	It is one of the oldest democratic instruments and is applied in many countries (Gallagher and Uleri, 1996, Verhulst and Nijboer, 2007, Setälä and Schiller, 2009). In Switzerland, they have more than 100 years experience with referenda. In Germany there are differences between Länder; Bavaria (1995); Berlin (2005); Brandenburg (1993); Bremen (1994); Hamburg (1998); Hessen (1993); Niedersachsen (1996); Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (1994); Nordrhein-Westfalen (1994); Rheinland-Pfalz (1994); Saarland (1997); Sachsen (1993); Sachsen-Anhalt (1993); Schleswig-Holstein (1990); Thüringen (1993).
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	Direct democratic decision making can improve representative democracy. Referenda are aiming at direct legitimacy for decisions or intended policies.
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	<p>In Germany we see differences. Citizens can play an important role in legislative processes by organising a petition (Volksbegehren). Enough support is required to hold a national referendum (Volksentscheid) with regard to the topic. In many German Länder citizens can also undertake a citizens' initiative, through which they are able to put a certain topic on the political agenda.</p> <p>In Switzerland Referenda can be hold about decisions from the parliament or from citizens' initiatives. In 2009, Switzerland has indicated 4 dates on which national referenda will be hold. Switzerland has four different sorts of referenda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An obliged referendum (since 1848)</li> <li>2. An optional referendum (since 1874)</li> <li>3. A constitutional citizens initiative (since 1891)</li> <li>4. A general citizens initiative (since 2003)</li> </ol> <p>(Verhulst and Nijboer, 2007)</p> <p>The Netherlands have a younger and modest tradition with referenda. Referenda are most often used on the local level and have a legal basis (for instance in the national Elections Act, or a local referendum by-law). Local governments are more often the initiators to a referendum than citizen(s) (De Graaf et al., 2009).</p>
<b>Results</b>	<p>Switzerland has the most profound experience with referenda. There are big differences between the various 'Cantons'. Some results from research on referenda in Switzerland (based on Verhulst and Nijboer, 2007):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The economic performances of a 'direct democratic Cantons' are 5,4 to 15 percent higher than 'representative democratic Cantons'.</li> <li>• In some Cantons there are budget referenda. When such a Canton wants to spend more than 2.5 million Swiss Franc, residents are allowed to vote for it. In the Cantons with these budget referenda the government depth (in the period 1990-1998) was 19 percent lower than in other Cantons.</li> <li>• Benz and Stutzer studied the relationship between direct democracy and the political knowledge of citizens. They created a method to measure the amount of direct democracy between Cantons on a scale form 1 to 6. Canton Basel had the highest score; 5,69 and Geneva had the lowest; 1,75. The difference in the political knowledge of a citizen from Basel and Geneva was big and equals the difference between membership and non-membership of a political party.</li> </ul> <p>In Germany, various instruments are used, but they are used differently per 'Land'. The, mostly southern 'Länder', such as Bayern, who are familiar with the use of these instruments have 'much' experience with direct democracy. In other 'Länder', the referendum is less common used.</p>

	<p>In the past 8 years The Netherlands experimented with the use of a mayor referendum (e.g. Utrecht, Eindhoven, Vlaardingen and so on). This experiment is part of the discussion with regard to the directly elected mayor. A temporarily act was specially initiated for this experiment. This was seen as one step towards a system of directly elected mayor, but the current government wanted to reject this plan. Since the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2008, local governments are no longer allowed to organise a mayor referendum, based on this temporarily act.</p> <p>In the 2007, there was another experiment with regard to a referendum. The city of Arnhem wanted a so called 'preferendum' about a new harbour. Citizens were allowed to vote for a plan which consisted of three options. Citizens could give there preferred choice. They were not allowed to vote against or say 'no' to the project. This experiment failed completely. The turn out was only 10 percent. There was a lot of resistance during the referendum campaign and the local government failed to mobilise 'ambassadors' for the preferendum and the project. Local government was accused of being too passive and citizens felt that they were not taken seriously by the local government (Boogers and De Graaf, 2008).</p>
<b>Learning effects</b>	<p>The use of direct democratic instrument does not necessarily have to harm democracy. National and democratic culture should be taken into account.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important to stimulate the turn out rate, for instance to hold a referendum on a regular election day.</li> <li>• The way the referendum question is posed/formulated, is crucial.</li> <li>• It must be crystal clear to voters what the difference is between an election and a referendum. It is also important to be clear, what will happen with the results off he referendum</li> </ul>
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	<p>Referenda, direct democracy.</p>
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	<p>Benz, A. &amp; Zimmer, C. (2010) Germany: Varieties of Democracy in a Federal System. In: Loughlin et al, forthcoming</p> <p>Boogers, M.J.G.J.A., &amp; Graaf, L.J. de (2008). <i>Een ongewenst preferendum: Een evaluatie van het Arnhemse preferendum van 6 juni 2007 over Rijnboog-Havenkwartier</i>. Tilburg: Tilburgse School voor Politiek en Bestuur.</p> <p>Gallagher, M. &amp; Uleri, P. V. (1996). <i>The Referendum Experience in Europe</i>, London: Macmillan Press.</p> <p>Graaf, L.J. de, Schaap, L., Boogers, M.J.G.J.A., &amp; Mulder, L (2009). Lokale referendums in Nederland sinds 1990. <i>Openbaar bestuur</i>, 19(8), 23-31.</p> <p>Setälä, M. &amp; Schiller, T. (eds.) (2009). <i>Referenda and Representative Democracy. Responsiveness, accountability and deliberation</i>, Routledge.</p> <p>Verhulst, J. &amp; Nijboer, A. (2007). Directe democratie in Zwitserland In: <i>Directe democratie: feiten, argumenten en ervaringen omtrent de invoering van het referendum</i>. Published by Democracy International in co-operation with Democratie.nu (Belgium) and the Referendum Platform (NL).</p> <p>Also see: <a href="http://www.referendumplatform.nl">http://www.referendumplatform.nl</a></p>

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Directly elected mayors</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Germany / German Länder
<b>Period</b>	Brandenburg (1993); Hessen (1992); Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (1999); Niedersachsen (1996); Nordrhein-Westfalen (1994); Rheinland-Pfalz (1993); Saarland (1994); Sachsen (1994); Sachsen-Anhalt (1994); Schleswig-Holstein (1996); Thüringen (1994).
<b>Reasons and purposes</b>	A number of Länder discussed the quality of local democracy at the end of the nineteen eighties. They formulated a number of internal and organisational problems (such as those regarding the 'Doppelspitze'), but some democratic difficulties too. Some Länder observed that former DDR-Länder introduced direct mayoral elections, while in most Western Länder councils appointed the mayors.
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	All German Länder (Bayern and Baden-Württemberg) already had directly elected mayors for decades.
<b>Results</b>	Differences in administrative systems still exist among the Länder (Hess, for instance, still has a 'collegial' or collective decision-making tradition, whereas the NRW mayors are 'strong' ones). Citizens in all Länder that introduced direct mayoral elections seem to be satisfied with the reform.
<b>Learning effects</b>	The introduction of directly elected mayors seems to have revived German democracy to some extent. Minor adaptations have been implemented, though.
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Models of democracy
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	Bäck, H., Heinelt, H., & Magnier, A. (eds) (2006). <i>The European Mayor. Political Leaders in the Changing Context of Local Democracy</i> (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften).  Bogumil, J. & Heinelt, H. (Hrsg.) (2005). <i>Bürgermeister in Deutschland</i> , Wiesbaden, VS Verlag.  Schaap, L., Daemen, H.H.F.M. & Ringeling, A.B. (2009). Mayors in seven European countries. Part I and II. <i>Local Government Studies</i> , 35, 1 and 2.

## GOVERNMENT, CIVIL SOCIETY AND CITIZENS – NEW WAYS OF WORKING

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>The rise of citizen's participation in Central and Eastern Europe.</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Bucharest in Romania, Kosice in Slovakia, Ljubljana in Slovenia.
<b>Period</b>	After 2003
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	There is an increasing need to get more transparency through citizen's participation.
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	Citizens' participation in Bucharest, Kosice and Ljubljana is only manifest in public service delivery.
<b>Results</b>	Participation is mainly based on laws. It has a Legal character. At the moment, it is not often used in practise. These countries try to learn form best practices in Western European countries.
<b>Learning effects</b>	Until now, citizens' participation experiences in Bucharest, Kosice and Ljubljana is mainly based on the procedures to participate. Current results show that the relationship between government and citizens has not yet been improved. Implementing and testing of citizens' participation in practice would yield more experience of it.
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	The theoretical background of this discussion is in debates of: decentralisation, citizens' participation at the local level, but also European integration of new EU members. To put it more broadly; the examples have be seen in the debate with regard to multi level governance and multi level democracy.
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	See the work of dr. Diana Camelia Iancu (Rumania), dr Daniel Klimovsky (Slovakia) and dr. Uros Pinteric (Slovenia).  Iancu, D.C. & Ostaaijen, J. van (2007). Centralization is dead! Long Live Centralization! The Cases of Intra-Municipal Decentralisation in Bucharest (Romania) and Rotterdam The Netherlands). In: Franzke, J. (et al.), <i>Tensions between Local Governance and Democracy</i> , Reed Elsevier  De Graaf, L.J., Klimovsky, D., Iancu, D.C. & Pinteric, U. (2009). <i>From Doorstep to City Hall and Back: Participatory practices in Bucharest, Eindhoven, Košice, and Ljubljana</i> , Conference paper, NISPA, May 2009, Budva, Montenegro. <a href="http://www.nispa.sk/portal/conference.php?sid=485">http://www.nispa.sk/portal/conference.php?sid=485</a>

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Community involvement and social capital</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	PLUS project; nine case studies in England, Germany, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland and Sweden.
<b>Period</b>	2002-2004
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	An examination how leadership and community involvement could combine to lead to better policies for cities.
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	Comparative case study research, experiments
<b>Results</b>	<p>Effective community involvement can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that policy making can more easily identify local needs and concerns and that are taken seriously;</li> <li>• Contribute to the quality of decision making by identifying alternative possibilities for action which professionals or administrators might otherwise overlook;</li> <li>• Increase public awareness of policy issues and bring transparency to decision making;</li> <li>• Secure legitimacy for decisions and secure willingness to follow in the implementation process;</li> <li>• Mobilise the resources (including knowledge and commitment) necessary for implementing policy objectives.</li> </ul>
<b>Learning effects</b>	<p>General lesson: In a number of PLUS cities there were examples of what was termed 'delegated' leadership, individuals who took on the role of leadership in making links with and exploiting the strengths and opportunities offered by community involvement. (p33 final scientific report)</p> <p>Specific lesson:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The political and institutional learning gained from special initiatives needs to be incorporated into sustainable processes and procedures of government and the organisations of community.</li> <li>• Community involvement matters in terms of improving the quality of decision making and the capacity of leaders to reflect and respond to locally generated demands.</li> </ul>
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Academic discussions with regard to participation, community involvement, social capital and leadership. It also relates to models of democracy; participative and deliberative democracy.
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	<p>PLUS European research network on Participation, Leadership and Urban Sustainability (5th EU Framework)  <a href="http://www.plus-eura.org/">http://www.plus-eura.org/</a></p> <p>Also see: CINEFOGO network (6th EU Framework):  <a href="http://www.cinefogo.com/">http://www.cinefogo.com/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a747992572~d b=all~jumptype=rss">http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a747992572~d b=all~jumptype=rss</a></p>

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>A new position for civil society and citizens</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Limerick, Ireland
<b>Period</b>	Since 2000
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	Ireland has a strongly centralised system with functions such as health, education and policing being carried out by central government departments (See Quinn, 2003). The involvement of civil society is institutionalised. As part of its reform strategy, central government sought to integrate local government and local development. To achieve these aims, new structures were created, based on a partnership approach. Each local authority established 4-5 Strategic Policy Committees (SPCs), mirroring the authority's major functions and formally involving non-governmental actors in local authority policy-making. A key element of the reform was the creation of the County Development Boards (CDBs) which are charged with the social, cultural and economic development of their particular local authority area. Since 2004 the role which CDBs play in efforts to promote social inclusion has been strengthened by central government as they have been mandated 'to consider and endorse work plans prepared by community and local development agencies' (Quinn, 2010).
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	The City Development Board is comprised of 28 people representing Local Government (7), State Agencies (10), Local Development (6), and Social Partners (5). Among the social partner group, three are from the voluntary and community sector representing the sports/culture cluster, the social inclusion and the youth clusters. Since its inception in 2001 Limerick City Development Board (LCDB) has been working towards an inclusive strategy which would foster economic, social and cultural development (Quinn, 2010).
<b>Results</b>	The 2002 strategy led to a number of developments such as the creation of a sports partnership, the commissioning of a socio-spatial profile of the city, preparation a report of immigration in the city, the development of a strategy for Limerick as a City of Learning, and the introduction of a software management system to monitor LCDB actions. From its inception LCDB fostered greater integration of service provision and improved linkages between local service providers and between Limerick City Council and central government departments. Consequently, while focussing on the original eight themes, LCDB is now engaged in realising sixteen goals, each of which has clear objectives, measurable indicators and a designated responsible organisation. The strategy review was an opportunity for reassessment and realignment. LCDB has focussed its revised strategy on actions which add value to the statutory/designated functions of its constituent organisations through the achievement of synergy between their respective endeavours as well as the sharing of knowledge and insight and the targeting of resources (Quinn, 2010). In order to ensure representation of the community and voluntary sectors on both SPCs and CDBs a community forum was established in 1999/2000. Limerick's process involved a number of large public meetings organised around functional/goal clusters. This approach has challenged the traditional form of local democracy, based as it was on representative institutions, albeit supplemented by a plethora of voluntary organisations which operated outside the formal system of government (Quinn, 2010).
<b>Learning effects</b>	As a further indication of the desire to involve civil society, one of the goals in the revised strategy is to facilitate community and voluntary sector involvement in the future development of the city. Involvement of citizens and civil society is not confined to the formal mechanisms of LCDB. The Community Forum has been designated as manager of the volunteering initiative (Quinn, 2010).
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Civil society, local democracy, local governance
<b>Sources in the literature and</b>	Quinn (2010), <i>A new position for civil society and citizens</i> . In Schaap en

the internet	Daemen (2010)
--------------	---------------

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Participation charter</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Greater Lyon (France)
<b>Period</b>	Since spring 2003
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	<p>Strategic policy for the implementation of participation in the Lyon region (Metropolis of Lyon / Greater Lyon)</p> <p>Three principles (according to the Charter):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Act at the right level</li> <li>2. Adaptability</li> <li>3. Progressiveness</li> </ol> <p>Three goals (according to the Charter):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transparency</li> <li>2. Efficiency</li> <li>3. Conviviality</li> </ol> <p>Four fields (according to the Charter):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information, learning process, development of participation capacities in specific social groups</li> <li>2. Prospective approach and thematic policies</li> <li>3. Projects</li> <li>4. Public Utility services</li> </ol>
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	The Participation Charter is a very large document concerning all types of participation among all sectors of activity of Greater Lyon. 'The ideology of participation has recently developed in France' (Politix, 2002).
<b>Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The implementation of participatory processes in Greater Lyon is in an early phase.</li> <li>• Inhabitants and stakeholders are informed, but often do not understand what is meant.</li> <li>• The implementation of the Charter is dominated by just a few persons.</li> <li>• The Charter is prescriptive and base don a certain ideology of participation in France.</li> <li>• It is growing and new approach in France.</li> </ul>
<b>Learning effects</b>	Time needs time. Participation in the implementation of policy can be fruitful, but it can't address fundamental problems. Politicians already took their decisions. There is more debate and discussion about who needs to be involved and what status participation has in relation to regular 'politics'. It is a 'new sound' in French centralistic way of policy making.
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Participatory democracy, strategic policy, implementation literature.
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	<p>See the work of Dr. Aisling Healy, Université Aix-Marseille, France.</p> <p>Revue Politix, (2002), <i>Démocratie et délibération</i>, 15 (57).</p>

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Coproduction and innovations between the public sector and the third sector</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	North West Europe
<b>Period</b>	Very recent
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	<p>Many countries in Europe are searching for new ways to involve the third sector in the provision and governance of social services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the challenge of an ageing population, second is the growing;</li> <li>• democracy deficit at all levels, local, regional, national and European,</li> <li>• the semi permanent austerity in public finances.</li> </ul> <p>In any given EU member state, the reasons will vary and may be more specific; however, taken together, they imply a major legitimacy crisis for the public sector as a provider of welfare services. It is in this context that the third sector came back into the spotlight as a provider of public services in welfare states where it traditionally did not have a major role; in those where it did, its role has been changing. As a result, third sector research has become increasingly intertwined with public management research, witnessed by various publications on the topic in the relevant journals and book series. (From: Pestoff and Brandsen, 2009)</p>
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	<p>The third sector has different roles in different countries. It has different meaning in service delivery. It is the involvement of co-producers, like parent participation in schools and day care, which promises to empower consumers and reduce the gap between the professionals and their clientele (Evers, 2006; 43-46).</p> <p>There has been some recent empirical work to explore the effects of citizen participation in service delivery. The TSFEPS Project<sup>1</sup> examined the relationship between parent participation in the provision and governance of childcare in eight EU countries (Pestoff, 2006 &amp; 2008). It found different levels of parent participation in different countries and in different forms of provision, i.e., public, private for-profit and third sector childcare. The highest levels of parent participation was found in third sector providers, like parent associations in France, parent initiatives in Germany, and parent cooperatives in Sweden. Different kinds of parent participation, i.e., economic, political and social, were observed. All three kinds of participation were readily evident in third sector providers of childcare services, while both economic and political participation were highly restricted in municipal and private for-profit services (<i>ibid.</i>).</p> <p>There is no systematic evidence to indicate that third sector organisations are necessarily greater innovators than other types of providers. However, there is some recent material that indicates how they can redefine their core tasks and, in doing so, question the paradigm underlying their traditional strategies.</p>
<b>Results</b>	<p>In the new public governance, the third sector has come to play a more important role in public service delivery. Yet, despite many popular assertions, there is as yet only limited empirical evidence on the actual contribution of the third sector. This is not to say that it has none, simply that there have been few studies that have systematically compared the 14 performance of the third sector with that of other types of providers, in the tradition of Titmuss' famous work on blood donations (Titmuss, 1970). Such work as there is shows mixed results. It is imperative to continue and expand these studies over the coming years.</p>
<b>Learning effects</b>	The third sector has the potential to be used in public service delivery. Co-production is a new way of working in these fields.
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy)</b>	New Public Management, Co-production, public governance



<b>theories, et cetera)</b>	
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	<p>See the work of prof. Dr. Victor Pestoff and dr. Taco Brandsen.</p> <p>Evers, A. (2006), Complementary and Conflicting: The different meaning of 'user involvement' in social services, Ch. 7 in <i>Nordic civic society organizations and the future of welfare services. a model for Europe?</i>; Matthies, Aila-Leena (ed.); Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers, TemaNord 2006:517. (pp. 255-276).</p> <p>Pestoff, V. &amp;. Brandsen, T. (2009). <i>Public governance and the third sector: opportunities for coproduction and innovation?</i> Paper presented at the conference of the International Research Society for Public Management, 6-8 April 2009, Copenhagen.</p> <p>Titmuss, R.M. (1974) <i>Social Policy: An Introduction</i>, George Allen and Unwin.</p> <p>See the work of the permanent study group of the European Group of Public Administration (EGPA).</p>

Name innovation	Participatory policy making and planning
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	<p>Malmö, Sweden, (Interact first case studies series): a pilot project to redevelop the Western Harbour area: 'planning by no planning'. This project has used an interactive approach, in which people are involved or interested from the very beginning.</p> <p>Seville, Spain (case Integaire.org): The participation of citizens has been active since the moment the city council of Seville decided to sign the Aalborg letter in 1996. (One of its main rules was that the local authorities in each city encouraged its citizens to take part in the decision making process). At the local level, in Seville, this participation has been led to several synergies that are providing a solution to several problems simultaneously. At the same time, citizens are informing the local Administration of the needs and interests of the population. Furthermore, it has provided a greater sense of local identity amongst the population and has also created more trust of and better relations with the municipality.</p> <p>Aberdeen (Scotland): 'City Voice' project. (Demos case study): Aberdeen City Voice is the name given to a panel of Aberdeen residents who are contacted on a regular basis and asked for their views on a range of issues.</p> <p>Groningen, The Netherlands: district budgeting (Wijdeven and De Graaf, 2008). Each district can use an extra amount of money (generally about 1 or 2 million Euros in four years) to stimulate social activity in the neighbourhoods and to refresh public space. The money comes from a collaboration between Groningen local government and all housing associations in Groningen. Citizens can ask to use the budget. Professionals at the district level (from schools, welfare organisations, the police, and housing associations) are advisors to citizens how to use the budget.</p>
<b>Period</b>	Since 1990
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	More direct legitimacy and support through direct involvement of citizens and stakeholders
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	Participation ladder, learning participation, citizenship, skills
<b>Results</b>	Participatory policymaking often gains more support and commitment among stakeholders and citizens. Citizens are better informed, but they do not have more decisive influence. Stakeholders often do have more possibilities to decide than citizens. Politicians consult citizens and often see stakeholders as co-producers.
<b>Learning effects</b>	<p>For government:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Be clear about the expectations that you raise</li> <li>2. Participatory policymaking is based on the principles of participative democracy and not on representative democracy. In participatory policymaking, many groups (minorities, Young people, and people with a low income) are underrepresented.</li> <li>3. Asking citizens and clients is not enough, government must respond to citizen input. (See DEMOS project, Scandinavia)</li> </ol>
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Participative democracy, democratic governance, urban planning.
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	<p>INTERACT project (EU 5th framework)  <a href="http://www.integaire.org">www.integaire.org</a> (Participation with regard to air quality and sustainability) (Eurocities)</p> <p>DEMOS project (5th EU framework)</p>

	<p>Graaf, L.J. de (2007). Stakeholders Support in Urban Governance. In: J. Franzke, M. Boogers, J.M. Ruano &amp; L. Schaap (eds). <i>Local Governance and Democracy (volume 1); Tensions between Local Governance and Local Democracy</i>, (pp. 179-198). The Hague: Reed Elsevier.</p> <p>Wijdeven, T.M.F. van de, &amp; Graaf, L.J. de (2008). <i>Met vertrouwen van start in het Gronings Nieuw Lokaal Akkoord</i>. ("Vertrouwen in de buurt": evaluatierapporten Deventer, Groningen, Hoogeveen en Enschede. The Hague: SEV.</p> <p>See also the work of: prof. dr. Sullivan, prof. dr. Newman, prof. dr. Lowndes, prof. dr. Stoker, dr. Pröpper, prof. dr. Edelenbos.</p>
--	--

## APPENDIX C. GOVERNMENT BETWEEN STRUCTURE AND PERFORMANCE

### GOVERNMENT - INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Structural Reform</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Denmark
<b>Period</b>	Run-up 2002-2004; implemented 1 January 2007
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	One of the main goals of the 2007 Danish Structural Reform was a reduction in the number of municipalities. This, however, was not a goal in itself. The main goal of the structural reform was to solve the problems municipalities had, especially the smaller ones, in executing the tasks that had gradually been transferred to them. Large variation in municipal size meant that not all Danish municipalities were able to fulfil their tasks optimally and not all could successfully ensure coherent policy making (Commission on Administrative Structure, 2004; Jørgensen, 2004). The reform aimed at utilizing economies of scale by municipal amalgamation. The subsequent decentralisation aimed at increasing the effectiveness of public service provision.
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	The 2007 Danish Structural Reform entailed a radical, in the sense of both major and abrupt, reform of Denmark's local authority structure. Basically, a new map of Denmark was drawn. Most importantly the number of municipalities was reduced from 271 to 98, counties were abolished and five large regions were created instead. The reform also included a substantial redistribution of tasks. Municipalities now become responsible for quite a number of public services, which can be considered to be an important decentralisation operation. Healthcare has become one of the main tasks of the new regions. Furthermore, the number of taxation levels was reduced from three to two, because regions are not allowed to levy taxes. In addition, the structural reform signalled the abolishment of the Greater Copenhagen Authority (or Hovedstadens Udviklingsråd). The Structural Reform can be considered to be an innovation because it modified Denmark's basic administrative structure, which had been in operation basically since the 1970s, substantially.
<b>Results</b>	Evidently, it is too early to provide a thorough evaluation of the results of the Structural Reform in terms of its goals and aims. No scientific research on this has yet been published, as far as we can tell. Of course, the main result at this point in time is the largest public sector reform in Denmark itself, amounting to a radical reorganisation of Danish sub-national government. In a relatively short period of time Denmark has reformed the geographical structure of its administrative system, as well as the distribution of tasks between different levels of the public administration. Denmark has portrayed a remarkable ability to implement structural administrative reform.
<b>Learning effects</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The speed at which the reform has been designed and implemented is impressive, at least in a comparative perspective. It seems that the Commission on Administrative Structure played an important role in this, as did the way in which other actors, such as the Government coalition, handled its recommendations.</li> <li>- The Danish case shows that major institutional reform is possible, provided that the necessary support is there, but that speed and tight steering of the process left relatively little room for a broader public and political debate (Bundsgaard &amp; Vrangbaek, 2007).</li> <li>- Also, Bundsgaard and Vrangbaek (2007) show that such a structural reform is a "complex process influenced by institutional and situational factors, including those of coincidence and external events."</li> </ul>
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Government approach (John, 2001). The government approach emphasises the necessity for clear distinctions between the levels of government in a hierarchical and consolidated structure, and is combined with direct central government control. In addition to this, a

	<p>clear division of tasks between governmental levels is thought to be essential, and capacities and authorities should be as exclusive as possible.</p>
<p><b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b></p>	<p>Short description of the main characteristics:</p> <p>Commission on administrative structure (2009); Recommendation of the commission on administrative structure – retrieved 06-10-2009  <a href="http://www.im.dk/publikationer/struktur_uk/index.html">http://www.im.dk/publikationer/struktur_uk/index.html</a></p> <p>Danish Ministry of the Interior and Social Affairs (2009); Structural reform - retrieved 06-10-2009  <a href="http://english.vfm.dk/MUNICIPALITIES-AND-REGIONS/STRUCTURALREFORM/Sider/Start.aspx">http://english.vfm.dk/MUNICIPALITIES-AND-REGIONS/STRUCTURALREFORM/Sider/Start.aspx</a></p> <p>Danish Ministry of Welfare (2009); Government reform in brief - retrieved 06-10-2009  <a href="http://www.im.dk/publikationer/government_reform_in_brief/kap01.htm">http://www.im.dk/publikationer/government_reform_in_brief/kap01.htm</a></p> <p>Policy process analysis: (Bundsgaard &amp; Vrangbaek, 2007)</p>

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Greater London Authority</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	London, United Kingdom
<b>Period</b>	2000 – present
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	To improve the effectiveness and democratic legitimacy of regional policies
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	The Greater London Authority (GLA) was established in 2000 (see for instance Pimlott & Rao, 2002; Goldsmith, 2005). The establishment of the GLA can be considered to be a true innovation in the form of a scale reform, because the newly established regional authority is unlike classic English local government, because it deploys substantial (personal) authority (Greer & Sandford, 2006). The metropolitan authority consists of a directly elected Mayor, an Assembly elected by proportional voting and four main functional bodies. The Mayor prepares and executes policies, whereas the Assembly's main function is scrutiny. Within the London area the boroughs kept their jurisdiction, in order to provide public services and to provide a strong collective voice when dealing with the Mayor of London (Pilgrim, 2006). The GLA's main policy fields are connected to spatial development, transport, planning and environment.
<b>Results</b>	The GLA has become a fully fledged tier of regional government that coordinates regional policies. Its competences seem to suffice and decision making seems to be balanced, though somewhat top-down and formal (Schaap & Karsten, forthcoming). Powers and responsibilities are clearer than before and checks and balances have improved. Clearly, the institutional design has played a major role in this. However, 'ways of working' also proved very important, especially when it comes to the position of the mayor. Whereas the Mayor's office was initially meant to act as a facilitator and negotiator, it has gradually evolved into an actor that relies more on the exercise of traditional executive authority (Young, 2006). Pimlott and Rao (2002) have called this the 'quasi-presidential' role of the mayor. Still, cooperation, participation and partnership with public as well as private actors are an essential element of London's regional policy making (business groups play an important role for example – see Hall, 2006). It has to be mentioned, though, that the present level of cooperation is less the result of statutory requirements than of the decisions and demands of the former Mayor of London. However, the Planning Advisory Committee of the GLA in 2002 signalled a lack of information provided to the London citizenry and that the Mayor seemed to disregard feedback from the boroughs (GLA, 2002).
<b>Learning effects</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The GLA has a somewhat <i>ad hoc</i> nature and differs from the rest of English local government (Greer &amp; Sandford, 2006). Nevertheless it seems to have improved the effectiveness and legitimacy of regional policies. This suggest that atypical scale reforms can be embedded in existing institutional settings successfully.</li> <li>- Although institutional design is important in institutional reform, ways of working are also very important, because they influence how institutional changes work out in practice.</li> <li>- The relations between newly created regional tiers of government and existing 'lower' and 'higher' tiers of government deserve a great deal of attention, not only in terms of institutional design, but also in terms of practice. Especially the distribution of competences and responsibilities as well as power relations are important aspects when establishing the roles of different tiers of government (for the GLA see e.g. Rao, 2006; Pelgrim, 2006).</li> </ul>
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Government approach (John, 2001); more specifically regional government strategy. In the regional government strategy, policy making has to be carried out by a single regional governmental body; institutional boundaries are considered to be obstacles to effective policy making. In this strategy, the creation of a new tier of regional government or the strengthening of an existing one is the answer to

	<p>problems of scale. The regional government is expected to function as the exclusive authority at the regional level, by deciding on regional policies and executing them. For that purpose the regional government will have exclusive capacities and sufficient financial means.</p>
<p><b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b></p>	<p>GLA (2009); website – home; retrieved 06-10-2009  <a href="http://www.london.gov.uk/">http://www.london.gov.uk/</a></p> <p>2006 Special issue of <i>Local Government Studies</i> 32 (3) on the GLA</p> <p>Pimlott, B. &amp; Rao, N. (2002). <i>Governing London</i>, Oxford: Oxford University Press</p> <p>Travers, T. (2004). <i>The politics of London: governing an ungovernable city</i>, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan</p>

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Councils in city quarters</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Slovakia
<b>Period</b>	After 1994
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	A number of Slovak cities have introduced so-called 'Councils in city-quarters' in order to improve the delivery of local services and local democracy, and to enhance the flexibility of local self-government. This is because the existing institutional arrangements suffered from disadvantages of centralised government structures, especially in terms of democratic legitimacy. For example, the ties between citizens and councillors were underdeveloped (Buček, 2000:63).
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	Especially after 1994, a number of Slovak cities took up the opportunities offered by existing legislation to establish 'Councils in city-quarters' and to strengthen their position through further decentralisation of competences and responsibilities, far beyond the minimum required by state legislation. These sub-local councils are territorial councils for the city quarters and are political decision-making bodies with regard to specific quarter related issues. They function as a vital link between quarter inhabitants and the municipal council, by representing sub-local interests, and as participatory arenas. The sub-councils generally consist of a number of elected municipal councillors and several other members. The geographical size of the city quarters that have a sub-local council differs strongly according to local preferences.
<b>Results</b>	According to Buček (2000:70) the sub-local councils have "great potential for improving local democracy, engendering more efficient self-government and higher quality social life." The revitalisation of the sub-local councils improved innovation dynamics and flexibility, and promoted democratisation. Local self-government has become more active and more autonomous, escaping initial top-down control. Decentralised councils in city quarters seem to be a viable alternative to increase local government's democratic legitimacy and responsiveness, which may be suitable for other cities in Central and Eastern Europe.
<b>Learning effects</b>	- The 'Councils in city-quarters' are interesting examples of innovation in sub-national government, because they show how existing legal instruments that until that moment have been utilized scarcely and in an uncreative way, can be deployed to revitalize and strengthen local democratic institutions. Furthermore, they can become an important and institutionally well-embedded part of sub-national government. - "Slovak transition at the local level (...) documents the role of local self-government as hard to replace in the facilitation of local civil society building and highlights a need for a local democracy which is more complex in nature." (Buček, 2000)
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Argument of effective management and argument of proximity (see chapter 2; Dahl & Tufte, 1973; Larsen, 2002). Government approach (see above). Political decentralisation.
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	Buček J. (1998). Decentralisation in the Slovak big cities' self-government after 1990, <i>Slovak Sociological Review</i> 30 (4), pp. 345-362  Buček J. (2000). Sub-local decentralisation — the case of Slovak big cities, <i>Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy</i> 18(1), pp. 57-78



## GOVERNMENT – NEW WAYS OF WORKING

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Öresund Committee</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Among others: Copenhagen (Denmark) & Malmö (Sweden)
<b>Period</b>	From 1993 onwards
<b>Reasons and purposes</b>	Copenhagen and Malmö are located very close to one another, but are separated by water (Oresund) and a border. On both sides of the Oresund we see metropolitan areas with, to some extent, complementary economic profiles. The initial purpose of the Oresund region was to stimulate economic and cultural development of the Oresund region by means of cooperation.
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	In 1993 the Öresund Committee is erected and the decision is taken to develop a bridge between the two metropolitan regions on either side of the Oresund. The bridge was a large scale infrastructure project that was finished in 1999 and opened in 2000. The Committee is comprised of 32 politicians (local, regional and national) en 32 replacement members from the two countries. Besides the Committee there is also an Oresund Commission that is comprised of civil servants. The Commission performs the supporting functions and runs the daily operations. Financing is arranged so that the different cooperating parties and the Nordic Council each pay a share. The Oresund Committee is not legally grounded as some sort of supranational body.
<b>Results</b>	Besides specific results such as the construction of the bridge there have been several other successes and spin-offs. We can mention a joint statistical agency, a harbour cooperation, a council for the local job market, cooperation on medical issues, and cooperations between different regional universities.
<b>Learning effects</b>	Innovation and cooperation can also be brought to a successful end without the process ending in forms of juridical debate and debates about formal reforming taking place. The Oresund region also spends a lot of attention to the marketing of the region as a whole. This contributes to a sense of community and has some positive economic effects in the form of tourism and increases in corporate settlements.
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	The Committee is a form of governance.
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	Andersen, J. & G. Hovgaard (2003) Welfare and Urban planning in transition – a Copenhagen case study. Research Paper no. 8/03, Roskilde University.  Dall Schmidt, T. (2005) Cross-border regional enlargement in Oresund. In: GeoJournal Vol. 64. pp 249-258.  Greve, B. & M. Rydbjerg (2003) Cross border commuting in the EU: obstacles and barriers. Research Paper no. 11/03, Roskilde University.  Hospers, G.J. (2004) Place Marketing in Europe: the branding of the Oresund Region. In: Intereconomics, Vol. 39. No. 5. pp 271-279.

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Regional Cooperations</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Switzerland
<b>Period</b>	
<b>Reasons and purposes</b>	In the five largest metropolitan areas in Switzerland there have been hardly any institutional consolidations or municipal amalgamations since the 2 <sup>nd</sup> World War. Furthermore, regional institutional reform is very difficult because of the unpopularity thereof, and the institutional hurdles that need to be taken. This has created a situation of bureaucratic fragmentation that can only be solved by regional cooperation in some instances.
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	In several policy areas such as public transportation, water delivery and management, drug policies, and cultural policies, looser 'governance-type' arrangements have been created to make cooperation between different local authorities. These arrangements take various different forms, sometimes it regards services being provided by a central municipality (such as water management in Zürich), sometimes the Cantons are involved (such as public transportation in Bern), sometimes joint 'companies' are established that conform to the legal demands placed on these companies by the federal authority (such as water management in Luzern), and sometimes a complicated mixture of these is the result (public transportation in Lausanne).
<b>Results</b>	The different arrangements seem to function without any real big problems as a result, which is interesting as such. The cooperations might also change citizens' perceptions of regional boundaries.
<b>Learning effects</b>	Considerable thought needs to be put into the involvement of different actors and the democratic nature of these arrangements. Structures of accountability can become clouded to the outside world and politicians alike. It is also a question whether this way of working, with various different specialized authorities, is very transparent.
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Governance
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	Kübler, D & B. Schwab (2007) New regionalism in five Swiss metropolitan areas: An assessment of inclusiveness, deliberation and democratic accountability. In: European Journal of Political Research, Vol. 46. pp. 473-502

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Comprehensive area &amp; government capacity assessment</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	The UK, The Netherlands.
<b>Period</b>	2009 (precursors in England starting 2001, in The Netherlands even earlier).
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	Changes in the way performance of local governments is measured to have better measurements, less strategic behaviour, and in the end: better policies
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	In the UK the set up has changed so that the area assessment includes other local assessments in one area wide assessment. Furthermore, the ways results are presented have changed. In The Netherlands we see experiments with assessment based on peer review under the guidance of a (neutral) specialist chairman. Both assessments work with self assessments, and are focused on outcomes.
<b>Results</b>	Changes in local government assessment can lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less strategic behaviour by government actors, more honest and less traumatic assessments.</li> <li>• More focus on outcomes: what does it actually mean for the citizen?</li> </ul> A less top down way of measurement (also in terms of judgment and consequences) leads to a different style of measurement and willingness to learn.
<b>Learning effects</b>	General lessons: the way performance is measured will lead to strategic behaviour by governments. Ever more specific indicators and ways of measurement will lead to a less cooperative and more 'number-oriented' organisation. A possible result is a ruined relationship between government layers. These new ways of measurement open up a way of performance that is in effect learning oriented. It is performance by peers and in that sense realistic. Furthermore, the UK example does have a possibility to intervene when performance does turn out to be below expectations.
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Performance measurement literature as a spin off of NPM oriented literature; governance.
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	Dool, L. van de, Hulst, M. van, & Schaap, L. (2009). Not just a friendly visit. EGPA 2009 conference paper.  Herweijer, M. (1998). Schaal en gemeente. In A. F. A. Korsten & P. W. Tops (Eds.), <i>Lokaal Bestuur in Nederland</i> . Alphen aan den Rijn: Samson.  Schutgens, J. L. M. R., Maessen, A. J. C., & Korsten, A. F. A. (2009). <i>Beoordeling van Gemeenten</i> . Delft: Eburon.

<b>Name innovation</b>	<b>Fiscal developments in Central and Eastern Europe</b>
<b>Location (City, Country)</b>	Central and Eastern Europe
<b>Period</b>	From 1989 onwards
<b>Reasons and Purposes</b>	Since the collapse of the Soviet Union new republics in Central and Eastern Europe have tried to develop and foster their democracies. The sub-national fiscal regime in these countries is used to further both economic and democratic development.
<b>Practice (what has been done)</b>	We can view different developments in different countries with some countries being more focused on creating more sub-national fiscal autonomy whilst other countries are in the process of centralising the local fiscal regime.
<b>Results</b>	The types of different movements, towards both more and less central control or local autonomy, do not provide a clear result from which we can distil simple lessons. However it does provide us with an intriguing contrasting case to study.
<b>Learning effects</b>	We can learn different types of things from (comparing) these cases. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The first thing worth following is the way local (fiscal) autonomy influences the development of a country both economically and democratically. Furthermore it also influences local democracy.</li> <li>▪ A second thing to study is the way these reforms are implemented. How do different bureaucracies and politicians deal with these reforms? It provides us with a best practice type learning situation.</li> </ul>
<b>Theoretical background (New Public Management, Governance, Democracy theories, et cetera)</b>	Democracy theory, fiscal theories
<b>Sources in the literature and the internet</b>	Brueckner, J. (2000). Fiscal decentralization in developing countries. <i>Annals of Economics and Finance</i> , 1, 1–18  Dobre, A. M. (2010). Romania: From Historical Regions to Local Decentralization via the Unitary State. In Loughlin et al, forthcoming  Dowley, K. M. (2006). Local Government Transparency in East Central Europe. <i>Local Government Studies</i> , 32(5), 563-583.  Swianiewicz, P. (2010). Europeanization of Polish Sub-national Governments. In Loughlin et al, forthcoming.