Governing the public space questioning public regulation and metropolitan dimension: the use of *mayoral's orders* and social services in the city of Milan.

Introduction

This article has the purpose to highlight the bond between urban social policy scale, the instruments used within the policy process and and the metropolitan dimension of the build environment. In order to address this complex and often non explicit relationship we analyse here a peculiar social policy that was implemented during three years, from 2008 to 2011, in the city of Milan. Even if it was a experimental policy without a huge financing effort, it is interesting to observe the dynamics and the impacts of all the policy process and the way they are connected to the elements that shape it. It targeted some urban groups connoted in the public speech as "marginals", it was characterized by a securitarian institutional framework and its implementation scale differed from the metropolitan area interested by the policy effects.

The article is divided in four parts that going deepen in different aspects of the policy here considered highlighting the connection between the policy instruments used their impact on the organizational field (Powell, DiMaggio 1991) of the local welfare and on the metropolitan politics. The **first** part is dedicated to the description of the policy focusing on the key aspects of the policy cycle and on the social issues targeted by it. It will be analysed the role of the local policy and moral entrepreneur, the process of naming of the three issues of the policy taking into account the way it shape the content of the mayoral's urban security orders. The second one defines the boundaries of the theoretical approach used here and explain the constituent elements of the device that shape the institutional framework of the policy. The following set out the institutional context that underpin the process of construction of the local welfare focusing on some key issues crucial to understand the connection among the scale of social policy, strictly tied to the organizational field of social policies and the process of construction of a metropolitan governance. The fourth part is dedicated to show the different dimensions of the instrument that shape the institutional framework. The fifht part recompose the prism of the impact on the metropolitan scale of this urban policy both on the side of the organizational field involved in it and on the metropolitan politics. The different dimension of the policy are reassembled trying to shine a light on how they contribute to promote specific processes of fragmentation at urban and metropolitan level. Within the **conclusion** some suggestion that come out from this case study about the connections between the scale of urban policies, the policy instruments and the metropolitan governance are

outlined. An hypothesis stems out from the evidence and the analysis presented. Its possible to state that in particularly institutionally fragmented metropolitan context, the regulation of public policy issues could be achieved easily adopting a metropolitan perspective in the design of urban policies. This could be a key aspect for the social policies that address marginal urban population with high visibility and mobility in the space. We take into account also the hypothesis that the metropolitanization of urban policies can be eased or hampered by the policy instrument chosen. This hypothesis and question come back over the fact that even if the institutional policies are very important in the process of metropolitan construction, the public policies have a key role in structuring the fate, the construction and the re-production of the politics in his live expression and not only formal.

The policy process

In last years at both local and national level a growing attention to the issues of the security in urban spaces has spread among citizens and policy entrepreneurs. Among the political answers to this renewed attention we can include the *"pacchetto sicurezza"*[1] that in 2008 renews different elements of national law and among them the role of the Mayor in urban security and the policy instruments at its disposal. It was extended in an undetermined way the possibility of using a new instrument for the local public policy: the *urban security mayoral's order* (from now only 'mayoral's order' or 'order' in the text). From 2008 to April 2011, when this instrument was declared unconstitutional, dozens of municipalities in the most part of the Italian Regions, introduce hundreds of orders aimed at regulating a lot of different issues: from the possibility to sit down in more than three in the public green areas to the advanced closing of some categories of shops, from the fine for the clients of street sex-workers to the contrast of peddling sanctioning the use of too big bags, from the prohibition of wear the *niqab* to the obligation of signal to the city council the stranger tenants. The city of Milan contributes to this "securitarian enthusiasm" constructing a device of three mayoral's orders aimed at sanction the consumption of alcohol in public spaces, the prostitution on the streets, the purchase and consumption of drugs in public spaces. Between 2007 and 2009 local medias of the area of Milan have given emphasis to two issues underlying how they could be a threat to urban decorum a peace in urban context: the street prostitution and the consumption of alcohol in public spaces. Concerning the former, great importance is given to some aspects that were pointed out by citizens committee. These issues have been dramatize following four different points: the wardship of rest, the rows that

---

[1] Security package

frequently happened, the handling of waste, the decreasing of building prices. This first phase of mobilization were nourished by an important policy entrepreneur: the security assessor that in this case were at the same time the deputy mayor. He has explicitly connected both the street prostitution and the alcohol consumption to a urban security issues. The deputy mayor pose himself as a policy entrepreneur that can lead to a concrete public actions the claims of the organized moral entrepreneurs. Together with the permanency of these issues in the political agenda some experts (psychologist, official of the *Azienda Sanitaria Locale* -local health care company-, the health care assessor) begin to take the floor within the public discourse. In November 2009 a new dramatization, more oriented in the frame of social work, found a concretion in the public action with the opening of a new social service called "Unità Multidisciplinare Integrata"[2] (UMI from now in the text) afferent to the department of social policy. The social service born, in the explicit intentions of the mayor and the social policy assessor, with the aim of draw up to the mayoral's orders cited above. Only the third sector organization that have accepted the new frame imposed in this opportunity by the city for the social policies are admitted in the policy network (Pavolini, 2003). The acceptance was certificated with the subscription of an official document which content can be summarised with the statement "reception only in legality". Considering the policy design, one key element was the constrain of a strict collaboration between UMI's social workers and local police officers in the moment of the enforcement of the orders. This synergy were presented to the citizenship as the new perspective of regulation of the "urban disorder" connected with presence and visibility of some groups targeted as marginal. Nevertheless, from the beginning of the implementation process it was clear that this collaboration couldn't have been realized. Both local police officers and social workers of the organizations that have chosen to accept the conditions imposed by the city, carried out resistance strategies both in coordination arenas and in the street level field.

The UMI was designed to be divided in two areas: the addiction area (including drugs and alcohol abuse), and the prostitution area. This service has met several difficulties in finding an operational fluency as it was affected by the cleavages that the institutional framework of the mayoral's orders has produced within the organizational field of third sector's organizations operating in Milan and in the metropolitan area and at the same time was affected by the resistance of organizations inside of the policy network that tried to modify the securitarian frame of this social policy. The prostitution area, instead, suffer in a deep way the securitarian frame in which it is plunged and moreover was implemented with scarcity of economic and human resources, at the end of 2010 this area was closed. During the same year the issue of street prostitution was used by the urban security assessor that,

---

2   Multidisciplinar Integrated Unity

pivoting on the relating order, remodeled the control of the urban space with the aim, declared only in administrative documents for internal use, to move the prostitutes in the territories of the adjacent municipalities.

We can make more explicit some element of this policy. Different institutional levels are involved in its design and implementation. The city council is interested on it with two different departments: on one hand the urban security one make pressure before as an policy entrepreneur and then during the implementation process to enhance the securitarian frame; on the other hand the social policy department imposed a new frame, with some securitarian influence, to the organizations of the third sectors that traditionally work with the drugs and alcohol abuse. This new frame comprehended also a new way of regulation of the power relations within the policy network that see the public actor as the key node of the circulation of power with a small degree of voice concede to private partners. Therefore we can affirm that this policy brought to a public and an hide aim in both areas. The public aims were the attempt to "contrast the addictions and the prostitution" trough educational practices a individualized way rehabilitation. On the other side, the hide aim were the moving out of the prostitutes from the city territory, spreading the phenomenon in other spaces of the metropolitan context, and change the frame of drug social policy in the city of Milan with an hierarchical and monocratic approach.

Theoretical approach and key questions of the case study

In this case study the policy is analysed with the aim of highlight the constitutive elements of public action: the actors involved, their characteristic, their beliefs and interactions, the deliberation rules, the legacies and the style of regulation. The aim is to comprehend which was the impact of each element in structuring the organizational field interested by the policy and the effect on the dynamics of construction of the metropolitan governance and politics. Both actors and institution have a key role within the policy process. Individuals and groups that participate to this process are normally self-interest and try to affect its dynamics, but the institutional elements (and between them policy instruments are particularly important) are those that shape both the way the actors interpret and pursue their interests and the outcome of actors' actions (March, Olsen 1984). The term "institution" is used to address a configuration of rules and procedures more or less coordinated that regulate the interactions and the behaviours of the actors and the organizations (Powell, Di Maggio 1991). In substance institutions guarantees a stable frame that help to reduce the uncertainty and structures the collective action. Lascoumes and Le Galès (2007, p. 4) propose a definition of the policy instruments that included them among the key institutions of policy processes: "a public policy instrument constitutes a

device that is both technical and social, that organizes specific social relations between the state and those it is addressed to, according to the representations and meanings it carries. It is a particular type of institution, a technical device with the generic purpose of carrying a concrete concept of the politics/society relationship and sustained by a concept of regulation." Policy instruments are a key issue because they consent us to track down the conceptions of the relationship between who governs and the governed that underlie their choice: each one is an essence of the way of knowledge that lead to the social control and the ways it is applied. They are never neutral: they product specific effects independently from the purposes of the policy maker. Then, this unexpected effects structure the implementation process with their normative rationale (Lascoumes e Le Galès 2009, Trad it). In a urban governance context the public power it is not granitic but it is the result of the interaction among public and private actors, the policy instrument organizes the relationship among actors within the public power. They produce specific effects that are independent from policy goals and that are often unpredictable. Among these effects we can find the distortion of purposes explained in public speech. In this case study, as we will see, this singularity come out with light. From this point of view the public policy instrumentation, as any other policy institution, is a political issue that can favours conflict or cooperation dynamics. Taking into account these considerations we can answer to some questions that normally are not considered in the analisys of social policy, but here are the questions that have driven the case study. First of all, which kind of relationship does exist between a particular policy instruments and the policy itself? How can they affect the implementation of other policies in different fields? How can the policy elements (the instruments used, its scale, its space dimension, the organizational field, the mode of governance) influence the dynamics of construction of metropolitan governance? The impact of a policy in a socially heterogeneous and institutionally fragmented context, as the city of Milan is (Lefevre, 1998) can trigger processes and mechanisms unpredictable. What relationship do they have with the instruments that organize power structure within the policy cycle?

The metropolitan scale and local welfare: institutional integration dynamics and metropolitan governance.

In this paragraph we outline some key aspects of metropolitan governance and government and of local welfare. This is the premise for better understand how the social policy's scale and the instruments have had a role in activating some institutional fragmentation dynamics in the metropolitan area of Milan. Focusing on these dynamics will be useful to give suggestion about how to manage urban social issues. Within the last part of the paragraph we make a synthesis of the institutional structure of the local

welfare in Italy with the aim to put on evidence its limits about the possibility to design social policies with a metropolitan breath.

The Italian context is characterized by some metropolitan areas that were not be able to build up any structure of metropolitan government. They are still interested by an high degree of institutional fragmentation. Considering only the Province of Milan, even if it this definitely smaller than whole metropolitan area (OECD, 2006) includes 134 local authorities. The legitimacy degree of a metropolitan institutional structure is another key issue involve in the policy cycle. The Italian local authorities have always played a strong opposition to the metropolitanization of the government, both at local and national levels, even if different law of administrative reform provide since 1990 the constrain to constitute a metropolitan government for certain areas. The most recent law foresee the obligation to create them during the 2013 in authoritarian way, with the presence of national government's officer that will impose the change. Therefore, the public action in urban contexts was focused principally of face single issues with a functional approach (public transport, social housing, education, social policies) involve limited portions of the metropolitan areas organized trough the *consorzi*[3]. This approach could be defined reclaiming the statement that defines this approach as "metropolis by projects" (Dente *et al.*, 1990). So, among the reasons of several failures of the attempts of building up metropolitan government structures, we find the lack of legitimacy. On the other hand, in relation with their polities, the legitimacy of local authorities is risen up during the last twenty years. We can observe, in fact, a greater importance for the role of the mayor both in symbolical way and in therm of government capability. The project of metropolitanization have failed facing the local population, the organized interests and the local authorities themselves. Where the processes of metropolitan governance have been stable we can find some suggestions about the normative elements they are characterized by. These contexts put in high consideration partnership values, negotiation, open participation and flexibility in the implementation of new institutional policies (Lefevre, 1998).

The law 328/2000 have started a deep reform of the Italian local welfare.

Actually the design and management of the social services system involve different public responsibility levels, mainly regional and municipal. The role of the public actor is in this new institutional framework fundamental to define the ways of citizens and third sector participation. Anyway the common denominator of the mode of governance is based on four points (Bifulco, Centemeri, 2008): one is the presence of a plurality of actors that contribute in the design, implementation and management of social policies. The second is the emergence of complex environments of public action with a low level of integration. The third point is the demand for

---

[3]   A type of intermunicipal single-purpose association

coordination that emerge from these complex situations. The last one point regard the deligitimation of forms of coordination based on public authority, for the benefit of a greater importance granted to contractual or consensual rationale (Le Galès 2002; Mayntz 2006). Considering the scale of the social policies of local welfare the local authorities have to join in new inter-municipal groupings called Piani di Zona (*Area Plans*). This organizational and institutional level is designed to be superimpose to the social-health districts. The aim is to ease the integration process between social and social-health issues in the local welfare system. The premise behind this choice is that the needs raise from the territory and the should be treated within it. By the way, the complex relationships among different local actors that shape the wide urban areas and the common or the contrasting interests between local authorities in the metropolitan areas are not taken into account for the definition of proper scale for social policies. This institutional framework fails in handling the social issues linked to all these *people* that do not have a clear connection with a definite *place* (Cremaschi (ed), 2008). These groups have often a lack of social inclusion also they frequently move trough different administrative boundaries, different urban areas or simply different roads (i.e. roma groups, homeless, squeeges, beggar, prostitutes, street merchant, undocumented strangers, youths in search of nocturnal leisure). Even if they are a small proportion of urban population these groups have high visibility and they often trigger displacement reactions in the majority groups that feel this presence as a threat for their interests: quality of urban environment, peace in deep night, decrease of real estate value, street crimes, raise of social heterogeneity in public space.

Concerning these remarks the social policy considered in this case-study includes two critical profiles in relation to its impact on the metropolitan area. Focusing on the implementation scale it have superimposed the *Piano di Zona* of Milan, even if it was designed and implemented outside of it, that coincide with the administrative boundaries of the city. From the point of view of the regulation of the relationship between the public and private actors it deeply move away both from the rationale of the local welfare reform and the good practices, cited above, that could help the govern of metropolitan issues. In this case-study the phase of policy design is excluded from any governance arena. Moreover, there were an attempt of an authoritarian legitimation of the public actor both in the choice of the institutional framework, shaped by the three mayoral's orders, and in the style of regulation of the relationship between the actors of the policy network. he fragmentation of the Italian social service system is e serious problem: to tackle it the integration of actors and interventions is the guiding idea of the reform of local welfare. This urban policy went to another direction. It was underpinned by policy instruments that have a normative dimension that is an obstacle to integration and that trigger distinction dynamics that easily become cleavages in the organizational field. The securitarian

framework lead to a re-naming of the social issue of the presence of some marginal (or disturbing) groups in a phenomenon that is a threat for the security. Therefore the solution is a repressive approach with the consequences that we will see in the subsequent paragraphs.

The institutional framework shaped by policy instruments

The leaders of local authorities in metropolitan areas are called to handle heterogeneous networks of actors trough which is possible to guarantee the possibility to organize a coherent urban agenda.

During the 90 a local public administration reform introduced the rule of the direct election of the mayor and spread in this way stronger local leadership model. The aim was to answer to the legitimacy crisis of public institutions giving a greater degree of accountability to local polities.

One can say that we are experiencing some key contradictory processes: (1) the restructuring of the state with a crucial role of the local authorities (Le Galès, 2005), (2) the innovation of the institutional role of the mayor (Borraz, John, 2004; Dato G., 1998), (3) the increasing complexity of metropolitan contexts and exigence to favour a governance approach allow the regulation of the relationship between the actors (Lefevre, 1998), (4) the reform of the local welfare system that shape local deliberative arenas where the citizens and third sector organizations could be involved. On one hand these processes stress the decision-maker role of the mayor but on the other they promote a cooperative decision making. However, as we have seen above, in the Italian context the strengthening of local leadership it became an obstacle in the process of structuring of metropolitan government and underpin the spread of the mayor's order instrument, in particular those related to the urban security. Highlighting the characteristics of the mayor's order of urban security as an institution help us in understanding how them can affect: the policy process, the relationship between the actors involved in the organizational field and the relationship between local authorities around Milan. Trough an historical reconstruction, and using the narration of the privilege witnesses about the implementation process we have defined four dimensions. In the chart that follows we put them in relation to the power relations and the policy elements they have shaped.

Tab 1 Dimensions for the mayoral's orders of urban security and connected policy aspects influenced by them.

Elements of the instrument	Elements of the policy

Costitutive dimension	- structure of the power relations within the local authority
	- relation governing/governed
	- structure of territorial power relations: a) access to policy network
	                                                b) relations among actors in
	                                                metropolitan area

Cognitive dimension	- reductionism and semplification of reality - normative definition of the policy targets - link between scale and systemic effect of the policy
Normative dimension	- political culture: government *vs* governance - representation of the problem - strategic reactions and production of cleavages
Technical dimension	- legitimacy - comunicative and visibility value - expected vs realized effects

In the following paragraph we will take into a systematic account these dimensions that, functioning in synergy with the policy scale and the institutional context of metropolitan area, have had a role in producing unexpected impacts. Our attention will be focused on those effect that could give us some suggestion about the role that policy instruments have in influencing the possibility of metropolitan regulation of some peculiar social issues (i.e. the presence of marginal groups).

The relationship between the scale of social policies, the policy instruments and the institutional and organizational fragmentation of the metropolitan area of Milan.

At this point we are able to define and describe (1) which was the role of mayoral's orders in structuring of power relationship of public and private actors, (2) how the attempt to introduce a change within the framework of the urban social policies trough a top-down dynamic, have produced a cleavage in the organizational field of local welfare, and (3) how the urban scale of the policy device have had consequences of the metropolitan contexts.

Often, a plural leadership scheme is a good solution to run the complexity of factors that affect the genesis of social issues and those that structure both the organizational field of local welfare and the institutional relationships in a metropolitan context. As we have seen the mayoral order has the characteristic of stressing the powerful asymmetries. These asymmetries have had an extensive impact

both within the scale of implementation, so the municipal area, and the external space relating to different local authorities. The *constitutive dimension* of the instrument impose in a hierarchical way a norm, monocratical defined by a local government institution, that detect in a discretionary modality the adequacy of the behaviours that is possible to have in a urban context. Who does not follows the prescription contained in the order is outside of the social norm and it is sanctioned for this reason. This rationale acted in a transforming sense also on the normative framework of the local welfare. Starting with the addiction social policies the attempt was to move out from the principle "to educate, not to punish" that characterize the policy interventions in the last decade, to the principle "welcome but within the legality". The nature of the new frame and above all the top-down style of its implementation, have produced a *distinction* also within the organizational field of third sector organizations. This distinction was imposed trough an administrative document that delimited operative procedure of bodies and social workers in order to transform them in coherent way regarding the new framework. The was the production of deep cleavage in the organizational field between *strategic* and *valorial* bodies. Former are those who have accepted to enter in the policy network with the terms of the social policies department, the latter have not accepted those terms and for this reason they have had hard difficulties in the relationship with the public actor and with the other organizations operating in the addictions field. This cleavage has meant the interruption of the coordination activities between *strategic* and *valorial* actors also in different policy sectors, increasing the fragmentation and the overlapping of interventions and diminishing the degree of coherence within the local welfare system in general. The organizations have been affected by this conflictual dynamic cooperate also with the adjacent local authorities on different policies and different fields of social issues. For this reason the cleavage have been created inside of the boundaries of Milan has had repercussions on a wider context, exporting some new troubles in coordination activities in different *Piani di Zona*. Considering the metropolitan dimension the movement of *inclusion/exclusion* that followed the constitutive dimension of the orders it was underpinned by its spatial dimension. The implementation scale of the instrument could not go beyond the municipal boundaries, and within them its regulative power descend directly from the mayor. The result was the *exclusion* of other actors of metropolitan area and it has had a strong impact just outside the scale of implementation of the policy. In fact, the monocratic aspects and the strictness of the scale of the instrument have favoured the control strategies of the municipal territory aimed to move these social problems in the adjacent local authorities.

The *cognitive dimension* highlight the reductionism to a securitarian view of complex social issues and the introduction of an high degree of discretionary linked to the monocratic characteristic of the instrument. In addition to trigger distinction processes that do not increase the govern capability in

heterogeneous and fragmented contexts, this instrument do not guarantee the coherence between purposes and goals. It the public purposes were to offer a social solution to the issues and to increase the urban security, the goal pursued was the displacement of unwilling groups intervening only on the visibility of those in the public space. In other terms the order de-historicize social issues and activate itself only in the moment of the sanction without looking at the "transformation", that broadly speaking is the aim of social policy. It is an instrument that reinforce the idea that a urban policy can stay contained within municipal boundaries with any political or social impact. It does not allow "to see" beyond its scale of implementation: wielding a hierarchical power inside the city it does not take into consideration the relationship and the social and political complexity that shape a metropolitan area.

Focusing on its *normative dimension* the critic issue is that the order has sanctioned not only the use of alcohol in certain areas, the drug consumption in public space or the plague of exploitation of sex workers ma above all it has intervened to maintain a certain representation of urban decorum. This instrument have promoted an idea of the urban security based not only on public order but also on the physical environment and public space order. In these cases the definition of what is "order" and what is not it isn't designed in a legal way but is tied in a flexibility manner to the dynamics of reproduction of political consensus within each municipality. The power can easily use the mayoral urban security orders to offer a simple answer easy to communicate relating to govern the urban space. This dimension of the instrument have resulted crucial in regulating the non-implementation of the UMI's area related to prostitution. The instrument itself was imagined in its contents in a incongruous manner with the goals of the social work explained within the public speech. The *technical dimension* interact with the last aspect reinforcing it. The instrument have shown a weak repressive efficacy towards the phenomenons is addressed to. Only few fines were imposed to alcohol and drugs consumers. The high number of fines that involved prostitutes and their clients have had a low rate of collection because of the former pay hardly. The real goal did not seem to repress the problem or to give an opportunity of social integration to marginal individuals, instead move the unwilling issues somewhere else: far from the eyes of electors.

Considering what we state about the instrument's dimensions we can now observe under a new light the effects of this policy on the metropolitan area. According to the aim of this article two are the aspects that we are not explicitly examined yet: (1) the relationship between public and private actors outside the urban area, (2) the relationship between different local authorities in the metropolitan context.

The cleavages of the organizational field did not involve only the urban area of Milan because some the actors affected are present in the local welfare system of the adjacent cities. Therefore, the break produced by the policy is mirrored in a wider territorial area compared with the scale of the policy. This

cleavage between *strategic* and *valorial* organizations did not remained confined within administrative boundaries of the city as the action of the instrument did, according to its implementation scale. Those bodies participate as well in different planning arenas (the *Piani di Zona*) that insist on the neighbour social districts that include also cities that are quite far from the boundaries of Milan. So, most part of this municipalities were not interested directly by the presence of unwilling displaced groups (in this case we refer to the prostitutes). Notwithstanding, they were subjected to the effects of a break in the integration dynamics between actors that has weakened the planning capability within the local welfare. The municipal scale of the instrument in synergy with its characteristic produce a wider and unexpected impact. In fact, it did not concern only the relationship between the public actor and the actors of the organizational field. The displacement of the phenomenon of the street prostitution has interested 7 municipalities among the 20 that are adjacent Milan. This lead to a radicalization of the securiatarian frame upon the issue and trigger a political dialectic between the mayors contrasting leaders of the same political coalition at the national level. There were produced in this way new cleavages within the metropolitan politic that potentially introduce some difficulties also in those policy sectors where was successful to trigger a metropolitan regulation following the logic of "*metropoli per progetti*" (Dente, 1990). Even if in a temporary way (the mayoral order were active from 2008 to 2010) a social policy with a securitarian framework have had an impact on the balance within the politics of a metropolitan area.

Conclusion: governing the public space and interactions between instrument and policy scale

The choice of this peculiar social policy, the reference to theoretical frame and the approach utilised for the study of the policy cycle, allow us to answer to the questions we posed in this article.

Studying the impacts of a policy that has the marginal groups as a target permit to stress with more clearness the socio-political dynamics that ensue from them. The political choices concerning the marginal subjects of a polity carry out the different configuration of values of the actors involved and favour their dramatization. The theoretical frame of the sociological neo-institutionalism help in focusing our attention on the relationship, circular in a way, between the institutions of the policy process and the interested actors and consent us to see how these configurations can be restructured.

The approach of policy study trough its instruments permits to highlight the power dynamics that these restructuring lead to and the cooperative or conflictual dynamics linked to them. This work questions

two elements of social policies relating to the metropolitan dimension: the type of instrument used and the scale of implementation. The focus on the functioning of the instrument and its effects on the policy elements of the policy give us some suggestions and prescriptions about how could be the best way to start metropolitan social policy process. A top-down instrument that pose again the accent on a government approach in local context, that do not allow to manage the complexity of the urban social issues, that dictate a new normative framework has deep consequences in the efficiency of local welfare. The choice were influenced by the will to increase the governance capability in regard to the most visible marginal groups and recover legitimacy in front of the polity. The incoherence with the rationale of the reform of local welfare produced a short circuit in the power structure establish until that moment. The complexity of relationships in a metropolitan context spread this dynamic well beyond the scale of implementation. All these elements give us the prescription to privilege instruments where the principal dimension go towards participation, reflexivity, processual decision making all along the policy process. This is enough for managing urban issues that have a metropolitan valency? The emerging social problems (like those we have covered here) raise questions that cross horizontally over different sectors of bureaucracy and vertically over different levels of government (Kazepov ed., 2005, pp 235-254). So, not only instruments but also the scale of the policy counts. As we seen, there is a multiplier link of the institutional fragmentation in this metropolitan area between the object of the policy (that is not particularly tied to a defined territory), the scale of the instrument and the planning scale of the local welfares included in the same area. A way to avoid the trigger of this mutual reinforcement of fragmentation profiles is to use instruments that open the participation and the reflexivity to the actors involved in the *street-level bureaucracy* (Lipsky, 1980) so that they could activate cross synergies between the different urban planning arenas of social policy (the *Piani di Zona*) that are not shaped with a metropolitan dimension. Therefore, the use of instruments that constitute themselves trough participation processes and that they have a flexible scale is potentially a mode to compensate for the fragmentation of planning institutions.

The processes and the dynamics that spring from the attempt to govern the marginal population provide suggestions on how it can bear on other policy sectors and on different polities as they are all strictly connected starting from the nexus between *place* and *people* (Cremaschi -ed-, 2008). Thanks to the choice of this case study approach was possible to recover some information about how the urban policies can contribute or obstacle the trigger of governamental process that would involve the municipalities of the metropolitan area. As we seen the on the instruments dimensions and its scale focus highlight the power dynamics on the organizational field and the link between those and the politic's actors not involved in the policy cycle giving new consistence to the statement "policy

determines politics" (Lowi -it-, 1999)

References

Agnew J., Shin M., Bettoni G. (2002) "City versus metropolis: the northern league in the Milan metropolitan area", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Vol. 26, No. 2 pp 266-83

Bifulco L. (2002) *Che cos'è un'organizzazione* Carocci Roma

Bifulco L. (2008) *Gabbie di vetro. Burocrazia, governance e libertà* Bruno Mondadori, Milano

Bifulco L., Centemeri L. (2007) "Governance and participation in local welfare: the case of Italian Piani di Zona" *Social Policy & Administration* Vol. 42 No. 3 pp 211-27

Borraz O., John P. (2004) *"The transformation of urban political leadership in western europe" International journal of urban and regional research* Volume 28 n°1 pp 107-20

Carrer M. (2011) *Le ordinanze dei sindaci e la scorciatoia della corte. Osservazioni, a prima lettura, alla sentenza della Corte Costituzionale 7 aprile 2011, n°115*, Forum di Quaderni Costituzionali

Castel R. (2004) *L'insicurezza sociale. Che significa essere protetti?* Einaudi, Torino (trad it.)

Caulfield J., Larsen H. O. (a cura di) "*Local government at the millennium*", Leske + Budrick, Opladen 2002

Cittalia Fondazione (2009) *Oltre le ordinanze i sindaci e la sicurezza urbana,* marzo

Chiodini L., Tortorella W. (2010) "Le ordinanze dei sindaci e oltre" *Amministrare*, n° 2 Agosto

Cohen M., March J., and Olsen J. (1972) "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice" *Administrative Science Quarterly* Vol. 17, N° 1, pp. 1-25.

Coleman R., (2005) "Surveillance in the city: primary definition and urban spatial order" *Crime media*

culture Vol 1 No. 2 pp 131-48

Corte Costituzionale, *Sentenza n° 115 anno 2011*.

Cremaschi M. (a cura di) (2008) "La nuova questione urbana" in *Territorio* n° 46

Dato Giurickovic C. (1996) *Il sindaco taumaturgo e il governo delle città* Franco Angeli, Milano

Davies J. S. , Imbroscio D.L. (a cura di) (2009) *Theories of Urban politics* 2nd Ed Sage Publications

De Leonardis O. (2008) "Una nuova questione sociale? Qualche interrogativo preliminare a proposito di territorializzazione delle politiche" in *Territorio* n° 46 pp 10-16

Dente B. (1990) Metropolitan Governance reconsidered or how to avoid errors of the third type. *Governance* Vol. 3 No. 1

Donzelot J. (2008) *Il neoliberismo sociale* in Territorio n° 46 pp 5-9

Di Maggio P. J., Powell W. (1983) "The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields" *American Sociological Review* 48, April pp 147-160

Di Maggio P. J., Powell W. (1991) "Introduction", Powell and Di Maggio (a cura di) *The new institutionalism in organizational analisys* Chicago IL, University of Chicago Press pp 1-40

Eliadis P. F., Hill M. M., Howlett M. (2005) *Designinig government: from instruments to governance* McGill's-Queen Press

Fiss P.C., Zajac E. (2006) "The symbolic management of strategic change: sense giving via framing and decoupling" *Academy of Management Review* 49 n°6 pp 1173-1193

Flyvbjerg B. (2006), "Five misunderstandings about case-study research" *Qualitative Inquiry* vol 12 n°12 219-245

Foucault M. (1978) *La governamentalità* in Aut Aut, 167-168, settembre-dicembre, pp. 12-29

Foucault M. (2009) *Bisogna difendere la società* Feltrinelli, Milano

Genieys W., Ballart X., Valariè P. (2004) "From "great" leaders to building networks: the emergence of a new urban leadership in southern europe?" *International journal of urban and regional research* Volume 28.1 March 183-99

Giddens A. (1994) L*e conseguenze della modernità. Fiducia e rischio, sicurezza e pericolo* Il Mulino, Bologna

Hall P. A., Victoria C. H. (1993) *Labor visions and state power: the origin of business unionism in the United States* Princeton University Press.

Hall P. A. , Rosemary C.R. Taylor (1996) "Political Science and the three new Institutionalisms" *Political Studies* XLIV, 936-957.

Hill H. C. (2003) "Understanding implementation: street-level bureaucrats' resources for reform" *Journal of Public Administation Research and Theory* 13 n°3 pp 265-282

Hood C. (1983) *The Tools of Government* Macmillan, London.

Hood C. (2007) "Intellectual Obsolescence and Intellectual Makeovers: reflections on the tools of Government after two decades" *Governance: An International Journal Of Policy, Administration and Institutions* Vol. 20, No. 1pp 127-144.

Howlett M. , Cashore B. , (2007) "Re-visiting the new orthodoxy of policy dynamics; the dependent variableand re-aggregation problems in the study of policy change" *Canadian political science review,* vol 1 n°2

Howlett M., M. Ramesh (2010) *Come studiare le politiche pubbliche* Il Mulino, Bologna

Kazepov Y., (ed) (2005) "Cities of Europe. Changing contexts, local arrangements and the challenge to

urban cohesion" Blackwell Publishing

Kingdon J.W., James A.T. (2010) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies* Longman Classics Edition pp 165-195

Krasner S.D. (1988) *Sovereignty: an institutional perspective* in Comparative Political Studies, n° 1

Lascoumes P., Le Gales P. (2007) "Introduction: understanding public policy trough its instruments – from the nature of instruments to the sociology of public policy instrumentation" *Governance: An International Journal Of Policy, Administration and Institutions* Vol. 20, No. 1   pp 1 – 22

Lascoumes P., Le Gales P. (a cura di) (2009) *Gli strumenti per governare* Bruno Mondadori, Milano (trad.it)

Lascoumes P. *et al* "Public policy seen through the prism of its instrument" Introduction, *Revue francaise de science politique (english)*, 2011/1 Vol. 61, p. 1-17

Le Galès P. (1998) "Regulations and governance in European Cities" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Vol. 22 No. 3 pp 482-506

Le Gales P. (2005) *Recomposition de l'Etat et territoire: L'Etat régulateur,une révolution bureaucratique en marche ?* Communication pour le colloque de l'AFSP, septembre, Lyon

Le Gales P. (2006) *Le città europee. Società urbane, globalizzazione, governo locale* Il Mulino, Bologna

Lefreve C. (1998) "Metropolitan government and governance in western countries: a critical review" *Internationa Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Vol 22, No. 1, pp 9-25.

Lipsky M. (2007) "Street level bureaucracy: dilemmas of the individual in Public Services" *Politics of polipaocy making and implementation* 16 ottobre working paper

Linder S.H. , Peters B. G. (1998) *The study of policy instruments: four school of thought* in Guy B.

Peters, Frans K. M. van Nispen, (a cura di) *Public Policy instruments: evaluating the tools of public administration.* Chelthenam, Uk, Edgar Elgar

Lowi T.J. (1999) "Politica e politiche: quattro sistemi di relazioni" in *La scienza delle politiche*, Il Mulino, Bologna

Magnier A. (2004) "Beetween institutional learning and re-legitimization: italian mayors in the unending reform" *International journal of urban and regional research* Volume 28.1 March pp 166-82

March J.G., Olsen J.P. (1984) "The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life" *American Politcal Science Review* 78, n°3 pp. 738

Mingione E. (1999) *Gli itinerari della sociologia economica in prospettiva europea* in Laville J., Mingione E. *La nuova sociologia economica. Prospettive europee.* Franco Angeli Milano

Mingione E., La Rosa M. (2000) *Presentazione* in Rizza R. *Logiche istituzionali e costruzione sociale delle organizzazioni. Un'analisi dei mutamenti nei servizi pubblici in Italia.* Franco Angeli Milano

Morandi F., Mascia D. (2010) *Il decoupling nelle organizzazioni sanitarie: un'analisi delle strutture dipartimentali e degli strumenti per il governo clinico nel ssn* XI workshop dei Docenti e dei Ricercatori di Organizzazione Aziendale Bologna, 16-18 giugno

Napolitano G. (2008) *Le nuove ordinanze del Sindaco* Maggioli Ed., Rimini

Oliver C. (1991) "Strategic response to institutional processes" *Academy of Management Review* 16 n°1 pp 145-179

Pavolini E. (2003) *Le nuove politiche sociali. I sistemi di welfare tra istituzioni e società civile* Il Mulino Bologna

Peters G. B. (2002) "The politics of tools choice" in Salomon L., Micheal con Odus V. Elliott, *The tools of government: a guide to the new governance* ,Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Raco M. (2009) "From expectations to aspirations: state modernisation, urban policy, and the existential politics on welfare in the Uk" *Political Geography* Vol 28 pp 436-444

Rago G. (2003) *Il sindaco e l'adozione delle ordinanze contingibili e urgenti* Halley Ed.

Salet W., Thornley A., "Institutional influences on the integration of multilevel governance and spatia policy in european city-regions" *Journal of Planning Education and Research* Vol 27 pp 188-198.

Salomon L. , Micheal con Odus V. Elliott (2002) *The tools of government: a guide to the new governance,*Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Segatori R. (2003) *I Sindaci. Storia e sociologia dell'amministrazione locale in Italia* Donzelli, Roma

Vaira M., (2003) "Dove va il neosititnzioanlismo? Alcune riflessioni sui recenti sviluppi e i problemi aperti dell'analisi istituzionale" *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia* n°1 gennaio-marzo

Weber M. (1974) *Economia e società*, Edizioni Comunità, Milano

Yin R. K., (1981) "The case study crisis. Some Answers." *Administrative Science Quarterly* vol n° 26 58-65

Zucker L. (1991)*The role of institutionalisation in cultural persistence* in Powell and DiMaggio *The new institutionalism in organizational analisys* chicago IL, University of Chicago Press, pp 83-107

Zygmunt B. (2008) *Paura liquida* LaTerza, Roma-Bari

Zygmunt B. (1999) *La società dell'incertezza* Il Mulino, Bologna