

Policy and Governance Innovations for Sustainable Urban Development: An Overview of the 2014–2020 Structural Funds Programming in Italy

Ekaterina Domorenok

Abstract This paper deals with policy and governance innovations in EU regional policies, illustrating how the strategy for sustainable urban development has gradually consolidated over time, progressively enlarging the scope of interventions and the related financial resources. As is well known, the current programming (2014–2020) calls for prominent attention to the territorial dimension and, in particular, to the EU urban agenda. In fact, member states have been invited to introduce specific policy instruments in order to promote integrated sustainable development in urban areas at national and regional levels. Evidence from a preliminary analysis of the Italian programming documents shows, however, that the success of these instruments cannot be taken for granted. Quite in line with the experience of other EU countries, the scenario of implementation of the new governance and policy provisions varies significantly across the country, bringing to light a number of obstacles and challenges to their diffusion within domestic policy structures.

Keywords Urban governance · Sustainable development · European union · Regional policies · Place-based

1 Introduction

As is well known, the EU cohesion policy has given rise to numerous policy and governance innovations, in particular as far as urban areas are concerned. After being introduced during the first programming period (1988–94), innovative actions for urban development have evolved first under Urban Pilot Projects (UPP) and later within the Community Initiative Programme (CIP) URBAN. From a substantive point of view, the urban policy innovations can be summarized under the

E. Domorenok (✉)

Department of Political Science, Law and International Studies,
University of Padua, Padua, Italy
e-mail: ekaterina.domorenok@unipd.it

umbrella of an integrated cross-sectoral approach, aiming to embrace all different dimensions of urban life—economic, environmental, social, and demographic. In procedural terms, instead, the so-called “URBAN method” has been promoted in order to encourage a participatory approach to programming at a local level, fine-tuned to the perspective of multi-level governance, which implies the involvement of social and economic stakeholders and local civil society in decision making and implementation activities.

Given the rather successful implementation results of the aforementioned initiatives between 1988 and 2006 (European Commission 2008), the EU Commission pushed for the diffusion of both their substantive and procedural elements throughout the mainstream objectives¹ of EU regional policies during the period 2007–2013. Remarkably, in the current programming (2014–2020), two new governance instruments have been introduced—Community-Led Local Development (CLLD) and Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI)—both enabling further strengthening of the participatory and integrated approach to urban development.

After a short overview of policy and governance innovations introduced by EU regional policies to promote sustainable urban development, this paper provides a preliminary analysis of the Italian programming documents for the period 2014–2020, illustrating how the EU-policy guidelines have been implemented and discussing challenges to policy innovations in this field.

2 Policy and Governance Instruments for Sustainable Urban Development in Cohesion Policies 1988–2013

The issue of sustainable urban development has progressively gained importance in EU cohesion policies since the very origins of the Structural Funds (SF) programming. Starting from the late 1980s, specific actions have promoted the view that the various challenges concerning urban areas—economic, environmental, social, and demographic—are interwoven, and success in urban development can only be achieved through an integrated approach. Therefore, the EU Commission (DG Regio) has stressed the need to combine measures concerning physical urban renewal with those fostering education, economic development, social inclusion, and environmental protection (COM(1998)605). In order to enable the design of successfully integrated actions, it has been suggested that the development of strong partnerships involving local citizens, civil society, the local economy, and the various levels of government is an indispensable element. Thus,

¹During the 2007–2013 programming period, EU regions were admissible for EU SF financing under the following three mainstream objectives: Convergence (those regions having a per capita gross domestic product (GDP) of less than 75 % of the average GDP of the EU-25), Regional Competitiveness and Employment (all other regions), and Territorial Cooperation.

combining capacities and local knowledge has been perceived as essential for identifying shared solutions and achieving well-accepted and sustainable policy results.

Drawing on the abovementioned premises, innovative actions for cities were foreseen within the framework of Urban Pilot Projects (UPP)² during the 1989–93 programming period, in accordance with Article 10 of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Reg. (EC) No 2052/88, while in 1994 the URBAN Community Initiative was launched, aiming specifically at promoting an integrated approach by taking account of all dimensions of urban life. The URBAN Initiative applied a package of actions combining the rehabilitation of obsolete infrastructures with economic and labor market actions, complemented by measures to combat the social exclusion inherent in run-down neighborhoods and measures to upgrade the quality of the environment. The so-called ‘URBAN method’ has been at the core of the Initiative, establishing a bottom–up approach to decision making, based on participation and networking at a local level. In this way, the Managing Authorities (MA) of the CIP URBAN normally coincided with municipal administrations, who were required to act in cooperation with a number of operational bodies, including the steering committee, composed of public authorities at the various territorial levels concerned (national, regional, and local), as well as of social and economic stakeholders and civil society representatives. Quite often, local forums were established, engaging wider local social and economic partnerships and local communities (non-governmental organizations, neighborhood councils, spontaneous groups of individuals, etc.). Collaboration and coordination between all partners concerned were to be guaranteed across all phases of implementation of CIP: from the formulation of actions to be carried out at the local level to the selection of the projects to implement. The commitment of URBAN to involving local citizens in the development and implementation of the programs was highlighted, stressing that the problems of urban deprivation should be solved at the grass-roots level (European Commission 2000).

After two consecutive editions in 1994–1999 and 2000–2006, the CIP URBAN was cancelled in the 2007–2013 programming period, while it was decided that actions for sustainable urban development and the consolidated operational method should be mainstreamed across all thematic objectives of the SF, thereby increasing both the geographical scope of its diffusion and the availability of financial resources (European Commission 2007).

It is worth mentioning that, since the mid-1990s, the overall attention to the urban dimension has substantially increased in many European countries, owing much to the policy process developed around the European Territorial Agenda, which has involved national governments in an intense reflection about the relevance of the territorial dimension for development policies (Domorenok 2009).

²During the 1990 to 1993 period, a total of 33 Urban Pilot Projects were initiated under the aegis of Article 10 of the ERDF. These projects were implemented in eleven member states and aimed to support innovation in urban regeneration and planning within the framework of the broader policy for promoting economic and social cohesion.

A number of political declarations approved within such a framework paved the way for the strengthening of actions for integrated urban development in the SF programming for the period 2007–2013. In this way, building on the Lille Action Programme (2000), the Rotterdam Urban Acquis (2004), and the Bristol Accord (2005), the seminal Report “Integrated urban development as a prerequisite for successful urban sustainability” was prepared by the German Presidency in 2006, affirming a strong support for the EU Sustainable Development Strategy and highlighting the objective of protecting, strengthening, and further developing cities. The report has stressed that all dimensions of sustainable development should be taken into account at the same time and with the same weight, including economic prosperity, social balance, and the environment, as well as cultural and health aspects. Moreover, it has been highlighted that particular attention should be paid to the institutional capacity in the member states to be able to implement holistic strategies and coordinated action by all persons and institutions involved in the urban-development process, which reach beyond the boundaries of individual cities. It has been emphasized that, in order to make the multi-level governance system really effective, the coordination of the sectoral policy areas should be improved, and, at the same time, developing a new sense of responsibility for the integrated urban-development policies. The role of integrated urban development and the importance of cities for economic and social cohesion have been reiterated by the “Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities” approved in 2007, stating that cities and metropolitan areas are the engines of Europe’s economic development, but at the same time they are the frontline in the battle against obstacles to growth and employment—especially social exclusion and environmental degradation.

Based on the aforementioned political commitments and considerations, the various possibilities to implement urban actions under all mainstream Objectives of the EU Cohesion Policy have been enshrined in the Regulations for the 2007–2013 period, and a common methodological framework for integrated urban development has been defined in the Community Strategic Guidelines. These documents, as well as the Commission’s Communication on “Cohesion Policy and Cities” (COM (2006)385), have been an important guidance for the elaboration of national programming documents—National Strategic Reference Frameworks and Operational Programmes (OP) co-financed by the ERDF at the national or regional level. Therefore, the ERDF could, where appropriate, support the development of participative, integrated and sustainable strategies to tackle the high concentration of economic, environmental, and social problems affecting urban areas, whereas member states were invited to develop strategies that would promote sustainable urban development through activities such as: the strengthening of economic growth, the rehabilitation of the physical environment, brownfield redevelopment, the preservation and development of natural and cultural heritage, the promotion of entrepreneurship, local employment, and the provision of services to the population taking account of changing demographic structures. As far as the governance dimension is concerned, it has been stressed that the local authorities have an important role to play in the achievement of sustainable urban development in the

cities, whereas the preparation of medium- to long-term development plans for urban regeneration is generally a precondition for success, as it ensures the coherence of investments and of their environmental quality and helps to secure the commitment and participation of the private sector in urban renewal (European Commission 2007). Building on the experience and strengths of the URBAN CIP, member states and regions were offered the possibility to design, program, and implement tailor-made, integrated development operations in all European cities investing up to 10 % of the ERDF, while in the previous periods a limited number of cities (around 200) were selected for sustainable urban-development programs. The ERDF funding of measures under the Regional Competitiveness and Employment objective falling within the scope of Reg. (EC) No 1081/2006 could be raised to 15 % of the program or priority axis concerned. Additionally, a new initiative was launched—Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA)—with the purpose of increasing resources and attracting private investments for integrated sustainable urban development. The operational mechanism of this initiative has foreseen the establishment of Urban Development Funds (Urban Authorities), based on a solid public-private partnership, to which MA could delegate the management of a part of SF. It was envisaged that as part of an operational program, SF could finance expenditure of an operation comprising contributions to support financial engineering instruments for enterprises, primarily small- and medium-sized ones, such as venture capital funds, guarantee funds and loan funds, and for urban development funds, that is, funds investing in public-private partnerships and other projects included in an integrated plan for sustainable urban development (Article 44, 78, Reg. (EC) No 1083/2006).

Later on, within the framework of the *place-based* narrative (Mendez 2013), which has guided the last SF reform, the objectives of Integrated Sustainable Urban Development (ISUD) have been included among key horizontal priorities of cohesion policy 2014–2020. Besides including a number of those thematic objectives that specifically target urban development, notably concerning environmental, regeneration, and mobility issues, the new SF regulations require member states to allocate at least 5 % of the total ERDF expenditure for ISUD, whereas cities, sub-regional, or local bodies (Urban Authorities) responsible for implementing sustainable urban strategies shall be responsible for tasks relating, at least, to the selection of operations in accordance with Article 123(6) of Reg. (EU) No 1303/2013. Moreover, in general, the new approach aims to support the development of more holistic integrated urban development strategies and the identification of investment priorities that specifically tackle urban development challenges. Actions for ISUD can be implemented through the so-called mainstream approaches: either a separate OP or a separate Priority axis in an OP. Two new specific tools have been envisaged—Integrated Territorial Investments (ITIs) (Article 36, Reg. (EU) No 1303/2013) and Community-led Local Development (CLLD) (Article 32–35, Reg. (EU) No 1303/2013)—with the purpose of linking the thematic objectives identified in the Partnership Agreements (PA), which is the main programming document at national level and OP, in compliance with Europe 2020 strategy on the one hand, and the territorial dimension on the other. These

instruments have been considered to be particularly relevant for the implementation of ISUD, although they could target also other types of territory (i.e., rural-urban, sub-regional, rural, cross border, and territories with specific geographic features). In this way, the ITIs tool has been suggested to be a particularly effective instrument for programming interventions in urban areas, ranging from actions for specific urban neighborhoods with multiple deprivations, metropolitan, and larger urban areas (e.g., a network of small- or medium-sized cities). It is a functional instrument, which can be programmed to cover innovation and competitiveness, low-carbon economy and renewables, and social cohesion themes, and it does not necessarily need geographically contiguous territories. According to EU guidelines, local bodies should be significantly involved in the implementation of ISUD through ITIs, taking on responsibilities concerning the strategy development, animation, and project generation, selection or pre-selection of project activities, etc. The other tool—CLLD—is instead envisaged for territorially delimited sub-regional areas and is based on an ad hoc, bottom-up development strategy, mobilizing, and involving local communities and organizations. The CLLD approach is strongly rooted in the experience of locally driven CIP, which were developed, among others, within the Urban Pilot Projects and the URBAN CIP. Both instruments have been expected to boost the territorial potential of development, especially in urban areas, while states and regions were supposed to possess enough experience and skills to be able to translate them smoothly into practice.

However, although the EU approach to the territorial dimension seems to be better spelled out for the 2014–2020 programming compared to the 2007–13 period, a preliminary analysis of its implementation in a sample of countries has brought to light several challenges (Zwet et al. 2014). Not only have several ambiguities and omissions been pointed out in the EU guidelines, but many concerns have also been expressed in relation to administrative and institutional capacity at the local level, as well as to the way the results orientation and thematic concentration obligations are applied. The following aspects have been mentioned among the difficulties in the implementation of the new instruments: inadequate capacity of local bodies to meet increased financial and operational responsibilities, as they often have limited expertise or resources to implement projects; scarce representativeness and operational capacity of local partnerships; the risk of political interference and urban rivalry (the largest cities vs. others); and possible tensions between local and central level administrations as a consequence of delegation of responsibilities, etc.

Although in some countries the relatively high rate of adoption of what are voluntary tools (ITIs and CLLD) confirms that authorities at member-state level recognize their value, and have a certain level of enthusiasm for integrated territorial approaches, the MA are often ‘caught in the middle’ between the Commission on the one hand, which is ‘pushing’ for the use of integrated approaches in order to coordinate ESI Funds, and local actors on the other hand, who are keen to use territorial approaches in order to secure ring-fenced multi-annual funding (Zwet et al. 2014). In fact, the MA face the difficult task of having to establish structures and

implement mechanisms that are in line with the expectations of local actors, or which may conform to the letter—but not the spirit—of the regulations. Thus, both thematic concentration and local responsibility for integrated development strategies are considered positive, but there is an inherent tension between the two.

In such a perspective, the Italian programming of ESI funds for the 2014–2020 period will be analyzed in the next section, showing how, along with an intense diffusion of the objective of ISUD at different territorial levels, the application of the new governance tools and their territorialization has been limited.

3 Sustainable Urban Development in the 2014–2020 Italian Programming: Objectives and Governance

The issue of sustainable urban development, signed on October 29, 2014, is mentioned as a crosscutting priority by the Italian Partnership Agreement. Given their enormous potential for economic growth, on the one hand, and the manifold challenges on the other, cities are considered to be a strategic territorial priority for the current programming period in the country, with the aim of achieving the following objectives:

- (a) increased role of institutions of urban government as key actors of interdisciplinary and inter-institutional dialogue, as well as of the management of collective services;
- (b) adequate adaptation of project-management tools to territorial needs enabling the achievement of common objectives;
- (c) tangible implementation of thematic innovations foreseen by the ESF Regulation (e.g., social inclusion);
- (d) effective coordination between ordinary and additional financial resources;
- (e) concrete steps to encourage the process of establishment of metropolitan cities and local governance reforms;
- (f) guarantee of the involvement of citizens, civil society, and different levels of government in the definition and implementation of investments; and
- (g) limitation of urban sprawl and soil sealing.

The aforementioned objectives have been translated into the three ‘drivers of development’, which constitute the core of the Italian urban strategy at the national level and from which OP at the national and regional levels were to choose when defining specific actions:

- the redesign and modernization of urban services for residents and users;
- practices and projects for social inclusion for the most disadvantaged social groups and neighborhoods;
- the strengthening of the cities’ capacity to support local segments of global production chains.

A fourth driver could be added at the regional level, combining several thematic objectives.³ In order to implement the new strategy, two target categories of urban areas have been identified. The first category includes ten metropolitan cities defined by Law 56/2014 (the so-called Delrio Law)—Rome, Bari, Bologna, Genova, Firenze, Milano, Napoli, Torino, Reggio Calabria, and Venice, while the other comprises cities selected by the Special Status Regions⁴ and includes Cagliari, Reggio Catania, Messina, and Palermo. These cities are covered by the National Operational Programme (NOP) METRO “Metropolitan Cities”, entirely devoted to the objective of sustainable urban development and co-financed by the ERFD and the ESF.

Such an approach shows a considerable improvement compared to the previous programming period (2007–2013), when the competitiveness of urban systems was the only action for city development at the national level financed exclusively by the ERDF. Moreover, the NOP has introduced an important novelty in terms of urban governance architecture: Municipal authorities of the corresponding metropolitan cities are supposed to act as intermediate programming bodies—Urban Authorities—whereas in the past they were only the beneficiaries of project financing. In compliance with Article 7.4 of the ERFD Regulation (No 1301/2013), the NOP identifies mayors of the capital cities as Urban Authorities, who are responsible at least for the selection of projects in accordance with the principle of joint project management and shared strategic planning by the UA and the MA of the program (National Agency for Territorial Cohesion). As far as priority actions are concerned, the scope of the program appears to be rather limited: it focuses on the two first drivers, aiming at promoting sustainable mobility and energy efficiency in public buildings and lighting (TO 2 e 4) and measures against poverty and social exclusion (TO 9). Moreover, it is worth emphasizing that only non-material investments can cover the whole territory of metropolitan cities, while other actions will focus exclusively on the county seats. As Table 1 shows, financial allocations

³The following Thematic Objectives (TO) for the EU Structural and Investment Funds interventions have been defined to translate the Europe 2020 priorities into regional policies: (1) Strengthening research, technological development and innovation; (2) Enhancing access to, and use and quality of; information and communication technologies (ICT); (3) Enhancing the competitiveness of small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs); (4) Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors; (5) Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management; (6) Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency; (7) Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures; (8) Promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labor mobility; (9) Promoting social inclusion, combating poverty, and any discrimination; (10) Investing in education, training, and vocational training for skills and life-long learning; and (11) Enhancing the institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administration.

⁴In Italy, there are fifteen regions with ordinary status (*regioni a statuto ordinario*): Piedmont, Lombardy, Veneto, Liguria, Emilia-Romagna, Tuscany, Umbria, Marche, Lazio, Abruzzo, Molise, Campania, Puglia, Basilicata, and Calabria; while five regions—Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Sardinia, Sicily, Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol, and the Valle d'Aosta—have a special autonomous status (*regioni autonome a statuto speciale*), taking into account relevant geographically and/or culturally specific features.

Table 1 Priority axes and EU co-financing of the NOP METRO (based on the data reported by the NOP METRO)

Axis	Title	Funding (million €)	%	EU fund	Thematic objective
1	Digital agenda	98.084.915,00	16.7	ERDF	2
2	Sustainable public services and urban mobility	210.808.800,00	35	ERDF	4
3	Services for social inclusion	142.376.058,00	24.2	ESF	9
4	Infrastructures for social inclusion	113.306.228,00	19.2	ERDF	9
5	Technical assistance	23.523.999,00	4.1	ERDF	11
	Total	588.100.000,00	100	–	–

Table 2 Comprehensive funding of the NOR METRO by category of region (based on the data reported by the NOP METRO)

Regions	Cities	Funding
Less developed	Bari, Naples, Reggio Calabria, Catania, Messina, Palermo	566.533.333,00
Transition	Cagliari	40.800.000,00
More developed	Bologna, Rome, Genova, Milan, Turin, Florence, Venice	285.600.000,00

will mainly be concentrated on the South of the country, depending on the category of regions (Table 2).

Finally, considering that the total amount of financing assigned to the program is around 900 million euros, there seems to be a risk of fragmentation of resources between different axes and cities. Taking into account the above described design of the NOP METRO, urban strategies defined at the regional level were expected to cover other thematic objectives, in particular Competitiveness and enterprises (TO3), Climate and environmental risks (TO5) and Environmental protection (TO6), as well as to guarantee complementary measures for metropolitan cities not covered by the national program. Furthermore, it has been observed that a number of actions planned for ISUD within the framework of the NOP during 2014–2020 overlap, in territorial and thematic terms, with actions implemented between 2007 and 2013, in particular with regards to e-government, e-learning, sustainability in public services, urban mobility, and energy efficiency in metropolitan areas. In this way, not only does the innovative potential of actions for SUD appear to be rather limited in the current programming period, but their positive impact also risks being undermined, given that the outputs of several projects previously financed in the aforementioned sectors were far from successful (Tortorella 2015).

As far as Regional Operational Programmes (ROP) are concerned, actions for integrated sustainable urban development have been foreseen by all of them, although the approach to programming differs widely across the country. A specific

axis for ISUD has been designed by 11 ROP with a comprehensive allocation of about 786 million, compared to 9 ROP with 5 billion of euros in the 2007–2013 programming period (Tortorella 2015). Thus, quite surprisingly, the comprehensive amount of resources for sustainable urban development has decreased by 3.5 billion during the current programming, although the number of operational programmes dealing explicitly with this issue has increased (IFEL 2015). At the same time, some interesting policy innovations have been introduced at the regional level out of specific programs or axes. For example, ROP ERDF of Tuscany has foreseen actions for high-speed internet in the Florence region, which cannot be covered by the NOP ‘Metropolitan Cities’, whereas ROP Lombardy plans to buy railcars to employ in the suburbs of the metropolitan city of Milano to integrate the actions planned by the NOP METRO, etc.

As for the diffusion of innovations in governance architectures, around 53 % of resources do not have any specific territorial target, whereas a larger part of resources (27 %) have been assigned to big cities (more than 50,000 inhabitants) with a substantially lower share (15 %) allocated for small and medium towns (between 5,000 and 50,000 inhabitants). Besides, a considerable difference exists between more and less developed regions: for the former category almost 70 % of resources has a territorial target, while in less developed regions this amount decreases to 46.6 % (IFEL 2015). Some regional strategies have targeted specific types of urban areas (e.g., Functional Urban Areas in Tuscany) in order to plan future interventions but without using new governance instruments.

Overall, the adoption of CLLD and ITIs has proved limited in Italy, although a specific section on “Integrated approach to territorial development to implement through the Development and Investment Funds” has been envisaged in the Partnership Agreement, specifying that the many forms of integrated territorial planning developed in the country during the previous decades could be enhanced through the new governance tools. Only a few regions have introduced ITI-type arrangements to design actions for sustainable urban development (Marche, Molise, Basilicata, Sardinia, and Sicily), while others have avoided the adoption of these tools (and in particular of ITI) because of their high organizational complexity. Remarkably, rarely has the experience of the past URBAN CIP been taken into consideration,⁵ while only two regions (Sardinia and Sicily) had relied on a similar kind of tool for integrated programming already in the period 2007–2013. Instead, no specific actions for integrated urban development have been foreseen in the operational programs for ERFD of Bolzano, Trento, Valle d’Aosta, and Lazio.

⁵The following URBAN CIP programs were implemented in Italy during the previous decades: Bari, Cagliari, Catanzaro, Cosenza, Foggia, Lecce, Napoli, Palermo, Roma, Salerno, Siracusa Ortigia, Regio Calabria, and Venezia Porto Marghera (1994–1999); Carrara, Caserta, Crotone, Genoa, Milan, Mister Bianco, Mola di Bari, Pescara, Taranto, and Turin (2000–2006). The PIC URBAN Genoa was supported during both programming periods.

4 Conclusions

Obviously enough, the above overview presents only a preliminary picture of policy outputs, as many other actions will be introduced in the forthcoming years. However, it provides a number of important insights with regards the scenario of the diffusion of policy and governance innovations within the framework of EU-cohesion policies related, in particular, to sustainable urban development. As illustrated, the EU has promoted specific policy objectives and governance tools since the 1990s in order to address the issue of development in urban areas in the perspective of sustainability. A progressive consolidation of these tools at the EU level has not been accompanied, however, by their extensive diffusion across member states. What is particularly striking, as the analysis of the Italian case shows, is that during the current programming period, when the place-based approach (Barca 2009) is strongly advocated by the EU, the task of matching the European guidance with local needs, passing through the national and regional levels of programming, remains quite a challenge. Moreover, besides concerns about the capacity of local authorities and partnerships to guarantee effective and efficient performance of functions that can be delegated to them according to the new regulations, a more general problem of governing development policies in multi-level systems seems to arise, as a limited adoption of the new policy instruments has partly been due to many uncertainties, high complexity, and insufficiently clear operational provisions for their application on the ground.

References

- Barca, F. (2009). An agenda for a reformed cohesion policy. In: A place-based approach to meeting European union challenges and expectations, DG REGIO.
- Domorenok, E. (2009). Le Iniziative Comunitarie 1993–2006: valore aggiunto per la coesione economica, sociale e territoriale. In: A. Bruzzo, E. Domorenok (Eds.), *La politica di coesione nell'Unione Europea allargata. Aspetti economici, sociali e territoriali*. Ferrara: UnifePress.
- European Commission. (1998). Sustainable urban development in the European Union: a framework for action COM(1998)605.
- European Commission. (2000). Communication from the commission to the member states of 28.4.00 laying down guidelines for a community initiative URBAN II 2000–2006 C(2000) 1100.
- European Commission. (2006). Politica di coesione e città: il contributo delle aree urbane alla crescita e all'occupazione nelle regioni - COM(2006)385.
- European Commission. (2007). Guide on 'The urban dimension in Community policies for the period 2007–2013 adopted on 24 May 2007. Brussels.
- European Commission. (2008). *Fostering the urban dimension. Analysis of the operational programmes co-financed by the European regional development fund (2007–2013), working document of the DG regional policy*. Belgium: Brussels.
- (2010). *The Urban dimension in European Union policies (Article 7 ERDF Regulation)*. Brussels.
- (2014). *Integrated Sustainable Urban Development, factsheet*. http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/informat/2014/urban_en.pdf.
- (2015). *Guidance for member states on integrated sustainable urban development*. Brussels.

- IFEL ANCI. (2015). *La dimensione territoriale nelle politiche di coesione*. Quinta Edizione, Studi e Ricerche.
- Mendez, C. (2013). The post-2013 reform of EU cohesion policy and the place-based narrative. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(5), 639–659.
- Regulation (EU) No 1301/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on the European Regional Development Fund and on specific provisions concerning the Investment for growth and jobs goal.
- Regulation (EU) No 1304/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on the European Social Fund.
- Tortorella, W. (2015). *Politica di coesione e questione urbana*. Carocci: Roma.
- Van der Zwet, A., Miller, S., & Gross, F. (2014). A first stock take: Integrated territorial approaches in cohesion policy 2014–2020, IQ-Net Thematic Paper 35(2), November 2014.